



# BCHR

## Newsletter

November 2019  
N°49



# The BCHR Network

The BCHR Network is pleased to present the BCHR Update Newsletter, which provides a host of insights into the work of the network and its members. The main purpose of this newsletter is to a) share information about the work of the network and its members to a wider audience, and b) to strengthen co-operation and co-ordination between the network members themselves and with other interested parties.

- Click [here](#) to learn more about the BCHR Network
- Click [here](#) for a complete list of the BCHR Network members

## INDEX / Newsletter

1. Network Announcements.....	4
2. Other announcements.....	16
3. About our network.....	18
4. Sharing and posting materials.....	19

# Network Announcements

## ANNUAL MEETING, 28TH NOVEMBER 2019, GENEVA.

On November 28th, 2019 the BCHR Network held its 8th annual Conference on Business, Conflict and Human Rights in Geneva, Switzerland. The annual conference was attended by approximately 50 of the field's top experts across the academia, civil society as well as NGOs -a blend of existing members of the network, members of the UNWG on Business and Human Rights, as well as individuals.

The day consisted of a keynote speaker, as well as three block sessions, led by experts sharing their updates and experiences - and with much time to debate and share ideas throughout each session. Attendees expressed a general consensus that the conference had been both thoroughly productive and interactive.

Below we share a brief overview of the sessions, topics, and takeaways.

### 1. The role of business in peacebuilding and conflict affected settings in Liberia and Colombia

#### Panelists:

**Francis Colee, Green Advocates, Liberia**

**Gráinne Kilcullen, Christian Aid Ireland**

**Moderator: Hannah Peters, Swedwatch**

This session, co-organised by Christian Aid Ireland, Green Advocates and Swedwatch, presented findings from Sierra Leone and Colombia, both dependent on natural resources and affected by years of violent conflict. Discussants highlighted the levels of human rights violations in the context of concession agreements, especially the violations of land rights, the role of Ireland and Irish owned company sourcing coal from Colombia where the majority of communities are indigenous Wayuu and Afro-Colombians, and ultimately the vital role sustainable natural resource management plays in addressing such violations and support societies in their transition from violence to peace.

**Francis Colee**, from Green Advocates, Liberia highlighted that half of the country's land is dedicated to multinational activities in the form of concessions which was conducted in a very irresponsible way. In the case of Liberia, this was not contributing to the peace process. There are a wide range of impacts: land grabbing, government giving away licenses without consent, loss of forest resources (therefore

loss of medical resources), water pollution, water scarcity, loss of farm land and crops, destruction of tribes and sacred places (attack on belief system), destruction of towns, population displacement with a greater impact on women and children and brutal attacks to organizations.

### ***The main causes:***

- 1.- Eager for the government to foster economic activity without accounting for long term impact
- 2.- Concept and reality is mismatched
- 3.- No consent, no information.
- 4.- Companies are not addressing the negative impacts. Concession alters the lifestyle and wellbeing of communities
- 5.- Natural resource management was not well addressed in relation to the peace building process
- 6.- Companies trying to modify domestic law. Conflict between international and domestic law

### ***What can be done and who can do it?***

All parties involved have a role to play, the private sector as well as the government.

- Addressing the culture of impunity and study of war crimes.
- Develop a Human Rights Culture.
- Suppression of Human Rights Defenders abuses.
- Companies should be able to conduct human rights due diligence and address compensation issues.
- Companies should be honest about the potential social issues they can have an impact on.
- Government should make sure there are no settlements on the areas they want to give concessions on.
- Investment should go beyond the business case. Government should also make it a “social” case.

The questions here is to find the business model that can make all things compatible (social welfare, profits, local communities can benefit from employment, companies rights can be respected).

**Gráinne Kilcullen**, from Christian Aid Ireland. highlighted that violence happens in many forms and no economic reforms are tacking place.

In North Eastern Colombia, mining has been taking place since 1976. Human rights abuses in the area have been very well documented: displacements, lack of prior and informed consent, Supreme Court ruling to reconstruct a village, but company did nothing about it, no proper relocations. The right to health, right to food, right to a clean environment, right to clean water have been abused. Environmental destruction, cancer, skin diseases, reproductive problems are common issues.

### ***Causes:***

- 1.- Predatory and detrimental economic model and unrivalled focus on economic growth.  
The power imbalance between corporations with large profits and influence, and the decreasing role of the state.
- 2.- Lack of legislation at the international and national level.



- 3.- Policy incoherence in relation to taxes.
- 4.- Impossibility to reach climate agreement targets.

### ***What can be done and who can do it?***

In 2016, the Peace Agreement, one of the most advanced in history, recognized the rights of minorities, addressed gender issues as well as issues related to violence and to drug trafficking. It ensured prior and informed consent.

## **2. Rewarding War Criminals: The Hidden Price Tag of Business in Syria**

### **Panelists:**

**Ibrahim Olabi:** Ibrahim Olabi, founder and Executive Director of the Syrian Legal Development Programme.

**Bassel Kaghadou:** Bassel Kaghadou, Founder of ProPax.

**Assaad Al Achi:** Executive Director of Baytna Syria.

**Emma Beals:** independent consultant.

**Moderator:** Noor Hamadeh. Syrian-American lawyer and the Programme Head of the Human Rights and Business Unit at SLDP

Co-hosted by:



This panel highlighted the role businesses play in the conflict, in human rights violations and in international crimes in Syria. Syrian economist Assaad Al Achi began by discussing the state of the Syrian economy beginning pre-2000 and concluding with the current situation. This highlighted the economic concerns and challenges that existed in Syria over time which led to the conflict and have allowed businesses to play the role that they currently do in financing the conflict and in the war economy. Assaad Also discussed how the conflict has impacted the Syrian economic situation overall. Moreover, he discussed the particular role sanctions have played in the Syrian context since they were first introduced against Syria in 1979.

Following this, independent researcher and Journalist, Emma Beals, spoke about the role of humanitarian aid provision in the war economy. Many of Syria's wealthiest business people gained their wealth off of humanitarian aid contracts and as a result of their relationship with the Syrian government. This is a symptom of the government's coopting and weaponisation of humanitarian aid—as a tool to increase conflict between different actors, and as a tool to control which communities are rewarded with aid and which are not. Humanitarian actors have allowed this to happen with no pushback.

Humanitarian actors need to approach aid provision in the Syrian context taking these conditions into account. The third and final panelist, Ibrahim Olabi, spoke about the political dynamics and motivations

that are behind the different approaches to reconstruction in Syria. He also discussed different approaches to accountability, including human rights-based sanctions as an interim accountability measure and addressing humanitarian actors through loud and targeted advocacy. He also recommended that humanitarian actors focus on developing small projects, don't prioritise value for money in selecting suppliers, and maintain conflict sensitivity to avoid contracting with individuals who may have been involved in human rights violations or international crimes.

### 3. Emerging research on business as a peacebuilding actor in conflict settings

**John E. Katsos, Associate Professor, American University of Sharjah**

First of all, John Katsos defined peace from a sustainability point of view as well as from a violence perspective. Afterwards, he delved on the different types on conflict intensity.

***He also highlighted that:***

- Conflict is any positional difference, regarding relevant values, between at least two decisive and directly involved actors, which is fought using measures that outside established regulatory procedures and threaten core state functions or the international order.
- Conflicts range in intensity from all-out-war to latent (low-level) conflicts
- Most conflicts globally (about 70%) are medium- to low-intensity
- Even more conflicts (about 80%) are within-state conflicts

***Types of Economic Activity in Complex Environments***

- Formal Economy: directly controlled and supervised by the government
- Informal Economy: grows during conflict as people often resort to alternative methods as means of survival
- Black Economy: which may actually prolong conflict, consists of serious crimes, networks, and violations of human rights
- War Economy: when production and distribution depend on violence and can potentially fuel conflict
- Combatant Economy: controlled by fighters and warlords
- Shadow Economy: controlled by people who exploit the states weakness in order to benefit themselves
- Coping Economy: households who are forced to participate in whatever economy will allow them to survive

When engaged in complex environments, business can have a positive impact on peace through the following means: Development of the Formal Economy; "Track-two" Diplomacy; "Imported" Rule of Law; Sense of Community.

### ***Why Should Business Engage in Complex Environments at all?***

- Some should not!
- The greatest growth gains can be found in the most complex environments
- Allows companies to develop a “complexity skill set” (providing competitive advantage)
- It’s the right thing to do (?)

## **4. UNWG consultation about the role of business in post-conflict settings**

Co-hosted by:



### **Highlights of the discussion**

#### **1. Findings from its expert and multi-stakeholder consultations held in 2019 (including regional consultations in Beirut and Davao):**

- There is a need to break silos between actors in several areas.
- Notably, integration of conflict analysis tools in the work of organizations focused on business and human rights would contribute to a better understanding of how to effectively prevent and address business-related human rights abuse in conflict-affected settings.
- Existing tools for conflict prevention and conflict analysis can be useful for “enhanced” corporate human rights due diligence in conflict-affected contexts, but are currently not widely used by companies or other actors focused on companies’ human rights impacts in conflict contexts.
- The need for engaging with actors in the peacebuilding world is also apparent, as currently there are few tools for engaging the private sector focused on the business and human rights lens and how to manage human rights impacts.
- Such silos exist within the UN and in government and also within companies. There is a need for more clarity on things that might seem obvious, but clearly not seem to be among the actors operating in conflict-affected contexts.
- For example, the Working Group convened a consultation with humanitarian actors to learn from their experience of dealing with armed groups. Surprisingly, while there is a lot of experience, there is very little guidance on how to engage responsibly with armed groups.
- The Working Group also highlighted one particular dilemma that has emerged, including at the regional consultation in the Middle East: what specific guidance should be developed for companies that face the risk of becoming entangled in conflict dynamics and human rights abuses, but do not have the choice of leaving as opposed to transnational corporations that have the possibility of exit. With regard to companies that may be able to leave, criteria for “responsible exit” still need further clarification.



## 2. Takeaways from the Forum on Business and Human Rights that took place on 25–27 November:

- A panel on the role of home states in promoting responsible investment in post-conflict contexts demonstrated that there is demand for guidance, not so much in the form of normative and legal standards, but rather for practical and operational guidance.
- There is a need to elaborate on what responsible engagement looks like when business and investment involves relationships with actors that may have committed war crimes or gross human rights abuses. This includes the question of what to do when the “bad guys” are government actors with ties to the sector in question. While the easy recommendation to make is to advise against engagement in such contexts, the reality is different, which begs the question how to address that reality and minimize and prevent adverse impacts. One clear message is the need for looking at business relationships.
- Some useful guidance is emerging, including from governments, such as the recent guidance from the Netherlands on conflict-sensitive private sector development. However, there is a need to identify what else is needed.
- While Forum discussions emphasized the importance of legislation and mandatory human rights due diligence generally, there is a need to also look at other tools for driving responsible business practice. Another example referenced was how the Canadian government may withdraw trade support to companies that fail to respect human rights, which can be an effective measure. It was stressed that there is a clear need for creativity and to identify the full canvas of tools.

## 3. Key points from the expert discussion where further clarity and guidance would be considered useful: The applicability of international humanitarian law

- The UN Guiding Principles on Business and Human Rights require that “in situations of armed conflict enterprises should respect the standards of international humanitarian law.” However, practical guidance needs to be unpacked.
- While companies have an interest in ensuring they are not complicit in war crimes, one challenge is that since there is no clear and uniform definition of “conflict”, it may not be obvious to companies when international humanitarian law should be applied, in addition to the question of how it should be operationalized. In this context it was noted that business cannot rely on the parties to the conflict to determine whether there is an ongoing armed conflict or not, as underlined by the example from one country where the question of recognizing whether there was an armed conflict was considered too sensitive by the government. As an NGO working on guidelines for the private sector concerning due diligence for responsible business – covering issues such as land rights, security and organized crime – it had included reference to international humanitarian law, but this had created tensions with the government. Another example was the question of whether a country is in a “reconstruction” stage or not, which can be a highly politicized issue.

- At the same time it was cautioned against overcomplicating guidance for companies and that in most contexts as long as companies respect international human rights law standards, they will be able to operate responsibly. It was noted that international humanitarian law in fact is more permissive than international human rights law, and except for in special cases, human rights standards provide the best benchmark.
- It was suggested that the Working Group project should not get bogged down in an attempt to define armed conflict, but that it would be useful to reiterate the fact that international humanitarian law indicates to states and companies when enhanced due diligence needs to be applied. It should suffice to mention that heightened tensions require taking into account international humanitarian and criminal law and to point business in the right direction.

### **How to engage responsibly in a post-conflict and reconstruction context**

- To some extent, ongoing conflicts present business with clearer lines for whether engagement is acceptable or not, not least where sanctions regimes exist. In situations of post-conflict and reconstruction contexts, the situation may be less black and white, and expectations toward companies and investors less straightforward, including with regard to what business relationships may be acceptable from the standpoint of responsible business conduct.
- A key issue for a company is the question of who to do business with and how to avoid becoming linked to actors – including government actors – who have been involved in or benefited from war crimes and gross human rights abuses. In some contexts, business may not have an option of who to deal with, and a basic practical question is where to draw the line for no-go engagements.
- It was suggested that a key factor to look at is the connection potential business partners have to the government and specifically government actors that played a role in war crimes and human rights violations. Business partners may also include government agencies. It was noted that a link to the government may not necessarily be a human rights concern in every case, but it is necessary to look closely at the connection and potential implications of a business relationship.
- It was recognized that it is challenging for responsible companies to find objective reliable information about potential business relationships and their connection with human rights violations. In such contexts, it would be critical to consult widely. It was suggested that the first place for business to look is civil society, but also consult with businesspeople who left the country due to the conflict and businesses in neighbouring countries. One challenge companies have faced, is that civil society organizations may be reluctant to advise companies, as they fear their information may be misused. One suggestion to overcome this challenge was that academics could play a bridging role. Embassies might provide another

key source of information for transnational corporations. The assessment of international financial institutions' role was more critical, as experiences suggest they have a weak record in implementing human rights safeguards locally (in spite of strengthened policy frameworks) and tend to focus on factors to attract investment (e.g. labour costs and business opportunities) – and that companies rely too much on their advice as opposed to seeking contrasting information from civil society organizations. Another source for companies in their due diligence process before entering fragile contexts is political risk consultancies, which also may not necessarily apply human rights standards in their advice.

- One suggestion for companies is that they should always ask who are the owners of the companies they become linked to. This means asking explicitly about who actually own the shares and going beyond the shareholding/shell companies. It may be uncomfortable for companies to do so, but it should be done as part of the due diligence process. Another suggestion was to recommend full transparency on all business relationships as often it may be difficult for a company to identify individuals linked to human rights violations, whereas civil society organizations may have access to such information and might be able to leverage transparency about business relationships. At the same time, it was stressed that there is no easy way out for companies and that enhanced due diligence should be carried out.
- It was noted that it might be most effective for uptake in actual business practice if guidance for companies provided a list of key concrete issues – such as land grabs and forced displacements – that they need to consider. In that context, reference was made to a 2018 “Statement of eminent jurists on legal obligations when supporting reconstruction in Syria” , which provides some suggestions on where to draw the line for responsible engagement. Notably, business activity should not contribute to institutionalizing impacts of war crimes. For example, where forced displacements along sectarian lines have taken place, it will hardly be possible to invest in a way that respects international standards. For business, it is not just a question of who you are dealing with but also where you are going, which requires understanding of the specific local context.
- The role of business in transitional justice and access to remedy is also important in such contexts. If a company has benefited from conflict or forced displacement, it was stressed that it should provide reparations – while being sensitive to ongoing transitional justice and peacebuilding processes and in consultation with TJ process and peacebuilding. It was noted that a fundamental issue is to be open about how it may have benefited and offer apology.
- Another issue that companies operating in conflict-affected settings need to consider is the risk of becoming linked to modern slavery, and that this also requires a solid understanding of the local context and presence of refugees and internally displaced persons.

## Role of home states

- It was noted that Working Group recommendations to home states and their role in promoting responsible business in conflict-affected contexts need to touch on all home states, covering both developed and emerging markets. At the same time, one observation was that the issue of business and conflict may be less sensitive than the human rights agenda for some states, as the connection between treating people well and stability may have wider resonance.
- States that set higher standards and requirements for companies' human rights due diligence in conflict-affected settings also need to consider the potential implication that such markets are left to companies from countries that are directly involved in the conflict and with little scrutiny on responsible business conduct. A balanced approach is undoubtedly complicated but needs to include a human rights-based perspective and assessments of how different actors are part of a conflict. Home states should not only use regulatory measures, but also apply other tools for example in their roles as funders of business.
- A common assessment is that most embassies continue to give priority to promoting trade and investment opportunities without giving adequate attention to addressing the risk that companies from their jurisdiction become linked to human rights abuse, both generally and in relation to conflict-affected contexts specifically. One good practice example was mentioned, where an embassy had reached out to human rights defenders and establish contact with civil society organizations in order to help facilitate dialogue.
- With regard to the recommendation that human rights due diligence should involve asking for information about the real owners of potential business partners, practical implementation may be rendered difficult in the view of wider policy reform issues related to home government beneficial ownership practices that enable companies to evade legal obligations and transparency.
- One recommendation for home states was to help offset costs incurred on companies by undertaking more comprehensive human rights due diligence through tax incentives for companies that can demonstrate good practice.
- The role of OECD national contact points (NCP) was highlighted in relation to the role of home states in promoting access to remedy for victims. It was noted that most NCPs lack conflict sensitivity in their mandates and policies, and that this was a specific aspect that the Working Group's recommendations should address, while further clarity on how to guide NCPs still needs to be worked out.
- The Working Group was encouraged to craft a strategy for effective uptake of its recommendations, where partners at the regional level could play an important role.

## Arms industry

- Arms trade provide an example of how lack of policy coherence plays out in practice within governments, between government departments that facilitate such trade and those that are charged with overseeing implementation of legal requirements and international standards. It was noted that even though arms trade licences are governed by law in most jurisdictions, capacity constraints for effective screening of the number of contracts are a real challenge.
- It was suggested that the capacity challenge – at least in a European context – could be addressed by international cooperation at the European level to co-manage assessment and advice on human rights risks for the industry. A lot of information on context-specific risks already exist as a result of tracking by civil society organizations as well as chambers of commerce and embassies. It was also noted that such inter-governmental cooperation would need to be backed by sufficient resources to be effective. A challenge for such coordination to develop in practice is that the arms industry is often connected to “national interests”.
- It was noted that such alignment has been developing in relation to trade in goods used for capital punishment and torture.
- While the Guiding Principles on Business and Human Rights should be applied to the arms industry, it was cautioned against the risk of “securitizing” the wider business, conflict and human rights agenda, as considerations for the arms industry may not necessarily be applicable for other industries.

## Gender dimension

- Participants emphasized the critical importance of integrating the gender dimension in guidance to states and business. With regard to post-conflict situations, it was stressed that business activities that reinforce patriarchy can undermine the foundations for sustainable peace.
- It was noted that gender and conflict is a very broad issue, and that there is a need for further work to clarify guidance in relation to business, gender and conflict.

## Framing guidance for business

- It was suggested that it is easier to get business to buy into the “business for peace” and “do good lens” than the Guiding Principles’ requirement of focusing first on managing risks and avoiding harm. However, it was noted that if companies first and foremost meet their responsibility and avoid harm, this will have the greatest positive impact.



- While the Guiding Principles' approach is to focus on preventing and addressing adverse impacts, one suggestion was that it would also be helpful if the Working Group's guidance is framed around the concept of building sustainable peace. One way of making the connection is to demonstrate that corporate respect for human rights is a critical component for sustaining peace.
- Another aspect is that companies ask for concrete practical guidance and how to translate human rights standards requirements into management language. It would be important for the Working Group's guidance to address this. One suggestion was that guidance would be more concrete if framed around specific impacts and using sector-based initiatives as a bridge to translate general expectations into concrete action in specific sector context.
- It was also noted that there is a need to be explicit about when enhanced due diligence is expected and that this will imply additional costs for the company. Companies need to spend more on stakeholder and expert engagement as well as accountability measures, and it is critical to be open about the fact that this will cost more.

### • **The Network's General Assembly endorsed AFRILAW as our new Secretariat**

#### **Network's Technical Secretariat**

María Prandi, along with Krsitian Herbolzheimer, Director of ICIP, opened the Network General Assembly by thanking all of the presenters, as well as attendees for the (once again) incredible dialogue and participation throughout the day.

Maria and Kristian informed the network members about ICIP's resignation as technical secretariat as of 31 December 2019. The International Catalan Institute for Peace (ICIP) had assumed the Secretariat of the BCHR Network for the period 2016-2019. Since its creation, ICIP had been organizing through Business and Human Rights (BHR) and Maria Prandi's coordination, a yearly event and producing, the Network's newsletter and other networking activities. In addition, it had assumed the costs associated with the website of the Network, the meetings of the Network, the monthly newsletter of the Network, and had provided office space for meetings where Network related matters were discussed, as well as the human capital that has made all of this possible.

In this regard, and after the launch of an open call, the General Assembly considered AfriLaw candidacy as it was the only one received. In this regard, we are happy to share with you that, after the presentation of its strategy, the **African Law Foundation (AFRILAW)**, Nigeria, was appointed as the new Secretariat of the Network. (<https://namati.org/network/organization/african-law-foundation-afrilaw/>).

Okereke Chinwike, CEO of AFRILAW, is a Human Rights and Development Law Expert. He has relevant experience and training working on the issues of Corporate Accountability and Business and Human Rights with various partners, networks and associations such as the OECD Watch Network, International Advocates Working Group (IAWG), BankTrack/EPA Campaign, Coalition for Human Rights in Development, USA, Human Rights Defenders in Development Campaign Advisory Committee, Africa Coalition on Corporate Accountability (ACCA), Lieghday LPP, UK, ICoCA, Private Security Governance Observatory, International Accountability Partnership (IAP), Geneva Center for Security Sector Governance (DCAF) and Global Law, Justice and Development (GLJD)Forum.

The Secretariat is one of the three governing bodies of the BCHR Network, and its main responsibility is to oversee the implementation of decisions taken at the annual meeting. It is located within the organization appointed by the annual meeting for a renewable period of three years. The organization that hosts the Secretariat will inform the advisory board no later than the beginning of the third year of a given term whether it will be able to continue as Secretariat host for a renewed term. The Secretariat is in charge of the website (<http://www.networkbchr.org/>) as well as the publication of an e-newsletter on a periodic basis. The main purpose of the newsletter is to a) share information about the activities of the Network and its members, and b) to strengthen co-operation and co-ordination between members and with other interested parties. The position of the Secretariat is not remunerated, since the Network itself does not have the economic capacity to cover the expenses associated with its cycle and activities. It does, however, allow the search for financial support from third legitimate sources.

### **Advisory Board new members**

Maria Prandi also consulted the participants about any interest in joining the Advisory Board. Some members participating at the General Assembly (Peter Webster, EIRIS Foundation and Jonathan Kolieb, RMIT University) showed their willingness to become members of the new Advisory Board.

In this regard an open call is now launched to all members wishing to become members of the Network's Advisory Board (closing 30 January 2020). If interested, please contact: [maria.prandi@networkbchr.org](mailto:maria.prandi@networkbchr.org)

## Other announcements

### CALL FOR INPUTS: PROJECT ON BUSINESS IN CONFLICT AND POST-CONFLICT CONTEXTS

#### Background

As part of its mandate to promote the UN Guiding Principles on Business and Human Rights, the UN Working Group on Business and Human Rights launched a project in 2018 to clarify the practical steps that States and business enterprises should take to implement the Guiding Principles in conflict and post-conflict contexts.

#### Why this project:

while it is well documented that the worst forms of business-related human rights abuse tend to happen in conflict-affected contexts, a better understanding of the practical measures that all actors should take to prevent and address business-related human rights abuse is still needed.

#### Project scope and focus

Against this background, the Working Group's project will aim at identifying and clarifying policies and practices for States and business, including public and private investors, across the full "conflict cycle" and the three "Protect, Respect and Remedy" pillars of the Guiding Principles.

In this context, the project will focus around key issues such as:

- What are or should be the home and host States' appropriate policies, regulation and adjudication to protect against corporate-related human rights abuses in conflict and post-conflict situations?
- What specific measures should business take in conflict and post-conflict situations and what does "enhanced" human rights due diligence look like in practice? How does/should the process to identify, prevent, mitigate and account for actual and potential impacts in conflict and post-conflict situations differ from "non-conflictual" contexts?
- What does responsible and sustainable investment in post-conflict and reconstruction contexts look like in practical terms? What actions should be taken (and avoided) by actors in the financial sector – both public financial institutions and private investors – to meet their responsibilities under the Guiding Principles, and to use their leverage to support outcomes that do not undermine human rights and sustainable peace?

- What is the role of business in transitional justice? What are the implications of the Guiding Principles in a transitional justice context?

## Call for inputs

The Working Group invites all interested parties to submit relevant information and materials to help inform the project. Submissions that address one or more of the identified focus areas are encouraged. Please see: <https://www.ohchr.org/EN/Issues/Business/Pages/ConflictPostConflict.aspx>

Case studies and good practice examples from past and current conflict situations in different regions are welcome.

Deadline: 10 April 2020.

For submissions or questions about the project, please write to [unwgbhrconflictproject@gmail.com](mailto:unwgbhrconflictproject@gmail.com) and [wg-business@ohchr.org](mailto:wg-business@ohchr.org).

## Outputs

The Working Group's recommendations will be presented in a report to the UN General Assembly in October 2020.

The recommendations will be disseminated in the last quarter of 2020, with active outreach to actors in the peacebuilding and conflict prevention area, governments, business and the investment community, as well as engagement with civil society and international institutions.

The report will be a key input to the 2020 UN Forum on Business and Human Rights (Geneva, 16-18 November).

## About our Network

The Network brings together researchers, practitioners and NGO members from various fields with the aim of researching and analysing the role of business in conflict situations reducing the human and people's rights violations and any other negative social and environmental impact as well as other adverse consequences. It also looks at the potential role of companies in relation to peace building.

The Network reflects upon the causes, dynamics and consequences of business involvement in armed conflicts and systematic state repression, as well as upon existing or potential responses to such involvements in light of the responsibilities of all concerned actors and ongoing international and local efforts to develop and apply appropriate initiatives and guidelines.

Visit: <http://www.networkbchr.org/>

---



## Sharing and posting materials

---

We very much welcome your comments and suggestions for how the BCHR newsletter can better serve the network's needs and interests as well as those of its members. We kindly invite you to share this newsletter with academics, NGO and practitioners that might be interested in its content.

If you are interested in contributing to future editions of the newsletter, please do not hesitate to contact us at [maria.prandi@networkbchr.org](mailto:maria.prandi@networkbchr.org).

---