



United Nations Global Compact Human Rights Working Group

**29 April 2008
WilmerHale, 60 State Street, Boston, USA**

Revised Draft Proposal: Making the Human Rights Working Group a Forum for endorsing good practices in implementing Global Compact human rights principles

During the meeting of the Global Compact Human Rights Working Group (HRWG) in New York on 14 September 2007, a proposal was made that the HRWG should act as a “clearing house” for identification of good practices by companies and stakeholders in the implementation of the Global Compact human rights principles. The Working Group decided to explore possible approaches which would ensure the legitimacy of decisions made in this regard by the HRWG, while at the same time capturing the evolving learning and experience of Global Compact participants.

During a subsequent meeting of the HRWG in London on 12 December 2007, a Note was circulated containing proposals for overarching principles and different modalities for the HRWG’s function as a “Clearing House” for good practice on human rights in the Global Compact.

Based on the discussion during the meeting of 12 December, **the following is proposed concerning the role and functions of the HRWG:**

- The HRWG should agree that a part of its mandate includes acting as a “**forum**” (rather than as a “clearing house”) for identifying good practices on implementing the human rights principles by Global Compact participants.
- The HRWG should announce to all Global Compact participants that it is undertaking this initiative and inviting proposals for good practice on human rights for consideration by the HRWG. This announcement could include a number of relevant themes or issue areas that the HRWG believes are of key importance.
- Taking into consideration the resource constraints of members of the HRWG and of the GC itself, a proposal submitted to the HRWG may be based on good practice developed by others, such as BLIHR, the IBLF, the Danish Institute for Human Rights, or others.
- A proposal for good practice received by the Global Compact office should be circulated electronically to members of the HRWG two weeks in advance of the meeting during which the proposal will be discussed.
- **Different models for developing good practice can work concurrently.** While most members of the HRWG expressed a preference for what was listed as Model 3 in the

Note of 12 December 2007 (**good practice developed through human rights dilemma discussion**), proposals for the HRWG can arise from a variety of initiatives and efforts, depending on the nature and scope of the human rights issues involved, available resources and level of engagement of the participants involved.

- While the exact modalities for how to develop a proposal for good practice for consideration by the HRWG are optional, any proposal **must** include all of the following:
 - **Transparency** about how the proposal has been developed. Any proposal made to the HRWG should outline clearly the process which has been followed to develop the proposal;
 - **Multi-stakeholder buy-in to the proposal.** While some stages of a process to develop a good practice may only comprise one of the Global Compact stakeholder groups, **the proposal must have been tested and supported by key affected stakeholder groups at some stage during the process prior to presentation to the HRWG;**
 - **The proposal must be explicit about how and why it relates to human rights;**
 - **The proposal must include reference to expected outcome and impact on the enjoyment of human rights;**
 - **The proposal must include a plan for reviewing the good practice, in order to capture evolving understanding** and learning about the issue for which the good practice has been developed.
- If a good practice proposal has been agreed as such by the HRWG, it will be **posted on the Global Compact website on a dedicated link.**

Outstanding issues for consideration by the HRWG:

1. What happens once the HRWG “endorses” a specific practice? How is this communicated and to what extent can it be integrated into guidance around Communications on Progress or other GC related activities?
2. What should be the level of consideration by the HRWG of a proposal for good practice? The current draft revised proposal does not entail any obligations on members of the HRWG as to the development of a proposal. Is it sufficient that the HRWG is satisfied that the mandatory elements outlined above are met in the proposal, or does the HRWG want to engage in more substantive evaluation of whether a proposal qualifies as a good practice on human rights in the context of the Global Compact?
3. In case of disagreement within the HRWG about whether something qualifies as a good practice, how does the HRWG resolve the issue? Must there be consensus, simple majority or qualified majority?
