

GLOBAL CSR

sustainable business consulting

IN THIS ISSUE

FROM OUR DESK

- LAWHOUSE.DK BECOMES GLOBAL CSR
- WORLD BANK
- UNDP
- DANISH MINISTRY OF FOREIGN AFFAIRS

NEWS

- LABOUR PRACTICES TOP THE LIST OF HUMAN RIGHTS REPORTING TOPICS
- NORWEGIAN PENSION FUND
- ASPEN INSTITUTE SURVEY
- IBM GLOBAL CEO STUDY
- 100 BEST CORPORATE CITIZENS 2008
- ADIDAS AND NIKE WORKERS ON £11 A WEEK IN CHINA
- PROTECT, RESPECT AND REMEDY

EDITORIAL

- THE FINAL REPORT OF THE UN SRSG ON BUSINESS & HUMAN RIGHTS

REQUEST

UP-COMING EVENTS

LITERATURE / LINKS

Business & Human Rights

NEWSLETTER ISSUE NO. 9 – May 2008

FROM OUR DESK

LAWHOUSE.DK becomes GLOBAL CSR

As of June 2008, Lawhouse.dk changes name to GLOBAL CSR. The name change is a reflection of the need to clearly position our field of expertise and our advisory services to clients. GLOBAL CSR continues to specialise in creating sustainable solutions for private companies, public authorities and organisations. Additionally, we continue to provide expertise within the field of development and formulation of CSR strategies and policies, implementation, risk-management and CSR institutionalisation. Likewise, we facilitate Corporate Social Innovation in both products and processes. The new webpage is www.global-csr.com. As of June 1st, our team expands with the addition of Senior Consultant Morten Lehmann. Morten is an economist and an expert in business sector development.

Our team reflects the cross-cutting nature of CSR;

Mira C. Skadegaard Thorsen – BA Philosophy and Anthropology; MA Literary Theory; Discrimination and Postcolonial discourse theory

Kamilla Vejergang Lembcke – BA (Int) in Business, Language and Culture; M.Sc. in Leadership and Management Studies

Troels Boerrild – M.Sc. in Public Administration and International Development Studies

Morten Lehmann - BA (Int) in International Business Administration - M.Sc. (Econ)

Sune Skadegaard Thorsen – Attorney at Law, Human Rights, Founder

WORLD BANK

In January, GLOBAL CSR was commissioned by WB, Danish Consultant Trust Fund (CFT) to produce a report providing a compilation of international best practices in the area of 'equitable access to labour markets' including a review of international labour law regarding regulation and in particular how such regulation relates to CSR. This draft report served as background material for the WB and GLOBAL CSR consultants visit to Honduras from April 16 – 26. The visit focused on how to facilitate and support progress and development with particular attention to vulnerable groups, particularly women. Next step will involve the drafting of the final report for World Bank lawyers on describing CSR, the legal implications and how to address CSR in particular in support of 'equitable access to labour markets' for women.

UNITED NATIONS DEVELOPMENT PROGRAMME (UNDP)

In March 2008, GLOBAL CSR assisted the UNDP in a project to assist in the development of a national agenda on CSR in Macedonia. The project, called "Accelerating CSR practices in the new EU member states and candidate countries as a vehicle for harmonization, competitiveness and social cohesion in the EU" has as objective the role of assisting members of the CSR Coordinating Body in understanding the role of government in CSR promotion via international experience and guidance on steps to develop and implement CSR policies in cooperation with different stakeholders.

DANISH MINISTRY OF FOREIGN AFFAIRS

On April 29th, GLOBAL CSR assisted the Danish Ministry of Foreign Affairs in the capacity building and training of Business-to-Business and Public Private Partnerships coordinators from Danish representations all over the world. The training took place north of Copenhagen and centered on how to apply human rights proactively when addressing CSR in business programs. Also, GLOBAL CSR introduced participants to a tool developed by GLOBAL CSR to prioritize risks and relevant CSR efforts. Analyses and identification of best practice examples in past projects further served to outline the workshop.

NEWS

Labour Practices Top the List of Human Rights Reporting Topics

AMSTERDAM, HOLLAND - March 2008

Companies need to go further in including quantifiable information about human rights in their sustainability reports. This is the conclusion of a survey on corporate human rights reporting just released by GRI and the Roberts Environmental Centre (a research institute at Claremont McKenna College). The survey, based on information published by 100 large companies from around the world, evaluated the extent to which performance information is reported by companies to describe their compliance with widely accepted human rights objectives. Compliance with the GRI G3 Guidelines on human rights was also assessed.

The study found that while labour practices were the most frequently reported human rights topics, reporters often did not identify them as human rights related issues. Four in nine topics addressed by the G3 human rights indicators were not mentioned at all by half or more of the surveyed companies. Nonetheless, despite a low adherence to the G3 Performance Indicators, it was found that companies reporting according to G3 include quantitative performance information more often than other companies.

<http://www.globalreporting.org/NewsEventsPress/LatestNews/2008/NewMarch08HumanRights.htm>

Comment:

Analyzing corporate reporting through human rights lenses makes a lot of sense. Human rights represent the only set of social standards that enjoy universal recognition. Interestingly, but not surprisingly, the human rights known as 'core labour rights' enjoy high corporate attention and demonstrate that human rights performance can also be measured in quantifiable terms. The study further reveals hesitance by corporations to use the term human rights and reflects the nascent status of making human rights operational for corporations. Compared to the conclusions and proposed framework presented by the UN Special Representative, (confer the editorial on the subject), both the corporations surveyed and the GRI indicators are inadequate when it comes to avoiding risks on human rights and strategically using human rights in contributing to sustainable social development.

Norwegian Pension Fund Publishes Voting Data, Revealing Stand on Ethical Issues

MANCHESTER, UK - March 10, 2008.

The Norwegian Government Pension Fund (NGPF) recently published its voting record for each of the companies it invests in. This act of disclosure is unprecedented and reveals a very active involvement in the companies the fund owns shares in. Pension funds are very influential investors and the Norwegian state controlled wealth fund, with an

asset of around 440 billion dollars, is one of the largest in the world. Because of their economic power, sovereign funds are viewed with suspicion by some politicians in Brussels and Washington, who fear pension funds may pursue other ambitions than financial only. Many funds have responded by keeping a very low profile, in some cases abdicating the voting rights connected to their shares and offering minimal disclosure. NGPF has not encountered problems using its legitimate voting rights to influence company boards' decisions and as a part of its good governance ambitions the fund has chosen to publish its voting record. The fund is known for giving high importance to the 'ethical' profile of the companies it invests in. In fact, the Norwegian Ministry of Finance provides NGPF with a catalogue of blacklisted companies in which the fund is barred from investing due to ethical concerns. The published voting records demonstrate that the fund voted in favour of resolutions on ethical issues such as company reduction of CO2 emissions, adoption of company ethical codes, anti-discrimination clauses and in favour of the disclosure of company financial contributions to political bodies.

<http://www.guardian.co.uk/business/2008/mar/10/1>

Comments:

The 'active ownership' demonstrated by NGPF forms part of the UN PRI guidelines as well and poses a challenge to all investment funds that have ambitions not only to avoid risks, but also to facilitate

change. Many investors claim to be active owners also on Triple Bottom Line issues, but very few have had the courage to make their engagement public. Lack of transparency leaves investors at a disadvantage by having to rely on the stakeholders. 'Active ownership' vis á vis CSR involves considerable changes in the way funds are managed including the establishment of systems and training. When investors overnight claim that they perform 'active ownership' without making approaches or results transparent, such statement causes distrust. Thus, the NGPF initiative should not only be considered best practice; it is essential in demonstrating that investment funds are able to make adequate analyses, or due diligences as pointed out by the UN Special Representative. Considering the NGPF voting record it would appear that the NGPF still has room for improvement in its approach.

Aspen Institute Survey: MBA Students Still Value Challenging Career Opportunities and Compensation, but Social Issues are Registering more Often as a Professional Expectation, especially among women

NEW YORK, USA – April 21, 2008

A survey of MBA students' professional expectations indicates that ethics and corporate reputation are highly valued criteria when it comes to the choice of a job. Certainly a challenging career and salary are still high priorities, but more and more of the students say that they prefer a job that has a positive impact on society. This preference is more common for women than for men. The result indicates, according to the director of the institute that conducted the survey, that students at top business schools are taking a more holistic view of the role of business in society. On the other hand students also indicate that job-recruiters do not meet their expectations. Students feel that their personal integrity and understanding of societal issues are often not taken into consideration. The survey indicates that concern for financial compensation and finding a job that aligns with personal values is becoming pervasive.

<http://www.csrwire.com/News/11725.html>

Comments:

The survey confirms findings from similar studies over the past decades. Questionnaire surveys on more 'elitist' students – 'coming business leaders' or top graduates from the leading business schools – have placed corporate human rights and environmental performance before remuneration. The trend also confirms the message that we continue to receive from corporate clients; a major driver for undertaking CSR is the battle for talent. Some clients describe interview sessions where potential recruits end up conducting an inquiry on corporate CSR performance. With the demographic developments and the heightened focus on skilled employees it should be apparent that this trend will only increase in strength. Promising students will seek promising companies.

IBM Global CEO Study: CEOs Battle to Keep Up With the Pace of Change - Plan Significant Investments to Meet Changing Customer Expectations

LONDON and ARMONK, USA – May 6, 2008.

The IBM Global CEO Study, the largest study of chief executives ever conducted, reveals a dramatic increase in the number of global business leaders who foresee major changes. CEOs point to the capacity to anticipate and manage changes as a chance for differentiation and economic survival. From the CEOs perspective, the change is brought about by two new types of customers: the "information omnivore" and the "socially-minded customer". Corporations able to reach these new customers have a competitive advantage. While customers have always cared about societal issues, those concerns are now more frequently turning into action as more socially aware customers evaluate the CSR profile of an enterprise before making purchasing decisions. CSR will therefore play an important role in differentiating enterprises, as customers increasingly demand socially-minded products, services and supply chains. CEOs therefore see opportunities in CSR and are already using it to create a competitive advantage and expand their market share.

<http://www.csrwire.com/News/11938.html>

Comment:

As opposed to the concerned employee, consumers have not been considered a major driver for change. However, the B2B relation is also part of the customer equation used in the survey and in this relation CSR has become a factor that counts. Eventually end-consumers may become a direct differentiator; however, this will most likely require trustworthy and diligent social labelling. The predominant position that core social standards form in a global level playing field will restrict rather than enhance free competition,. Consumers will have to depend on private labelling initiatives that often lack integrity. In effect, it is disconcerting, that the duty for states to protect the basic rights of individuals impacted by corporations is being transferred to business directly. It should be obvious that governments have to become involved in ensuring the protection of basic rights, and that business should seek to enhance state capacity to do a decent job.

100 Best Corporate Citizens 2008

EDISON, NJ, USA - February 20, 2008.

The CRO magazine published its list of the 100 Best Corporate Citizens 2008. The list was first published nine years ago. Every year it groups the Best Corporate Citizens in 8 categories. Corporations have begun to look at the list with interest and a low position in the chart provokes major repercussions in companies. Nobody wants to be the last or experience that direct competitors rank higher than themselves and it would be considered a defeat to be erased from the list. Companies view the category scores and rankings as a learning opportunity. In fact it matters for the company to have its own CSR policy in place, as CSR practices have become a normal part of boardroom conversation, says INTEL's Director for Corporate Responsibility, Dean Stangis referring to meetings with CEOs from other companies. INTEL's CEO says that the company views sustainability through a business lens and that such an approach can lead to a competitive advantage. He also stresses that a placement in the 100 Best Corporate Citizens can serve as employee retention and a recruitment tool.

<http://www.thecro.com/node/615>

Adidas and Nike Workers on £11 a Week in China - Staff Complain of Terrible Conditions in the Olympic Sponsors' Factories

LONDON, UK - March 30th 2008

An investigation by The Sunday Times into workers' pay and conditions has found alleged violations of China's labour laws and Adidas's own code of workplace standards. Workers at the factories in Fuzhou - owned and operated by a Taiwan-based firm -accuse the management of cheating on pay, discriminating against young men and stifling a pioneering attempt to set up a trade union. They have provided documents which indicate that they must work more than 70 hours a week to earn a living wage. Chinese law limits the average working week, including overtime, to 49 hours.

In a statement, Adidas denied discrimination. It stated that neither Adidas nor the factory management had anything to do with the politically sensitive "restrictions" on the union election. The company acknowledged that most workers receive the legal minimum basic wage. It acknowledged awareness that that "unrecorded overtime has taken place from time to time". In terms of adapting to Chinese government policy for improving labour standards, Adidas appears to be running second to Nike, its American competitor, despite its high profile as an Olympic sponsor. Nike recently admitted that conditions for Chinese workers left room for improvement and called on China to respect International Labour Organisation (ILO) conventions that guarantee freedom of association.

<http://www.timesonline.co.uk/tol/news/world/asia/article3646424.ece>

Comments:

Adidas has already been criticised for sponsoring the Olympics - it would appear that human rights are under pressure where the goods are produced as well. Although human rights are part of both Nike's and Adidas commitments, it appears

that both corporations have a way to go in terms of making rights operational. It may be argued that when corporations operate in states where human rights are notoriously violated they should display extraordinary efforts in performing due diligences and reacting adequately to findings. Nike's call upon state obligations to protect against human rights violations is a sign of corporations realizing that working with supply chains alone have limited effects and may de facto be counterproductive to economic development disabling SMEs to participate in supply chains.

Protect, Respect and Remedy: a Framework for Business and Human Rights, by John Ruggie

The 3rd and final report by the Special Representative for the Secretary-General on Business and Human Rights (SRSG) was published in the beginning of April. On the basis of empirical studies the SRSG finds that business actors are impacting the full range of human rights from the International Bill of Human Rights; and are subject to criticism for violating all rights. This puts an end to the dominant notion that companies should only concentrate their efforts on particular rights. Companies are met with allegations of infringement on both core labour rights and non-labour rights. This means that they should not define a priori or a short list of rights they address; e.g. core labour rights. The SRGS also notes that violations of human rights occur in every region of the world and in every industrial sector. The *full range* of human rights is therefore relevant for *all* companies wherever they operate.

The SRSG concludes that the division of responsibilities between states and private companies cannot be defined in terms of primary and secondary responsibilities. Private companies are found to have their own specific duties, which are different from the duties of states. On the other hand, an improvement of the human rights situation can only be expected if *both* states *and* private companies discharge their

duties: their responsibilities are in fact complementary.

The SRSG proposes a line of actions structured around three principles. The first focuses on states' responsibilities to protect from corporate abuse. As examples the SRGS points towards States enhancing respect for human rights by asking private companies to submit sustainability reports and by accepting sound human rights due diligence processes as a mitigating factor in liability cases. States should ensure that their human rights commitments are respected by all state owned bodies performing public functions. The case of the Export Credit Agencies (ECAs) is emblematic. Even though they are public bodies, they rarely demonstrate states' human rights obligations in their lending policies.

The second principle focuses on private companies' special responsibility to respect human rights. The SRSG requires private companies to respect the *full range of human rights* and defines it as a baseline responsibility; trade-offs between rights are therefore not possible. As a useful instrument for a company to ensure that human rights are not violated, the SRSG strongly suggests the use of due diligence processes developed around human rights.

With regard to access to remedies, the third principle, - the SRSG underlines an international trend for treaty bodies and public opinion to push for states to provide remedies to victims of corporate violations. In addition to suggesting private companies to provide for internal grievance mechanisms the SRSG asks NGOs to increase their aid to victims' access and to the possible establishment of an ombudsman in the area.

The report is further elaborated below in the editorial

<http://www.reports-and-materials.org/Ruggie-report-7-Apr-2008.pdf>

The Final Report of the UN Special Representative of the Secretary General (SRSG) on Business & Human Rights

Prof. John Ruggie, appointed in 2005 by the UN Secretary General as Special Representative on business and human rights (SRSG), published his third report in April 2008.

During the last three years of his mandate the SRSG has produced two 'interim' reports on human rights in a corporate context. The first report, published in March 2006, contained an outline of the major challenges within the field and the second one, published in March 2007 highlighted a number of inadequacies in the relation between human rights and business. The April 2008 report (hereinafter the report) proposes a framework around which to structure the debate. In this way, the SRSG can influence further developments by outlining a solid foundation on which to build. The SRSG presents "a conceptual and policy framework to anchor the business and human rights debate and to help guide all relevant actors".

The proposed framework rests on three pillars:

- State duty to protect against human rights abuses by third parties, including business;
- Corporate responsibility to respect human rights;
- Effective access to remedies for victims of human rights abuses.

The three elements of the framework are complementary and mutually reinforcing, providing for the achievement of sustainable progress. The SRSG starts the report by stressing the importance of using a principled approach to address the debate. The Bill of Human Rights is thus the point of departure: The SRSG warns against the application of a limited list of rights, e.g. core labour rights, that corporations should be responsible for. Empirical studies show that corporations can in fact impact *all* rights. The report goes on to elaborate on the proposed framework.

Stressing state duty to protect is nothing new. States have, since signing and ratifying the Covenants under the International Bill of Human Rights, an obligation to ensure individuals on their territory the enjoyment of human rights. A correlative part of this obligation has from the outset been the duty to protect against third party violations and corporate violations have in this sense attracted increased attention under globalisation. The SRSG points at some specific issues that increase the urgency of state protection against corporate abuses. Bilateral treaties, for example, are signed to protect foreign investments, but they may also prevent host states from improving social (i.e. human rights) and environmental protection: Apparently innocuous law changes that have the side effect of increasing business costs and thus adversely impacting investors' interests may trigger arbitration cases and constitute basis for state liability for corporate loss. The so called "race to the bottom" to attract foreign investments pushes many emerging economies to refrain from regulating or enforcing national law that might increase business costs. *Home* states may avoid regulating their transnationals' actions because they fear losing investment opportunities or corporations relocating their operations to other, less regulated, states. The SRSG responds to these challenges by reminding the states of their responsibility to protect. He therefore suggests that states can regulate extraterritorially their corporate citizens' actions. A shift in many states' mindset is likely to occur if they were to acknowledge that they do not in fact help business by failing to regulate corporate impacts; they only increase risks including reputational damage - writes the SRSG. The SRSG suggests initiatives states might implement to discharge their duty to protect; they could foster a corporate culture of respect for human rights by making the release of sustainability reports compulsory, by allowing shareholders proposals and by redefining fiduciary duties to include appropriate recognition of corporate impact on human rights. States themselves could lead by example and apply these initiatives to State Owned Enterprises (SOEs). The SRSG then points to the missing policy alignment within the public administration, where many public bodies do not act consistently with the state's international human rights obligations. The SRSG chooses a paramount example to illustrate the problem; Export Credit Agencies (ECAs). In fact "relatively few ECAs explicitly consider human rights at any stage of their involvement; indeed, in informal discussions, a number of ECAs indicate they might require specific authority from their government overseers to do so." Instead ECAs should require clients, as a part of the due diligence process before starting business activities, to perform an analysis of the company's potential impacts on human rights. In this way the ECA-supported private investments would be aligned with the official national aid agency's efforts. To enhance states' leverage in protecting individuals and communities from corporate human rights abuses some help at the international level is also required. Existing treaty bodies and the Office of the High Commissioner for Human rights could in this sense provide for a common platform for state cooperation. The final area of concern in relation to 'the state duty to protect' concerns the lack of aligned state policies and practices vis á vis corporations operating in conflict zones, where the most egregious violations occur. Home states

should intervene by alerting *and* by assisting private companies conducting business operations in those areas.

With regard to the second pillar regarding corporate responsibility to respect, the SRSR points to the need for and outlines the main elements of human rights due diligence processes to be conducted by corporations. Many boardroom members may be concerned with this recommendation due to their lack of familiarity with human rights. However, the report stresses and demonstrates that it is in the best interest of corporations to have such processes in place.

From a comprehensive empirical study of alleged corporate violations (Addendum 2 to the report), two conclusions can be drawn that have the potential of fundamentally changing the way corporations conduct their human rights management. Firstly, the study shows that the full range of human rights can be violated by corporations and that this can occur in any industrial sector. This means that corporate responsibilities comprise all the rights from the International Bill of Human Rights. The SRSR therefore stresses that corporations cannot limit their human rights management to a short list of rights if they wish to adequately manage risks. On the contrary, corporations have to address all thirty human rights. This is a major change. Many corporations only acknowledge core labour rights as relevant human rights. In this light, supply chain management will also need to be restructured, considering that most Codes of Conduct in average address eight rights only. The second finding shows that abuses can occur in all regions of the world rendering the inclusion of only certain countries, when assessing human rights performance in various sustainability indices, investment schemes and risk maps, flawed. Corporations violate human rights and are exposed for criticism anywhere in the world.

The third pillar concerns access to remedies. The SRSR lists and analyses the different kinds of remedies to human rights violations: these range from judicial, state controlled mechanisms to corporate in-house compliant remedies. The conclusion is that "the patchwork of mechanisms remains incomplete and flawed." Signs of improvement, on the other hand, are illustrated by larger flows of information on accessibility by National Human Rights Institutions, NGOs, academic institutions, governments and other actors. As a solution to the lack of access to adequate remedies the SRSR explicitly address a proposed establishment of a well-resourced global ombudsman outlining a list of basic requirements for such a function.

In conclusion the third and final report presents a very useful framework for the continuation of the process at UN level. Solidly based in numerous reports, surveys and papers the report responds to the "urgent need" that "every stakeholder group, despite their other differences, has expressed [...] for a common conceptual and policy framework, a foundation on which thinking and action can build."

The framework is likely to meet opposition, but the diligent and tactical approach adopted by the SRSR during the past three years has prepared the ground well for alignment and appreciation by the most important stakeholders; governments and business. Already, NGOs, the Business Leaders Initiative on Human Rights and, most important, the International Chamber of Commerce and the International Organisation of Employers have endorsed the framework. While the framework is logical, it may nonetheless challenge individual stakeholders; governments may find the report overwhelming in scope and businesses may find the substantial changes challenging. The report does not provide for final solutions or a needed concretisation of corporate responsibilities to 'respect'. When the report will be presented for the UN Human Rights Council it will be supported by a proposal for a resolution to continue the mandate for another two years asking the SRSR to fill in the framework with more concrete guidance. Norway and UK will take the lead presenting a resolution. It is most likely that some states will argue that the mandate should be restricted to deal with transnational corporations only.

The debate concerning such a limitation will possibly mirror a similar debate that took place in the Subcommittee for Human Rights during the 80s and 90s before the UN Norms were presented in 2003. However, considering the legal structures of business and the fact that all business impact human rights, it would make little sense to focus on trans-nationals only. The SRSR mandate will probably be extended for another two-year period allowing John Ruggie to clarify the multiple open issues and continue building appreciation with governments and business. Global CSR congratulates the SRSR and his team for the achievement of establishing a very useful framework and more importantly having achieved almost complete consensus on such framework. We all know that the devil is in the detail; but the framework already includes a basic foundation that will assist the actors in achieving genuine support to sustainable social development.

REQUEST

How Companies Can Contribute to Celebrating the 60th Anniversary of the Declaration of Human Rights

The Universal Declaration of Human Rights (UDHR) will turn 60 on December 10th 2008. This anniversary is an opportunity for companies to address and display their support and engagement within the area of human rights.

Subscribers to the UN Global Compact have already pledged their support for the Human Rights. For those, and other socially responsible businesses, the anniversary is a special occasion to raise awareness amongst stakeholders e.g. employees, subsidiaries, business partners etc. Other, more concrete activities could include:

- Ensuring that company practices are aligned with a company's human rights commitments
- Creating policy statements on the commitment to Human Rights.
- Engaging in dialogue with stakeholders (including critics) about the company's human rights performance
- Engaging in or facilitating activities in a local or industry-specific human-rights network. This could raise awareness, create a forum for sharing experiences and contribute to training employees in making human rights operational in the specific company context.
- Advocating the anniversary of the Declaration via the company web page, press releases etc

GLOBAL CSR specializes in working proactively with human rights as part of Corporate Social Responsibility. Please contact us if you need guidance and advice on how the anniversary of the Declaration of Human Rights can be supported and promoted by your company/organisation.

For more inspiration please see the official UN website for business engaging in marking the anniversary: http://www.unglobalcompact.org/Issues/human_rights/UDHR_60th.html

UP-COMING EVENTS

Principles for Responsible Investment. Annual Meeting: PRI in person;
17-18 June, Seoul, Japan
http://www.unglobalcompact.org/NewsAndEvents/upcoming_events.html

The 3rd annual sustainable finance summit 2008;
23-24 June, Brussels, Belgium
<http://www.ethicalcorp.com/finance/>

CSR Partnerships;
26-27 June, Amsterdam, Netherlands
<http://www.ethicalcorp.com/partnerships/#>

International Corporate Social Responsibility Conference;
29-31 July 2008, Kuala Lumpur, Malaysia
<http://www.asria.org/news/press/1207193156>

International Conference on Corporate Social Responsibility, Business Responsibilities for Human Rights, and International Law: *Where do we go after the final report of the SRSG on Human Rights and Business?*
6-7 November 2008, Copenhagen, Denmark
http://uk.cbs.dk/forskning_viden/konferencer/brhr

CSR ASIA SUMMIT 2008;
3-4 November 2008, Bangkok, Thailand
<http://www.ethicalperformance.com/pages/eventsList.php?region=asiapacific>

LITERATURE/LINKS

The Corporate Social Responsibility Reader: Context & Perspectives
by [Jon Burchell](#) 2008

http://www.amazon.com/Corporate-Social-Responsibility-Reader-Perspectives/dp/0415424348/ref=sr_1_2?ie=UTF8&s=books&qid=1210159623&sr=1-2

Global Practices of Corporate Social Responsibility
by [Samuel O. Idowu](#) (Editor), [Walter Leal Filho](#) (Editor) 2008

http://www.amazon.com/Global-Practices-Corporate-Social-Responsibility/dp/3540688129/ref=sr_1_7?ie=UTF8&s=books&qid=1210159623&sr=1-7

The Difference Makers: How Social and Institutional Entrepreneurs Created the Corporate Responsibility Movement by [Sandra Waddock](#)

http://www.amazon.com/Difference-Makers-Institutional-Entrepreneurs-Responsibility/dp/1906093040/ref=sr_1_11?ie=UTF8&s=books&qid=1210159623&sr=1-11

Corporate Sustainability as a Challenge for Comprehensive Management (Contributions to Management Science)

by [Klaus J. Zink](#) (Editor)

http://www.amazon.com/Corporate-Sustainability-Comprehensive-Management-Contributions/dp/3790820458/ref=sr_1_12?ie=UTF8&s=books&qid=1210159623&sr=1-12

GLOBAL CSR

sustainable business consulting

Contact info:

GLOBAL CSR, Sortmosen 6, DK-3520 Farum

Tel: +45 4499 5506 Fax: +45 4423 0560

www.global-csr.com – global-csr@global-csr.com

Editor: Kamilla Vejergang Lembcke kvl@global-csr.com

GLOBAL CSR IS A CONSULTANCY SPECIALISED IN PROVIDING A WIDE RANGE OF ADVICE WITHIN THE FIELD OF CORPORATE 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 POLICIES AND STRATEGIES, CUSTOMISING INTEGRATED PROACTIVE APPROACHES, GOING BEYOND COMPLIANCE, THUS CREATING SUSTAINABLE CORPORATE SOCIAL OPPORTUNITIES.

DISCLAIMER: GLOBAL CSR is pleased to provide this quarterly newsletter to friends of GLOBAL CSR via email. If you would prefer not to receive the newsletter please reply to this email or send an email to: global-csr@global-csr.com and put "Remove from list" in the subject line
GLOBAL CSR extends its great appreciation and thanks to the Business & Human Rights Resource 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 GLOBAL CSR. Quotations are allowed with due reference being made to the source.