

Promoting, Respecting And Fulfilling Human Rights: The Challenge Before Intergovernmental Agencies

**September 24, 2002
Washington DC, USA**

Organized By:

Bank Information Center (USA)
Bretton Woods Project (UK)
Campagna Per La Riforma Della Banca Mondiale (Italy)
Center Of Concern (USA)
Center For Economic And Social Rights (USA)
Citizen's Network For Essential Services (USA)
Friends Of The Earth (USA)
Human Rights Watch (USA)
Indian Law Resource Center (USA)
Washington Office On Latin America (USA)
World Vision
ActionAidUSA

Acknowledgements

Irungu Houghton wrote this report. The co-organisers acknowledge Nisha Thapliyal for organizing the workshop, Shazia Anwar for rapporteuring and photography, Vicky Gass (WOLA) for securing the venue and the workshop steering committee (Aldo Calieri, Tish Armstrong, Steve Herz, Irungu Houghton, Alex Wilks and Nisha Thapliyal) for conceptualizing the workshop purpose and process.

Thanks to the presenters and moderators for steering the process. Thanks also to Carolyn Reynolds of the World Bank for advice and liaison during the hectic Annual Meetings schedule.

Open Society Institute, Human Rights Watch, the Center for Economic and Social Rights and ActionAidUSA financially supported the event.

Table of Contents

Acknowledgements

page 2

Preface

page 3

Workshop Objectives and Process

page 4

Reflections on the Past Preoccupations

page 4

Opportunities and Challenges before intergovernmental agencies as perceived by Civil Society

page 6

Opportunities and Challenges before intergovernmental agencies as perceived by World Bank, UNICEF and UNDP

page 7

Working Group propositions on increased downward accountability, public participation and rights consistent macro-economic policy

page 9

Conclusions

page 10

Appendix A: List of participants

Appendix B: Comments and Points of Action

“The human rights policy of the World Bank is not a negative one but gradually evolving engagement over a wide range of issues. However, only fragments of human rights policies exist on these issues”
Philip Alston

“It is a moral obligation of institutions like the [International Monetary] Fund and the [World] Bank to be consistent with their own actions and accept that in practice they have a much broader scope than their charters would suggest.”

Alex Wilks, Bretton Woods Project

“I believe that the mandate of the Bank has a very fundamental niche today to implement rights faster, quicker and acceptable to society.”

Alfredo Sfeir-Younus, World Bank

“The rights-based approach is performing an integrating function across sectors of the agency.”

Jake Werksman, UNDP.

“It is conceivable that the UN, WB, UNICEF may violate someone’s human rights when implementing a project. How do these organizations refrain from doing so is the big question they need help with.”

Dorothy Ruzgo, UNICEF.

Preface

Various human rights treaties and covenants place three basic obligations in front of the state: to respect, protect and guarantee human rights. States must not violate human rights through their own actions, must ensure that non-state actors do not violate basic human rights and thirdly, take steps towards the guaranteeing of human rights realization for its all citizens.

Over the nineties, there have been numerous policy discussions, popular demands and research papers linking these obligations and non-state actors such as intergovernmental agencies. In 2002, the Washington consensus framework for the international finance institutions is at its lowest credibility within policy circles and the wider public yet. Dissatisfaction with global economic growth performance, the negative impact of structural adjustment and widening poverty-wealth gaps has found its way to the inter-Governmental agencies. Referred to as “the noise out there”, it is possibly this momentum that was cited by senior Bank officials during an internal World Bank seminar on May 2nd 2002.

The World Bank internal seminar marked an important step towards acknowledging human rights within Bank policies and operations. In his closing remarks, President Jim Wolfensohn spoke about the changing mood within the Bank, which has encouraged people to “come out of the closet” and speak openly about the role of the Bank in promoting human rights.

Following the May workshop, a number of organisations jointly wrote to the Bank encouraging the new development and requesting an opportunity to engage the Bank on this issue. By September, the Bank had not replied to the letter. The NGO working group elected to utilize the 2002 World Bank and IMF Annual Meetings as

an opportunity to revisit human rights and the World Bank within the broader experiences of several inter-governmental agencies.

Workshop Objectives and process

Organized by twelve organizations, the one-day seminar is therefore, the second comprehensive response by NGOs to the informal steps by the World Bank towards acknowledging human rights within World Bank policies and operations. Sixty participants drawn from 40 different non-governmental organizations as well as senior level representatives from the World Bank and the UN attended the event.

The seminar explored the opportunities and constraints of adopting an international human rights framework to guide, support and enhance global policies and strategies for poverty reduction and sustainable development. Human rights researchers, NGO, World Bank and UN representatives made presentations throughout the day. The presentations were discussed in two working group sessions. Although inconclusive in terms of an agenda or work plan, a number of important insights were made and suggestions offered¹

Reflections on past preoccupations

Presentations by Prof Philip Alston, Prof. Danny Bradlow and Tom Palley in the morning made the points that in the past; three major pre-occupations have prevented the adoption of human rights norms and practices by the World Bank.

The first was emphasized by the previous General Consuls and the Board of Executive Directors and revolved around the question of “mandate”. It was argued that the mandate of the Bank was essentially economic. Human rights were largely political in nature.

The second preoccupation lay in the anxiety that human rights embraced the concept of redress in the case of violations. It was perceived that the World Bank might have to provide compensation in the cases of programmes and policies that undermined basic human rights.

The third preoccupation was the relegation of human rights to broad policy questions and to omit them from an examination of specific Bank funded projects and economic policies.

A case study from Guatemala reflected the complex issues surrounding redress and compensation following human rights violations.

¹ See here Working Group propositions on increased downward accountability, public participation and rights consistent macro-economic policy and Appendix C for interesting individual ideas on what intergovernmental agencies should continue to do, start doing and stop doing.

The case of Chixoy Dam and the Rio Negro Massacre, Guatemala

Refusal to relocate and make way for the Chinoy dam, led a community living on the banks of the Rio Negro to be politically and violently targeted by various guerilla groups and state militia death squads in Guatemala. Several years later, the Truth Commission of Guatemala was to state that the resettlement of this population to accommodate a World Bank-funded dam led to acts of genocide.

In many ways this is a test case for the World Bank. A Bank funded project led to human rights abuses within the context of a guerilla civil war in Guatemala. During the period of the violations, both World Bank staff and international contractors were well aware of the violence accompanying the resettlement. Yet, there were no reports issued. The Guatemala government and the companies were repeatedly awarded more money to continue with the project.

Under basic international legal theory, there are three aspects to reparation: indemnity, restitution and satisfaction. In this case, such a remedy should include repairing the damage they caused, making amends to the people, and compensating the damage. To date, there has been inadequate acknowledgement of responsibility at all by the World Bank. They do not even address the indirect complicity of funding a government that is committing massive human rights violations. They have refused to be involved in the process of neither financial reparations nor the resettlement of the population.

The World Bank does not possess a policy on reparations. There are no criteria for evaluating possible damage caused by a World Bank project in the past. In order to prevent these human rights abuses from happening again at a World Bank funded project, the Bank must conduct human rights assessments and evaluations prior to every project. For past cases, there should be an independent body that can create clear guidelines for the World Bank, IDB, and other international bodies.²

Yet, it was noted in the words of Philip Alston, "policy makers at the World Bank have come a long way in recent years in acknowledging the need for incorporating human rights norms into their project analysis". Evidence of this shift could be seen in the treatment of resettlement, indigenous peoples, women, AIDS, child labour, governance, corruption and information transparency. He concluded thus, "The human rights policy of the World Bank is not a negative one but gradually evolving engagement over a wide range of issues. However, only fragments of human rights policies exist on these issues"

Alex Wilks noted that the Bank has begun to speak more boldly on governance, anti-corruption and judicial reform in the last 7-10 years. In fact, "the number of governance related conditionalities has shot up to the point that they are half of the conditionalities on current projects". All these changes reveal a changing set of policy boundaries that exceed the narrow confines of economic policy.

² Presented by Jaro Colajacomo, Campaign to reform the Bank (Italy)

Opportunities and Challenges before intergovernmental agencies as perceived by Civil Society Speakers

Retaining a dislocated approach to projects, economic policies and sustainable development undermines the work of the Bank, Bradlow argued. Project sponsors and implementers must integrate broad policy considerations and narrow project decisions in a way that allows for affected people to participate and have a real say in the desired outputs and outcomes. This makes consultations and other means of accountability critical. Yet, crucial questions remain, who is accountable, for what and to whom? How much participation is enough? What is adequate participation? What to do with irreconcilable conflicts?

Incorporating the use of the normative language of human rights instruments and developing standards of accountability are the first steps. These standards must be applied both at national and international levels. The Bank must adopt a 360° vision to accountability which includes, direct beneficiaries, borrower governments as well as the taxpayers of countries all around the world that are financing these projects.

Two forms of accountability exist: legal and non-legal. Legal methods of accountability include national court systems and international mechanisms such as World Bank and regional Banks' Inspection Panels and the IMF independent evaluation office. A key non-legal mechanism is the media and publicity. Institutional legitimacy depends on the perceptions of the public. Despite movement on information disclosure and transparency in recent years, Tish Armstrong cautioned against the perception that releasing information that is complex and difficult to understand does not make the organization transparent. Accountability requires at minimum iterations between intergovernmental agencies and the public.

Learning from Pakistan

The World Bank claims that the purpose of the PRS process is to move away from conditionality based projects and towards a more holistic strategy of lending, offering ownership and participation of civil society. In the case of Pakistan, this has been accompanied by the extension of past structural adjustment programs. Yet, poverty has increased with each passing year of these programs in the past.

The ownership of the PRS process has largely excluded civil society. It is clear that IMF and World Bank staff wrote the paper, offered it to the Government for ratification and then released it for civil society review. While the paper raised issues about governance and corruption, it continues to reaffirm the undemocratic and military government. Doesn't this further implicate the World Bank as an accomplice to a government that is committing human rights violations?

Presentation by Khadim Hussain, ActionAid Pakistan

While welcoming World Bank openness to talk about political and human rights issues, the development community should not allow the World Bank to become the human rights police. What is needed is more accountability to the citizenry of the client country regarding the entire project. One way to make this possible is to make the Poverty Reduction Strategy processes, a much more structured set of relationships within the existing mechanisms in the client countries. Requiring parliamentary committees and national civil society associations to be active during the negotiations for example, would ensure the government and the international financial institutions include civil society on a level playing field.

Alex Wilks posed several questions, challenging calls for more assessments; who will do the assessments, under which terms and to whom will these assessments be accountable? Alternative options exist including third parties such as the UN Rapporteur system or a code of project ethics for development workers, which embrace standards of information sharing, participation and accountability.

Opportunities and Challenges before intergovernmental agencies as perceived by the World Bank, UNICEF and UNDP

Alfredo Sfeir-Younus of the World Bank welcomed the discourse between civil society and the Bank. He called for “the dialogue between the two to be open and rigorous in order to be productive. The World Bank does not want to get stuck in the past, but wants to move forward.” His presentation generated a number of dilemmas and problems for the adoption of a human rights paradigm by the Bank.

Reconciliation of the discipline of economics and human rights theory is key for the Bank moving forward. The relationship between human rights and the attainment of wealth must also be recognized. Development actors cannot say growth now and social justice later, he argued. They also cannot argue for social justice now with no material welfare. This indivisibility between socio-economic welfare and human rights requires “an intellectual journey that cannot be truncated just to hurry up and get human rights onto the table,” argued Younus.

He characterized as a key tension, the tendency of economists to think in terms of trade offs and human rights advocates to think in terms of the absolute. He counseled that understanding the limits on economics could help human rights advocates relate to their colleagues during negotiations.

Development policies must provide society with an enabling environment to accomplish these rights. A country cannot implement the right to education if there are no schools, no teachers, and no roads. Privatisation of public utilities in order to facilitate access is not against human rights theory. The Covenant of Economic,

Social and Cultural Rights can be most helpful in understanding the gradual nature of rights realization and the manner in which it can be realized.

He argued that concepts such as the right to development and a human rights approach have often been used interchangeably despite the lack of international consensus.

The centrality of governments in the governance of the World Bank and the ratification of human rights covenants ensure that if these governments are not interested in implementing human rights, than it is very difficult to make it happen. By addressing these concerns, human rights advocates can assist the World Bank in moving forward into a more rights-based approach to its work.

In response to a question, Sfeir-Younus clarified that the World Bank is not at this point contemplating an operational policy on human rights, rather the President has instituted an internal working group to develop thinking on this issue.

Rights-based programming at the UN

Dorothy Rozga (UNICEF) and Jake Werksman (UNDP) shared various lessons from the experiences of UNICEF and UNDP.

UNICEF's experiences with implementing a rights-based approach at least six lessons for other agencies. Firstly, a rights-based approach includes two main aspects; all programs of cooperation are focused on the realization of the rights of children and women, the standards for which are found in various human rights treaties and that human rights principles guide all areas and phases of programming and project planning.

Locating accountability is often an area for disagreement between lawyers and development specialists. While a lawyer may say that accountability is with the state, a development specialist says that accountability runs throughout all levels of society, from parent to child onwards.

The operationalisation of human rights approaches requires the development of capacity of duty bearers to meet their obligations, and rights holders to claim their rights. UNICEF analyzes what these capacity gaps are and programs to meet those gaps at all levels.

Firm commitment and leadership from the top management is a pre-requisite. New policies need to be a systematic and deliberate in seeking mainstream change. The agency and staff must embrace and internalise the new value system.

Mechanisms and processes that facilitate bottom-up learning from the field must be constructed to feed into practices and policies of the agency. Evaluations, reviews and training is a key to moving agencies around.

UNDP is a non-operation agency, which provides grants, policy and technical services. In this context implementing a rights-based approach has a unifying factor for development and human rights goals. Developmental goals and human rights goals are now linked.

UNDP Units on social economic development, institutional development, and environmental development have created internal partnerships in the order to fulfill and empower rights realization. Externally, UNDP requires governments to empower the citizens with information so that the citizens can empower the governments to implement the needs of the citizenry. Some areas of cooperation that policies are being developed on include increasing participatory rights, improving accountability and increasing transparency.

Working Group propositions on increased downward accountability, public participation and rights consistent macro-economic policy

Working groups took place around three central change questions surrounding downward accountability, public participation and IFI macro-economic policy consistency with human rights standards. Propositions emerged from the groups, which could be characterized as rites of passage perhaps;

Rite of passage 1: Increased downward accountability of IFIs, multi-lateral donors and recipient countries

Existing human rights obligations must be included in the PRSP process. Issues of capacity building and rule of law problems must be addressed. There should be positive incentives for the State's enforcement of rights. Citizen based litigation strategies should not be discouraged. For the Bank, strengthening the capacity of the Inspection Panel should be considered. There should also be sector specific initiatives around issues such as resource extraction. Combining incentives that encourage Bank staff performance and removing immunity for officials to address violations through litigation strategies must be allowed. A more public role of UN Treaty Bodies and Special Rappateours should be implemented.

Rite of passage 2: Enabled increased public participation

Participation is a right of the people. Among other stakeholders, the communities directly affected by the project should participate in all levels of discussions. Participation must be informed by access to information throughout the process.

Participation should start long before the main design of the project is drafted, and should continue to monitor and evaluate during the design and implementation of the project as well.

Rather than having a public relations campaign to get civil society involved, agencies should improve their quality of consultation through careful management and monitoring of efforts. The views of participants should be incorporated, and the exclusion of their opinions should be formally addressed. There should be an external monitoring body to monitor the level and quality of participation plus other quality issues.

Rite of passage 3: IFI macroeconomic policy, planning and operations redesign for consistency with international human rights standards

This group provoked a series of questions. How to safeguard against macroeconomic policies that violate HR? Given their wedding to macro-economic dogma, would the World Bank even consider using a framework such as UNICEF's? What are the relationship between growth and human rights? How good were SAPS for growth? What are the opportunities to engage and dialogue on this with the IMF and others?

Conclusions

The day initiated/re-started a dialogue between the World Bank, UNICEF and UNDP and civil society organizations. No agreement emerged on how to take this dialogue further. Most participants nevertheless appreciated the wide variety of issues covered the diversity of participants and the opportunity to engage high level representatives from the World Bank and the United Nations' development agencies. Areas for improvement included increasing time to some of the sessions; more parallel group work and building more consensus on concepts and implications of adopting a rights based approach.

Some participants elected to follow up the issues raised in the day long seminar by researching the relationship between macroeconomic policy making and human rights violations with a view to framing a range of actions for ESCR (Julian Liu (CESR) and Daria Caliguire (ESCR-Net)), public opinion campaigning to urge the World Bank to promote human rights (Nicolas Guihard, from Agir Ici, France), research into World Bank corruption and get students to work with NGOs on specific projects to support human rights advocacy (Peter Rosenblum, Donovan Rinker-Morris and Michael Camiller of Harvard Law School), tracking the World Bank's actions and engage partners on their opinions of the World Bank's role vis-à-vis human rights (Bruce Jenkins, BICUSA), strengthening understanding of the PRS

and human rights (Rory Mungoven, Human Rights Watch), monitoring the World Bank working group on human rights (Nikki Reisch of BICUSA) among others.

Appendix A: List of participants			
Name	Organization	Phone Number	Email
Mausume Mahapatro	ActionAid Bangladesh	880-2-881-5991/2	mausume@actionaid-bd.org
Fouzia Saeed	ActionAid Pakistan		Fouzia@actionaidpakistan.org
Khadim Hussain	ActionAid Pakistan		Khadim@actionaidpakistan.org
Ophira Carr	ActionAidUSA	202-8351240	ophirac@actionaidusa.org
Mishka Zaman	ActionAidUSA	202-8351240	mishkaz@actionaidusa.org
Nisha Thapliyal	ActionAidUSA	202-8351240	associate@actionaidusa.org
Irungu Houghton	ActionAidUSA	202-8351240	irunguh@actionaidusa.org
Shazia N. Anwar	Consultant rapporteur	301-270-8981	shaziaanwar@hotmail.com
Iain Guest	Advocacy Project		Iain@advocacynet.org
Gwen Sullva	AFSC	512-349-9877	gwensull@auotu.rr.com
Nizola Guiland	Agira Ici (France)	33-1-46-98-24-40	ifi@agiraici.org
Sheila Perosa	Amnesty International	917-216-6314	sperosa@amnesty.org
Nochbel Hoack	AU FISA	202-885-6528	heretoo@aol.com
Bruce Jenkins	Bank Information Center	202-624-0620	bjenkins@bicusa.org
Leslie Greene	Bank Information Center	202-624-0632	lgreene@bicusa.org
Henneke Brink	Both Ends		Hb@bothends.org
Alex Wilkes	Bretton Woods Project	44-207-561-7546	awilks@brettonwoodsproject.org
Karla Simon	Catholic University	202-319-5140	simon@law.edu
Jimena Garrote	CELS	54-11-4334-4200	garrote@cels.org.ar
Julian Liu	Center for Economic, Social and Cultural Rights	718-237-9145 x17	jliu@cesr.org
Paul Ladd	Christian Aid	44-207-523-2103	pladd@christian-aid.org
Antonio Tricarico	CRBM		Atricarico@crbm.org
Søren Kirk Jensen	Eurodad		soren@eurodad.org
Steve Horz	Friends of the Earth (US)	783-7400	sherz@foe.org
Channapha Khamvongsa	Ford Foundation	212-573-5072	ckhamvongsa@fordfound.org
Elaine Zuckerman	Gender Action	202-234-7722	ezuch@springnet.com
Liane Schalater	H. Boell Foundation	202-462-7514	liane@boell.org
Pam Foster	Halifax Initiative	613-789-4447	pfoster@halifaxinitiative.org
Sharon Kelly	Harvard Law HR program	617-623-1530	skelly@law.harvard.edu
Peter Rosenblum	Harvard Law School	617-496-2825	prosenbl@law.harvard.edu
Rory Mungoven	Human Rights Watch	212-216-1276	mungovr@hrw.org
Steven Tullberg	Indian Law Resource Center	202-547-2800	stullberg@indianlaw.org

Vanessa Jimenez	Indian Law Resource Center	202-547-2800	vjimenez@indianlaw.org
Brian Greenberg	Innovative Resources Management	202-293-8384	bgreenberg@irmgt.com
Name	Organization	Phone Number	Email
Bob Golten	International HR Advocacy Center (Uni. of Denver)	303-871-7784	bgolten@du.edu
Daria Caliguire	International Network for Econ, Social and Cultural Rights	718-237-9145 x16	dcaliguire@cesr.org
Luisa Nardi	International Network for ESC Rights	718-237-9144 x13	lnardi@cesr.org
Bill Ferguson	Jubilee USA Network	408-946-5096	bill@bill-ferguson.org
Lisa Veneklasen	Just Associates	202-232-1211	lvk@justassociates.org
Raj Purohit	Lawyers Committee for Human Rights	202-547-5092	purohit@lchr.org
Eudio Carmona	Mozambique Debt Group	258-1-303026/ 258-82-392845	diurda@zebra.ubm.mz
Maureen Hinman	Oxfam America	202-496-1323	DCTemp2@oxfamamerica.org
John Ruthrauff	Oxfam America	202-496-1304	jruthrauff@oxfamamerica.org
Joao J. Uthui	TEIA-National Form for Mozambican NGOs	258-1-43043011/ 309665	teia.forum@teledata.mz / faweano@teledata.mz
Goh Chien Yen	Third World Network	604-227-7553	monk@pacifinet.sg
Jake Werksman	UNDP	212-906-5029	jake.werksman@undp.org
Inga Elisabeth Hawley	UNDP	202-331-9130	inga.hawley@undp.org
Dorothy Rozga	UNICEF	212-824-6239	drozga@unicef.org
Steve Klees	University of Maryland	301-405-2212	sklees@wam.umd.edu
Katie Malouf	Washington Office on Latin America		katietravels@hotmail.com
Vichi Gass	WOLA	202-797-2171	vgass@wola.org
Veena Siddharth	World Bank	202-473-3548	vsiddharth@worldbank.org
Judith Edstrom	World Bank	202-473-3621	jedstrom@worldbank.org
Sfeir-Younis	World Bank	011-41-22-748-1000	
Teresa Gentafo	World Bank	202-458-1771	tgentafo@worldbank.org
Kathrin Plagemann	World Bank	202-473-0301	kplangemann@worldbank.org
Milena Sanchez de Boado	World Bank	202-458-0467	msanchezdeboado@worldbank.org
Magui Moreno Torres	World Bank	202-473-8899	mmorenotorres@worldbank.org
Juan Garrison	World Bank	202-473-4742	jgarrison@worldbank.org
Jeff Thindwa	World Bank	202-458-1112	jthindwa@worldbank.org
Annika Silva-Leander	World Bank	202-473-6384	asilvaleander@worldbank.org
Sakil Malik	World Learning, Inc.	202-408-5420	sakil.malik@worldlearning.org
Randini Wandwagala	World Vision	44-19-08-84-10-32	randini@worldvision.org.uk

Alan Whaites	World Vision	44-1908-8410-63	policy_advocacy@wvi.org
--------------	--------------	-----------------	--

Appendix B: Draft comments and Points of Action³

Intergovernmental agencies should **continue**

1. Acknowledging, protecting and implementing recommendations by communities invited to comment and participation in policy and project formulation and implementation
2. Supporting states to share information and best practices among them
3. Supporting the independent monitoring of human rights in client countries and the steps towards accepting “shadow” reports and non-state actors
4. Strengthening systems of legal accountability within their institutions and in borrower countries to ensure compliance with HR standards
5. Integrate clear commitment to uphold a “sound” human rights environment before a “sound” economic environment
6. Incorporate and make clear their interpretation of their own obligations under international HR law and norms in their policy dialogues with states

Intergovernmental agencies should **start**

7. Embracing a holistic HR paradigm as operational policy that does not prioritize at the outset economic and social rights over civil and political rights for instance
8. Carrying out comprehensive social impact assessments
9. Developing internal capacities and those of states and corporate businesses to realize human rights obligations.
10. Promoting aid as a right not a privilege and actively seek legal framework for developed countries to give 0.7% of their GDP as aid.
11. Financially supporting inter-governmental and civil society organizations that are tracking human rights issues

Intergovernmental agencies should **stop**

12. Avoiding responsibility, however indirect or partial, in cases of human rights violations
13. Creating secrecy about their own internal operational policy-making and implementation and limiting access to information for governments, parliaments, CSOs and communities
14. Including cost recovery in basic social services in loan conditionality
15. Selectively isolating aspects of rights over others and adopting HR language without stating clearly what is changing in terms of behavior.
16. Requiring governments to reform in ways that undermine states capacities to respect, protect and guarantee human rights obligations under international law.

³ This list was generated through an individual brainstorming exercise of five minutes and collated for presentation back to the group as a whole. It does not reflect consensus. This list is a slightly edited one of the draft comments that were typed and circulated during the meeting.

17. Imposing structural adjustment reforms as condition for loans and grants
18. Financing or collaborating with transnational corporations that undermine citizens access to rights or ignore national law and HR obligations.
19. Allowing individual donors to wield unilateral political agendas