



IN THIS ISSUE

FROM OUR DESK

- MFA
OECD - DAC -
POVNET
- POPULAR
LAWHOUSE
SERVICE

NEWS

- GOOGLE
RESPONDS TO
INTERNET
CENSORSHIP
- NEW GUIDE FOR
BUSINESS
- KEY OUTCOMES
OF GLOBAL
COMPACT
SUMMIT
- LAW ON CSR
INTRODUCED IN
INDONESIA
- AMERICAN COAL
COMPANY
ACQUITTED

EDITORIAL

- LINKING THE
CONCEPT OF
HUMAN RIGHTS
TO EMPIRICAL
INDICATORS
- ROOM FOR
CONSIDERABLE
IMPROVEMENTS
ON HUMAN
RIGHTS

UP-COMING EVENTS

LITERATURE/ LINKS

FEED BACK

BUSINESS & HUMAN RIGHTS

NEWSLETTER ISSUE NO. 6 - AUGUST 2007

FROM OUR DESK

DANISH MINISTRY OF FOREIGN AFFAIRS

CSR is about the social values and behavior of private sector organizations and their contribution to sustainable development. However, the approach and values of good corporate citizenship are also relevant to other organizations, including Governments. In spring 2007, the Royal Danish Ministry of Foreign Affairs (MFA) asked Lawhouse.dk to start identifying where and how the ministry can best benefit from the exponentially increased focus on sustainable development by corporations; and how the ministry can assist in supporting the development of the area. From globalisation, the need for a global framework for better defining corporate responsibilities has emerged. MFA believes in the concept "Think Global – Act Local" and support the 10 UN Global Compact principles as the overall framework for understanding and making operational "Corporate Responsibilities". Kamilla Green Vejergang and Sune Skadegaard Thorsen from Lawhouse.dk facilitated and provided advice in this first phase of the process. The analysis of how CSR is perceived and how it could with advantage be framed combined with a brief analysis of existing governance models aim to provide for a platform for the ministry to make informed decisions on its engagement. The work runs in parallel with the broader intention of the Danish government to establish a cross-ministerial strategy on CSR. Also the English development aid agency, DFID, has organised four workshops on CSR to explore their take on CSR. Lawhouse.dk was invited to present at the first workshop with Paul Hohnen, advisor to the Dutch Government, and Gerald Pachoud, who is expert advisor to Prof. John Ruggie, the UN General Secretary's Special Representative on Business & Human Rights.

OECD DAC - POVNET

The Development Assistance Committee (DAC) is a key forum of major bilateral donors under the OECD. They work together to increase the effectiveness and coordination of their common efforts to support sustainable development in economic developing countries. POVNET, a working group under DAC engaged in promoting pro-poor growth, has recently engaged in exploring the role of CSR as part of the sustainable development framework; primarily in relation to employment and social protection. Lawhouse.dk was hired by the Danish Development Agency (Danida) to assist in formulating a 'hot topic issue paper' on the subject for discussion in Paris early September.

POPULAR LAWHOUSE.dk SERVICE

As a new service Lawhouse.dk offers to provide companies with a free introductory workshop on the concept of CSR including latest developments providing the company with a focus for their specific industry. Many companies are uncertain on where to begin and on how to focus their CSR efforts most effectively. The Lawhouse.dk models that has been developed and tested in practice over the past decade enable companies to manage risks while strategizing on opportunities and reputation building without compromising economic goals or diverting focus from core business objectives. Lawhouse.dk CSR experts provide this service to dedicated companies wanting to build a serious business strategy including CSR. The workshop may also enable corporate directors to critically assess and discuss CSR initiatives emanating from daily management.

NEWS

Google responds to internet censorship

Responding to the past 5 years increase in governmental censorship of Internet services the Internet giant Google has launched a new initiative to curb the trend and has asked U.S. trade officials to treat Internet restrictions on par with other trade barriers such as tariffs.

Google, which last year was heavily criticised by human rights organisations for agreeing to Chinese censorship of its services, stated that censorship was Google's "No. 1 barrier to trade".

http://www.washingtonpost.com/wp-dyn/content/article/2007/06/25/AR2007062500364_pf.html

Comments:

In late 2005, a colleague and friend of Lawhouse.dk, Elliot Schrage, a renowned human rights lawyer with a keen interest in business & human rights, took up a position as Vice president for public affairs with Google. This was in the aftermath of the heavy criticism alleging that Google was to be considered complicit in human rights violations by the Chinese government in relation to the freedom of information and expression, in addition to the right to privacy. The present proactive initiative responds well to the criticism which Google faced a few years ago and was unable to address adequately at the time. The approach is very ambitious and may well prove that public 'lobbying' on human rights issues of vital importance to the core business can lead to real improvements.

New Guide for Businesses Rates NGOs and UN Agencies on Partnership Competence

In an effort to lessen the difficulty experienced by corporations in finding appropriate NGOs and UN agencies to enter into CSR partnerships with, the "The Business Guide to partnering with NGOs and the United Nations", has now been published by the UN Global Compact, Financial Times, and Dalberg Global Development Advisors.

The global guide is the first of its kind and its findings, drawn from surveys of 20,000 companies worldwide, aims to provide businesses with an overview of prospective social partners, such as NGOs, UN agencies and other social actors. Business can gain an insight into the profiles of these potential partners through the information and case studies provided in the guide.

Effectively the guide maps the characteristics of the current CSR partnerships which have brought to light several key findings such as the fact that at present, a third of partnerships at the global level relate to environmental protection, while almost 40% of those at the local level are in the educational sector. The guide also promotes the building of these public-private partnerships by highlighting the main reasons for corporations to partner with NGOs and other social actors. These include, effectively implementing their CSR programs and building trust with stakeholders. The apt timing of the guide is shown by another key finding, namely, that 73% of companies anticipate that partnerships with NGOs and other social actors will be important or extremely important for them in the next 3 years. The guide was presented to 700 senior company executives, heads of international NGOs and government officials participating in the Global Compact's Leaders Summit in Geneva on July 5th. It is likely to facilitate the positive development of CSR partnerships by rendering the process of corporations finding partners and entering CSR partnerships more transparent and more easily achievable.

<http://www.csrwire.com/guide>

<http://www.dalberg.com/guide>

Comments:

A guide that helps business optimize output of partnerships is welcomed; partnerships for sustainable development are crucial, but entail a range of unsolved issues. 'Bluewash' remains the most eminent threat. If potential partnering organisations are not capable of evaluating the real impact of business on human rights, due to the fact that business standards are not yet established in

relation to human rights, they will evidently risk partnering with businesses that may contribute to human rights through the partnership, while human rights are blatantly disregarded in other parts of such businesses' operations. Also the wider development agenda may suffer. NGO and business partnerships are often directed by the desires of a certain company's reputation building and may disregard and even undermine donor agencies strategies in relation to economic development in certain areas. Government to government aid is often conditioned by governance or human rights performance by the receiving countries. If the receiving country can receive unconditional aid in relation to certain areas they may choose corporate funding over conditional aid. Also, aid agencies may fear that quality requirements in relation to interventions are not fulfilled by corporate interventions, whereby outcomes can prove counter-productive to sustainable development. These challenges are not addressed by the otherwise helpful guide.

Key Outcomes of 2007 Global Compact Leaders Summit

The UN Global Compact Office has released its initial assessment of the major outcomes of the Global Compact Leaders Summit, which took place on 5-6 July in Geneva, Switzerland.

"Among the most fundamental conclusions from the Summit was a consensus among all stakeholders that organizing corporate practices around universal principles can be a winning proposition for both business and society", said Georg Kell, Executive Director of the UN Global Compact. The Summit exposed chief executives to learning and dialogue opportunities in many of the Global Compact's priority issue areas through roundtable discussions on human rights, labour, environmental responsibility, anti-corruption, responsible investment and UN-business partnerships. For example, in the area of human rights, business was challenged to introduce human rights-specific policies in advance of the 60th anniversary of the Universal Declaration on Human Rights in 2008. The roundtable discussions provided important content which will

shape the future direction of the Global Compact's work programs in these areas.

http://www.unglobalcompact.org/NewsAndEvents/news_archives/2007_08_22.html

Comments:

Lawhouse.dk wholeheartedly supports the crucial outcome of the Global Compact summit. Our business model developed over the past 11 years is based on a principled approach to CSR and the success of the model, which is logically apparent, underlines the validity of the UN Global Compact Summit proposition. However, the real challenge appears when translating principles to corporate action, which is the exact field where our work and advice add value for our clients.

Law on Corporate Social Responsibility introduced in Indonesia

In a recent act the Indonesian House of Representatives chose to introduce legal obligations in relation to Corporate Social Responsibility (CSR) requiring businesses to operate socially and environmentally responsible programs. While other national legislation relevant to CSR exists both in Indonesia and abroad, this is arguably one of the first laws to expressly impose obligations on businesses under the heading of CSR. The law applies to limited liability companies and was introduced as it was felt that Indonesian businesses were failing to act socially responsible under existing laws. After pressure from the business community, the law was amended to exclude the financial sector and apply only to companies in natural resources sector, though the interpretation of natural resources sector may be quite wide as the commentary

specifies that this includes companies which produce hazardous waste.

<http://www.thejakartapost.com/yesterdaydetail.asp?fileid=20070725.A07>

Comments:

Indonesian law has taken a bold step forward in mandating CSR for all limited liability companies in a specific sector. However, the Act shall merely be perceived as a framework and further regulation will have to follow specifying the content and implementation of the intentions laid out. Hopefully Indonesia will follow the UN Global Compact proposition to follow a principled based approach to the conceptualisation of the very vague understanding of CSR. In conclusion the initiative is highly commendable and will give Indonesia an opportunity to be seen as a progress oriented country thus answering such challenges regarding CSR as may be perceived by foreign investors. The Act provides for brilliant example of how governments may relate to CSR by establishing a clear nexus between CSR and law. Also the initiative puts into perspective the somewhat stubborn and incomprehensible attitude of institutions like the EU to keep CSR 'voluntary' only, confer the discussion in this newsletter, issue 5.

American coal company acquitted of involvement in the murder of union leaders in Columbia.

The American coal company, Drummond, was cleared on Thursday 26th July of involvement in the murders of three union leaders for the coal miners in Columbia. The lawsuit, which was based on a rapport from a human rights organisation, hinged on the allegation that Drummond had supported the

side of some paramilitary groups in Columbia's civil war in return for having the three union leaders killed. The jury in the instant case found there was insufficient evidence to prove the connection between the Drummond and the paramilitary groups. However, a number of similar cases against such American companies as [Exxon Mobil](#), [Occidental Petroleum](#) and [Chiquita Brands International](#) are currently pending. When the allegations first surfaced in the Danish media DONG, the Danish Energy company, stated in 2006 that no contracts would be renewed with Drummond, which supplied a fifth of Denmark's coal in 2005, unless the coal company was completely acquitted for the charges. The plaintiffs, 'United Steelworkers of America' and the 'International Labour Rights Fund', which sued Drummond on behalf of the victims' families, plan to appeal the verdict.

<http://www.nytimes.com/2007/07/27/business/27drummond.html?ex=1343275200&en=b0dc4c8b43c02282&ei=5124&partner=permalink&exprod=permalink>

Comments:

The very harsh allegations against Drummond were found groundless in the first instance. The allegations in the first place led to reactions by Drummond's business partners all over the world, some of which actually stopped orders and detached themselves from the then perceived human rights violator. It will be interesting to see how such companies react to the verdict, especially considering that the verdict was appealed. From a legal standpoint, nothing has changed until the final verdict is reached by the appeal court. However, it is evident that the risk for Drummond being deemed complicit in the killings has been reduced considerably.

EDITORIALS

Linking the concept of human rights to empirical indicators

- A preliminary study of the methodological issues in the measurement of corporate human rights performance

Over the past decades growing demands for influential actors to acknowledge their accountability in all spheres of public life have led to the creation of new procedures. Statistical indicators have increasingly been introduced within

the area of human rights monitoring and provide for a useful tool in the struggle for human rights. They make it possible for individuals and organisations to identify and assess important actors holding them accountable for their actions. That is why developing and using indicators for human rights has become a cutting-edge area of advocacy. However, rights are difficult to fully measure merely from statistics. Nevertheless, as a tool for analysis, statistics may point to important questions behind generalities and help reveal social challenges.

The connection between the abstract human rights concepts and empirical indicators for the measurement of corporate human rights performance has been the focus of a methodological study conducted by Lawhouse.dk in the spring and summer of 2007.

The central question in the methodological study centres on how it is possible to link the concepts of human rights to empirical indicators, ascribing numerical values to corporate human rights performance

The preliminary study was carried out as a reaction to the lack of consensus and even debate on the formal methodological difficulties in measuring corporate human rights performance. While the quantity of literature on fundamental considerations with regard to indicators and corporate human rights performance has grown since the turn of the century, formal methodological frameworks are still uncharted territory. Therefore, the methodological study has centred on expanding and developing the methodological structure that lay the foundation for establishing indicators.

The methodological study was conducted on four levels; the first level focusing on the abstract concepts of human rights; the second level giving a systematic analysis of the human rights concepts in a corporate perspective; the third level was oriented towards analysing indicators; and the fourth level, which is still to be finalised, aims at establishing numerical values.

When looking at indicators in general, reliability and validity is the centre of attention in the majority of proposed indicators. In order to comply with these basic conditions when developing indicators for human rights measurements, various dimensions of human rights must be taken into consideration. Secondly it must be recognised that human rights measurements can be conducted from an obligations perspective as well as a violations perspective. Likewise, it is of importance to recognise that different indicators must be used for measuring respectively the progressive realization of rights and the non-violation of basic obligations.

The analysis showed that when it comes to measurements of corporate human rights performances, the distinction between; measurements of input, measurement of process, and measurement of outcome is of great importance to the development of indicators. The *input* is the company policy, how the corporation recognises its responsibility. The *process* is the actual conduct; which processes are in place in the company to ensure that the policy is followed. In this regard, there are processes relating to the corporate sphere of influence and processes relating to corporate complicity. The *outcome* is the actual result of the processes; can indicators be established that *indicate* violations or complicity. This distinction gives rise to a three-step process of corporate human rights performance measurement. When it comes to input, the corporation should evidently demonstrate full responsibility in relation to all rights. When it comes to the processes it is important to make a distinction between sphere of influence and complicity; corporate indicators at this level will obviously relate to conscious and informed priorities of the specific company in relation to implementation of social management and indicators will reflect such priorities as well as the stage a given company has reached. When it comes to measuring outcome the company indicators can be established to each human right as they relate to sphere of influence and complicity respectively; moreover, a distinction between basic obligations (compliance) that should be monitored across the board of rights and proactive initiatives (progressive realization of specific rights – social opportunities) that require measurement in relation the chosen right(s) should be established.

This study of methodological approaches to human rights indicators and their implications has served to clarify and strengthen the monitoring advice and services at Lawhouse.dk with regard to implementation as well as assessment of human rights policies and initiatives. With regard to monitoring and improving human rights policies and processes, we base our services on a nuanced version of the management principle: "What you can't measure, you can't manage". Establishing indicators is crucial to make human rights commitments operational.

Room for considerable improvement on human rights among top-20 companies in the extractive industry

The previously announced Lawhouse.dk initiated research on publicly available human rights policies and implementation mechanisms of the largest 20 companies in the extractive industry was completed after months of analysis. Each of the 20 companies' human rights policies were assessed with regard to each specific human right (33 categories). This has enabled Lawhouse.dk to identify how human rights are perceived and the implementation mechanisms of each company, also establishing an industry average.

Findings

The overall findings from the survey present a picture of the oil and gas industry's top 20 with room for considerable improvement. Based on the public information available most companies demonstrate rather poor performances and no companies employ a comprehensive approach encompassing all rights basing their processes on principles of explicit implementation mechanisms and transparency. A few companies do well on a number of rights but the average is not impressive as Table 1 illustrates (below).

One fourth of the companies never mention human rights...

The survey demonstrates that the human rights frontrunners of the industry in general restrict themselves to mere mentioning of all or most human rights and to a lesser extent describe implementation mechanisms for some rights, whereas one fourth of the companies in the top 20 have no mentioning of human rights or international human rights instruments whatsoever.

On average, the survey indicates that the frontrunner companies (top 6) do not monitor or report on each individual human right and are far from realising the principles of transparency through external audit or impact assessments on a general basis - although this is the case with regard to certain rights in a few companies.

With regard to the individual rights the commitment of the average top 20 companies in the oil and gas industry is also disappointingly low - even with regard to the top 10 rights receiving most attention: Only non-discrimination and 'the right to safe and healthy working conditions' (and to some degree 'the right to health') are, on average, protected by a specific mentioning in the human rights policy and explicit implementation mechanisms to ensure compliance. On average, none of the top 10 rights are mentioned directly with implementation processes, internal monitoring and reporting not to mention external auditing. This finding indicates lack of compliance with the fundamental principle of transparency applied to the human rights discourse.

Furthermore, on *average* 29 out of 33 rights receive no specific mentioning, no description of implementation processes and no internal or external monitoring or reporting. Looking at the industry average as a whole, 22 rights are covered indirectly by a general commitment to human rights instruments, whereas 11 rights are not even covered indirectly by human rights commitments. Human rights instruments include the Universal Declaration of Human Rights (UDHR), the International Covenants, ILO conventions etc. The identification of rights for the study is based on the two International Covenants reflecting the UDHR and covering the basic workers' rights.

A question of poor communication?

Is the poor performance a question of lack of awareness or communication on the part of business? Do they in fact do more than stated on their websites, human rights policy documents, codes of conduct, sustainability reports etc? Or have the many broad declarations in support of human rights simply not materialised in governance systems and implementation measures as of yet? At the moment there is no sign in the publicly available human rights policies indicating that companies have in fact established the necessary governance systems to facilitate the implementation of human rights.

Moreover, it is evident from the survey that the top-20 companies leave much room for improving their communication on how they seek to implement their human rights commitment by respecting, protecting, fulfilling or promoting each individual human right. Thus, it is difficult to ascertain how the several UN Global Compact members actually live up to their commitment to *support and respect the protection of internationally proclaimed human rights* (Principle 1). Additionally, this may harbour the suspicion that the Global Compact merely becomes 'blue wash' for some members.

From a human rights perspective, the findings are somewhat surprising given the perceived status of the extractive industry as frontrunners on the establishment of human rights policies and practices.

Table 1 – Ranking of Human Rights Policies of Oil and Gas Top 20 – rating from 0-6; 6 indicating top performance.

Ranking	Company	Average HR-rating	Country of Origin
1.	Petrobras	2,55	Brazil
1.	Shell	2,55	The Netherlands
2.	BP	2,48	UK
2.	Repsol YPF	2,48	Spain
5.	Exxon	2,42	USA
6.	Chevron	2,12	USA
7.	Total	1,82	France
8.	Nippon Oil	1,70	Japan
8.	Lukoil	1,70	Russia
10.	Statoil	1,52	Norway
11.	ConocoPhillips	1,48	USA
11.	Marathon Oil	1,48	USA
13.	Pemex	1,42	Mexico
14.	ENI	1,33	Italy
15.	SK corp.	0,12	South Korea
16.	CNPC	0	China
16.	Sinopec	0	China
16.	PDVSA	0	Venezuela
16.	Petronas	0	Malaysia
16.	Valero	0	USA

Survey Methodology and Authors

The companies have received a score ranging from 0 to 6 where an increasing number is awarded for the better human rights policy:

- 0 = No mentioning of human rights**
- 1 = Each right not mentioned directly but part of general commitment to human rights**
- 2 = Each right mentioned directly but with no indication of implementation mechanisms for the individual right**
- 3 = Each right mentioned directly + implementation mechanisms**
- 4 = Each right mentioned directly + internal monitoring and reporting**
- 5 = Each right mentioned directly + internal monitoring and reporting + limited independent audit**
- 6 = Direct mentioning of the individual human right + external monitoring and reporting + comprehensive external audit of implementation and impact of company activities on each right.**

A numerical value of e.g. 2.55 is reached by calculating the average rating of a company on the 33 categories of specific rights. The relatively low rating of the frontrunners is reached due to the fact that some rights are not mentioned resulting in a low score whereas other rights (such as e.g. the right to a safe and healthy working environment and non-discrimination) appear well protected. Thus, the average provides an overview but hides substantial differences between the individual rights. For the full survey results including the rating on each right please contact Lawhouse.dk.

The scoring system is developed on the basis of current assumptions in parts of the CSR research field with regard to corporate reporting and monitoring. This contends that increasing levels of transparency through reporting and accountability through external verification rather making use of broader impact assessments than merely check list audits are desirable if positive impacts of a CSR-policy or code of conduct are to be obtained and/or maximised.

The web survey has been carried out by assessing all available information regarding human rights on the websites of the 20 largest (based on Fortunes Global500) oil and gas companies including downloadable documents such as sustainability reports, human rights policies and governance documents etc. This has been carried out in cooperation between Lawhouse.dk, master thesis students at Political Science, Copenhagen University: Rasmus Raabjerg Nielsen and Casper Jensen and master thesis student; Troels Børrild, International Development Studies, Roskilde University, Denmark.

Disclaimer: Lawhouse.dk has merely assisted the researchers in developing the conceptual and analytical framework. The researchers have conducted their analyses on their own based on publicly available material (autumn 2006 - spring 2007). Lawhouse.dk has not interfered nor checked the validity of the information analysed. Thus Lawhouse.dk assumes no responsibilities in relation to the survey or its findings. The findings are made public presenting the conclusions of the independent research.

For more info on the survey please contact lawhouse@lawhouse.dk

UP-COMING EVENTS

5 September 2007, Geneva, Switzerland: "The Role of Business in Respecting and Promoting Human Rights".

http://businessforhumanrights.files.wordpress.com/2007/08/draft_agenda-web-version2.pdf

20-21 September 2007, Barcelona, Spain: '6th EABIS ANNUAL COLLOQUIUM on "The Emerging Global Governance Paradigm: The Role of Business and Its Implications for Companies, Stakeholders and Society".

<http://www.esade.edu/eabis>

4-6 October 2007, Amsterdam, Netherlands: "The Anti-corruption summit"

<http://www.ethicalcorp.com/anticorruption2007/docs/Anti-corruptionSummit2007-070518.pdf>

9-10 October 2007, London, UK: How to manage responsible business in emerging markets?

<http://www.ethicalcorp.com/emergingmarkets/>

23-26 October 2007, San Francisco, USA: '2007 BSR Annual Conference'.

<http://www.bsr.org/BSRconferences/index>

7-8 November 2007, London, UK: "Engaging in Corporate Responsibility"

<http://www.osneymedia.co.uk/events.asp?etype=furtherevents>

LITERATURE/LINKS

May k., Steven, Cheney, George & Roper, Juliet: "The Debate over Corporate Social Responsibility", 2007, Oxford University Press. <http://www.oup.com/uk/catalogue/?ci=9780195178838>

Hestermeyer, Holger P.: "Human Rights and the WTO; The case of patents and the access to medicines", 2007, Oxford University Press. <http://www.oup.com/uk/catalogue/?ci=9780199215201>

Robinson, Mary: "A voice for Human Rights", 2005, Pennsylvania Press.
<http://www.upenn.edu/pennpress/book/14200.html>

Waddock, Sandra & Bodwell, Charles: "Total Responsibility Management – The Manual", 2007, Greenleaf Publishing.
<http://www.greenleaf-publishing.com/productdetail.kmod?productid=686>

FEEDBACK

This is the 6th edition of our Lawhouse.dk newsletter. Thanks to our readers and many new subscribers for the keen interest we have meet.

We are very interested in making the newsletter even more interesting and relevant for all of you readers.

Therefore we would be pleased to receive your comments on content, style and possible ways of improving the format. Please send your feed back to **kamilla@lawhouse.dk**

Thank you!



Contact info:
Lawhouse.dk, Sortmosen 6, DK – 3520 Farum
Tel: +45 4499 5506 Fax: +45 442 lawhouse@lawhouse.dk 3 0560
www.lawhouse.dk -
www.corporate-responsibility.co.uk
Editor: Kamilla Green Vejergang kamilla@lawhouse.dk



Corporate Responsibility Ltd

LAWHOUSE.DK IS A CONSULTANCY/LAWFIRM SPECIALISED ON PROVIDING A WIDE RANGE OF ADVICE WITHIN THE FIELD OF SOCIAL RESPONSIBILITY IN GENERAL AND HUMAN RIGHTS IN PARTICULAR. OUR ADVISORY SERVICES ARE BASED ON EXTENSIVE LEGAL AND BUSINESS EXPERIENCE AND INCLUDE ESTABLISHING SOLID CSR FRAMEWORKS, CUSTOMISING INTEGRATED PROACTIVE APPROACHES, GOING BEYOND COMPLIANCE, THUS CREATING SUSTAINABLE CORPORATE SOCIAL OPPORTUNITIES.

DISCLAIMER: Lawhouse.dk is pleased to provide this quarterly newsletter to friends of Lawhouse via email. If you would prefer not to receive the newsletter please reply to this email or send an email to: lawhouse@lawhouse.dk and put "Remove from list" in the subject line
Lawhouse.dk extends its appreciation and thanks to the Business & Human Rights Ressource Centre
www.business-humanrights.org

All rights reserved, no part of this newsletter may be reproduced or transmitted by any form or by any means for commercial or teaching purposes without the prior permission of LAWHOUSE.DK. Quotations are allowed with due reference being made to the source.