



## **UN Business & Human Rights Framework: Developing an intergovernmental process towards a binding instrument**

**CIDSE written statement  
on the occasion of the UN Human Rights Council 26th Session (Geneva, 10-27 June 2014)**

In its 2011 resolution, the UN Human Rights Council recognized the role of the UN Guiding Principles on business and human rights as a contribution to enhancing standards and practice, “without foreclosing any other long-term development, including further **enhancement of standards.**”

The UN Protect, Respect and Remedy Framework and its Guiding Principles set out clearly that business impacts require a “**smart mix**” of policy responses that goes beyond voluntary standards and includes regulation. CIDSE and its member organizations believe that if the **Framework and Principles are implemented effectively** in this way, they could be a valuable tool for reducing the risk of human rights abuses. Therefore we are actively engaging in national discussions on Business and Human Rights Action Plans and working with our partners to monitor and evaluate the situation on the ground.

Yet implementation by States and companies has been **very slow**, and States’ efforts so far have given little attention to legal measures. At its June 2014 session, the Council must take its responsibility to review the situation and consider remaining gaps requiring **complementary, targeted further steps** in order to strengthen the collective framework, especially in relation to access to judicial remedy.

There is **urgency**. A wide number of communities and individuals are suffering abuses and **violations of a range of human rights** now as a result of business activity. By some measures, the situation has even worsened since 2011, as for cases of social conflict, criminalization of protest related to business investments and killings of human rights defenders. **Access to justice** and remedy continues to be denied to communities in numerous countries, also highlighting the need for effective **extraterritorial actions** by States where multinational companies are based. The case for further international action is supported by the UN Office of the High Commissioner on Human Rights (OHCHR) study on domestic law remedies for corporate involvement in gross human rights abuses.

The OHCHR study follows on from former Special Representative John Ruggie’s call upon States in 2011 and subsequently to address the weaknesses and inconsistencies in the legal protection of human rights related to gross human rights abuses. **Recognising** this and other **gaps** in the Guiding Principles, several initiatives are calling for an international treaty or instrument.<sup>1</sup> Civil society and Church voices across the globe are demanding **more effective responses**. The growing impatience in many countries has been marked by the Ecuador initiative for a binding instrument.

---

<sup>1</sup> See Call for an international legally binding instrument on human rights, transnational corporations and other business enterprises, People’s Forum on Human Rights and Business, Bangkok, November 2013.

One year ago, one of the most devastating catastrophes in the textile sector happened with the collapse of the Rana Plaza building in Dhaka, Bangladesh. This disaster illustrates the shared obligations and responsibilities of multiple States, transnational and national enterprises. There is a clear need for instruments that **match the reality of today's global corporate structures and business relationships**, also to provide a level playing field for all businesses.

We recognise that the complex challenge of preventing corporate abuses of human rights will require a **range of creative approaches**, not one single solution. In France, parliamentarians have proposed to establish a duty of care for multinational corporations, to prevent damages to the environment, health and human rights within all their economic relationships.<sup>2</sup> An international instrument requiring national legislation enacting **corporate legal liability for serious violations** of human rights would serve both as an incentive for businesses to undertake proper **human rights due diligence, and to repair harm** done where they fail. This would build upon and strengthen the approach to human rights due diligence articulated in the UN Guiding Principles.

The September 2013 statement to the Human Rights Council in favor of a binding instrument, supported by 85 States, is an indication of the depth of support by a number of States and a favorable sign for implementation. A legally binding instrument addressing the **shared responsibilities** of multiple States and businesses in preventing and remedying situations of human rights abuses, such as the Rana Plaza disaster, could remove obstacles to individual States and businesses moving independently of others. With an **effective monitoring and follow up mechanism**, this could make a real difference on the ground. It is certainly worth developing in-depth **thinking about the pros and cons** of different regional and international instruments, without simply closing down the debate.

If we are to see wide-scale reductions in instances of human rights abuses as a result of business activities, it is important to **make progress in parallel both on implementation of the Guiding Principles, and in discussions on a binding international instrument**, building on efforts to date.

---

## Contact

Denise Auclair, Senior Policy Advisor, CIDSE, [auclair\(at\)cidse.org](mailto:auclair(at)cidse.org), +32.2.233 37 58

---

<sup>2</sup> Proposition de loi n°1524, Devoir de vigilance des sociétés mères et des entreprises donneuses d'ordre, November 2013.

CIDSE is an international alliance of Catholic development agencies working together for global justice

**MILYBERR:** [Broederslijk Delen](#) – Belgium • [CAFOD](#) – England and Wales • [UCED](#) / [Tercer Solidaritat](#) – France • [Center of Concern](#) – USA • [Concilium](#) – the Netherlands • [Development and Peace](#) – Canada • [Eterniteit en Doelmatig](#) – Belgium • [eReto](#) – Slovakia • [Evangelische](#) – Switzerland • [ECC](#) – Portugal • [EDCSIV](#) – Italy • [Evangelium Brüdertum Diakon](#) – Luxembourg • [KDO](#) – Austria • [Misako Uricas](#) – Spain • [MISEREOR](#) – Germany • [SCIAF](#) – Scotland • [Trocite](#) – Ireland