



FAKULTETA ZA DRŽAVNE
IN EVROPSKE ŠTUDIJE

10let



Scientific report

GLOTHRO SLOVENIA WORKSHOP ON THE DIRECT HUMAN RIGHTS OBLIGATIONS OF CORPORATIONS IN INTERNATIONAL LAW (17-19 January 2013, Bled)

Glothro webpage : <http://www.glothro.org/main.aspx?c=.GLOTHRO&n=105963>

Webpage : <http://humanrights-business-workshop.blogspot.com/>.

Workshop photos available at :

<https://plus.google.com/photos/107957811179597802472/albums/5837133278208468369>

1. Summary

Glothro Slovenia workshop addressed the question of the direct human rights obligations in international law over three workshop days and included fifty participants. Corporations play an important role in the realisation of the civil, political, economic, social and cultural rights of their employees and of the society as a whole. For example, they are responsible for guaranteeing adequate labour conditions to their employees, and they may be involved in the provision of basic services to communities. They can become violators of human rights, for example where their activities lead to denial of access to water, food, housing, health and education or where their activities infringe upon right to life, right to privacy or freedom of expression. This workshop answered, among others, these fundamental questions: Do corporations have direct obligations in international human rights law? Are corporations obliged to comply with international human rights norms when doing business extraterritorially? How can a link between direct state and corporate human rights obligations under international human rights law be generally established? Should states and corporations



FAKULTETA ZA DRŽAVNE
IN EVROPSKE ŠTUDIJE

10let

be responsible for financially supporting criminal regimes? What is the role of international human rights law in the context of business and human rights?

2. Description of the scientific content of and discussions at the event

Glothro Slovenia workshop addressed the question of the direct human rights obligations in international law over three workshop days and included fifty participants.. Corporations play an important role in the realisation of the civil, political, economic, social and cultural rights of their employees and of the society as a whole. For example, they are responsible for guaranteeing adequate labour conditions to their employees, and they may be involved in the provision of basic services to communities. They can become violators of human rights, for example where their activities lead to denial of access to water, food, housing, health and education or where their activities infringe upon right to life, right to privacy or freedom of expression. This workshop answered, among others, these fundamental questions: Do corporations have direct obligations in international human rights law? Are corporations obliged to comply with international human rights norms when doing business extraterritorially? How can a link between direct state and corporate human rights obligations under international human rights law be generally established? Should states and corporations be responsible for financially supporting criminal regimes? What is the role of international human rights law in the context of business and human rights?

The workshop was opened at 14h00 on 17 January 2013 at conference hall of Hotel Golf at Bled, by professor **Peter Jambrek**, former president of the Constitutional Court of Republic of Slovenia and former judge at the European Court of Human Rights, **Matej Avbelj**, Dean of the Graduate School of Government and European Studies, **Jernej Letnar Čerňič**, Vice-Dean of the Graduate School of Government and European Studies. Participants were also welcomed by **Janez Fajfar**, Mayor of Bled, a town where workshop took place.

After the introductory remarks, keynote address was delivered by professor **Surya Deva (City University of Hong Kong)**, one of the most prolific researches on business and human rights. His keynote address was entitled *Multinationals, Human Rights and International Law: How to Deal with the Elephant in the Room*. He argued that “like elephants, MNCs are very powerful creatures. But controlling their behaviour does not necessarily require brute force. What is, however, needed that MNCs do not evade accountability for human rights violations by exploiting states’ inability or unwillingness to perform their duty to protect human rights. Non-state actors require a non-state-centric conception of international law to remedy the weaknesses of the state-centric approach of regulation. The SRSB’s Framework and the Guiding Principles have intentionally taken a recourse which undermines the factum as well as the potential of international law in imposing direct human rights obligations on companies.« After the keynote address, speakers were divided in nine different panels with three to five speakers.

The first panel on the first day discussed privatization of human rights law. **Gentian Zyberi (University of Oslo)** discussed Protection of the Environment from Serious Harm: Towards Shared Responsibility between Corporations and the State? He argued that the



FAKULTETA ZA DRŽAVNE
IN EVROPSKE ŠTUDIJE

10let

protection of the environment is a case of shared, but differentiated responsibility, on the part of corporation and the State. **Cedric Ryngaert (University of Leuven, University of Utrecht)** talked about transnational private regulation and human rights as paradigmatic shift in our thinking about the desired nature and scope of government regulation in the 21st century. **Nicolas Zambrana Tavar (University of Navarra, Pamplona)** discussed right to Remedy under the Ruggie framework on the basis of part III of the UN Guidelines on Business and Human Rights.

The second panel on the first discussed the role of corporations in human rights abuses and right to remedy. **Karin Lukas (University of Vienna)** discussed the right of access to remedy for victims of corporate abuses. Her research has revealed decisive factors and major challenges for establishing and implementing a human rights compatible extra-judicial grievance mechanism. **Mary Footer (University of Nottingham)** discussed the role of due diligence in the responsible supply of gold and other precious metals from conflict-affected and high risk areas. She argued that the sort of risk-based due diligence, which companies are required to take in order to identify and address actual or potential risks in their sourcing activities, relies on a number of factors. The last contribution of the first workshop day was delivered by **Humberto Fernando Cantú Rivera (Université Panthéon-Assas Paris II)**, who spoke about corporations and compliance with international human rights law: from a “responsibility to respect” to legal obligations and enforcement. His presentation explored, by means of a historical and comparative legal analysis, whether the explicit linguistic characterization of the concept of human duties has any weight for its normative validity in the area of international human rights protection.

The third workshop panel, first on second day explored idea of the direct human rights obligations of corporations in international Law. **Jernej Letnar Čerňič (The Graduate School of Government and European Studies)** analyzed in his presentation on the direct human rights obligations of corporations in international law, from utopia to reality the potential legal basis of corporate human rights obligations, trying to draw out lessons concerning the understanding of the field of business and human rights. He argued that there exist strong normative and moral grounds for arguing for the direct human rights obligations of corporations in international law. **Tara L. Van Ho (University of Essex)** spoke on “due diligence” in “transitional states”: an obligation for greater transparency. She argued that only robust understanding of due diligence will best protect the state, individuals, and the corporation in states emerging from conflict and authoritarian regimes. **Ann Sofie Cloots (University of Leuven)** also examined direct human rights obligations of business corporations under international law. She noted that the aim is not to re-do the work of the Special Representative on Business and Human Rights, but rather to assure that the policy concerns and moral aspirations reflected therein are discerned from the legal state of affairs, in order to start the discussion with a clear view of *de lege lata* and the existing gaps. The last speaker in this panel, **Brigit Toebes (University of Groningen)** touched upon human rights responsibilities of non-state actors in the health sector. Her contribution focused on the definition of potential obligations of all the non-state actors in the health sector.

The next two panels were conducted in a parallel way in two different conference halls. The panel four discussed direct obligations of companies in international investment law I and included four speakers. **Roos van Os (University of Amsterdam)** talked about corporate accountability, human rights and international investment agreements: imbalances



FAKULTETA ZA DRŽAVNE
IN EVROPSKE ŠTUDIJE

10let

and policy options. Her paper examined the relation between this, and explores, also based on arbitration cases, several relevant aspects of the relation between the current human rights and corporate accountability framework and international investment law. **Adriana Espinosa González (Universidad Carlos III de Madrid)** analyzed the conflict between international investment and human rights international regimes and its effects on human rights protection. She presented 'fragmentation of international law' phenomenon, summarizing its causes and its impacts on the protection of human rights. **Lana Olup (European School of Law, Nova Gorica)** talked about respecting human rights as an investment strategy. In this way she argued that corporations should acknowledge that respecting human rights does not mean just fulfilling legal obligations but it is a good investment strategy and an opportunity to prosper. Finally, **Josh Curtis (Irish Centre of Human Rights, Galway)** addressed implications of the Obligation to Cooperate for the Renegotiation of International Investment Law. He, firstly, examined ways that human rights law can enlighten the proper place of FDI in development. Secondly, he determined to what extent this body of law could reorganise our approach to international investment regulation. Thirdly, he used this discussion as a backdrop for developing certain themes connected to the utility of human rights law in prioritising social values over perceived economic exigencies; namely the relationship between human rights advocates and heterodox economists, the debate over a global constitutional order, and the use of obligations of international cooperation to limit global competition.

Panel five also addressed direct obligations of companies in international investment law II. Firstly, **Yannick Radi (University of Leiden)** talked about the Contribution of International Investment Law to the Horizontalization of Human Rights. His presentation talked about the possibility to incorporate direct human rights obligations binding upon investors in IIAs. In particular, it examines whether the current context can lead states to overcome their traditional reluctance to incorporate such obligations. **Juan Ochoa-Sanchez (University of Oslo)** examined whether States Have, or Should Have, a Duty to Ensure the Observance of Internationally Recognized Human Rights by Transnational Corporations which are domiciled in Their Territory While Conducting Operations Abroad? He focused in his presentation on the Duty to Provide a Remedy to Victims of a Human Rights Violation Involving One of Such Corporations. Finally, **Mikko Rajavuori (Åbo Akademi)** addressed State-owned Enterprises in Business and Human Rights Agenda. He argued that if a convincing argument for distinct corporate human rights obligations cannot be maintained in cases where state is heavily involved with business through significant ownership, can it be maintained at all?

The next two panels were also conducted in a parallel way in two different conference halls. Panel six addressed the issues of soft law and human rights obligations of companies. **Tineke Lambooy (University of Utrecht)** examined the development of soft law human rights standards for companies towards legal obligations'. She discussed whether corporate law concepts are entering the CSR and human rights and business discourse. **Anna Bulzomi (IPIS, Brussels)** addressed Human Rights & Investment: Opportunities and Challenges in Conflict-Affected and High-Risk Areas The case of the Democratic Republic of Congo. She explored the 'healing' potential of foreign investment and outlined the challenges arising in trying to incorporate human rights standards in the State-investors dialogue. **Damiano de Felice (London School of Economics)** talked about commercial banks and human rights and why market-based initiatives and international proto-regulations are not enough. He suggested



FAKULTETA ZA DRŽAVNE
IN EVROPSKE ŠTUDIJE

10let

alternative avenues to foster change in financial activities: in particular, domestic/international regulation (sanctions), corporate civil liability (lawsuits against banks) and individual criminal liability (prosecutions against managers and employees). Finally, **Sisay Alemahu Yeshanew (Åbo Akademi)**, examined the utility of the African human rights system to deal with violations emanating from transnational conducts involving non-African states.

Parallel Panel number seven addressed ethics, criminal law and human rights obligations of companies and included three speakers. **Vojko Strahovnik (University of Ljubljana)** talked about Corporations, group agents and responsibilities. He followed approach developed by List and Pettit (2011) that emphasize that the best way to approach such questions is by first analyzing the concept of group agents. **Andrew Spalding (University of Richmond)** examined international corporate bribery as a human rights violation. He argued that anti-bribery laws may indeed be the most promising legal mechanism today for deterring corporate human rights violations, and could provide a template for corporate human rights law generally. **Genny Ngende (Vrije Universiteit Brussels)** addressed establishing corporate liability through vicarious liability. She examined whether corporations can be held vicariously liable for the human rights offences of directors and/or managers.

The final panel of the second day, panel eight, was entitled human rights obligations of corporations and included five presentations. **Cees van Dam (University of Utrecht)** examined the role of tort law in protecting human rights. He analyzed how is the standard of care different from the due diligence requirement in the Ruggie framework and what is the relationship between the soft law instruments and tort law? **Wei Xiaohong (University of Rotterdam)** talked about the Alien Tort Statute after *Kobel*: A Substitute for the International Criminal Court? She analyzed the possible relationship between corporate civil and criminal liability for international crimes under the Rome Statute. **Dorothee Cambou, (Vrije Universiteit Brussels)** spoke on the Ogoni People vs. Shell: towards greater accountability of multinational corporations for human rights violations. She analysed in what role companies play in the violation of human rights, and examines in particular the significance of the case for indigenous and minority rights protection. **Sara Andersen (EUI, Florence)** talked about Gendered Harms in the Fashion Industry: Lifting the Veil of Multinational Corporations (MNCs) from an American and Scandinavian Perspective. She defended a polycentric law approach in dealing with the global challenge of corporate liability contending that the power divisions and geographic diversity of supply chains provide reasons why the contacts approach in private international law ought to be embraced as a starting point. Finally, last speaker of the second day of the workshop, **Silvia Scarpa (John Cabot University, Rome)**, spoke about Direct obligations of Multinational Corporations for the Works Form of Child Labour in Cocoa Plantations. She argued that a new – and this time - binding instrument could be developed - containing basic rules and standards as well as an independent monitoring mechanism, shaped on UN human rights monitoring bodies - as a way to eliminate the worst forms of child labour from cocoa plantations.

The workshop continued on with the final panel on the third day. In this way, panel nine addressed human rights obligations of corporations and tort law. Firstly, **Nicholas McMurry (Griffith College, Cork)**, spoke about fulfilling Rights under Privatisation. His presentation explored possible legal frameworks to mitigate against these consequences and



FAKULTETA ZA DRŽAVNE
IN EVROPSKE ŠTUDIJE

10let

balance the state's contractual and human-rights obligations, such as applying an obligation to fulfil rights directly to businesses or recognising the discretion of states in choosing how to fulfil rights as overriding contractual obligations. Secondly, **Charline Daelman (University of Leuven)** examined the Issue of State-Owned Companies in the Case-law of the European Court of Human Rights. Thirdly, **Nicolás Carrillo (Autonoma University of Madrid)** analyzed Direct International Humanitarian Obligations of Corporations and Other Non-State Entities: Analysis of the *lex lata* and the *lex ferenda*. He argued that to ensure an effective minimum protection of essential rights, as demanded by human dignity and equality, international legal obligations must be set in place at least in some core events, so that multiple actors are empowered to promote and protect rights in relation to non-state entities and there is no impunity. Finally, **Karin Buhmann (Roskilde University)** examined the emergence of 'a government case for CSR'? How and why public policy interests are coming to govern CSR through establishing human rights relevant obligations on business, where she presented emerging public regulation of CSR or private sector conduct which impacts on human rights, build on public policy objectives, including that of promoting and protecting human rights extraterritorially.

Finally, the workshop was concluded by short summary of discussion delivered by the organisers. The final part was dedicated to the discussion about publication of an edited monograph on the basis of the workshop

3. Assessment of the results and impact of the event on the future directions of the field

The Glothro Slovenia Workshop on direct human rights obligations of corporations in international law turned to be very successful. Overall, 50 participants from majority of Glothro member countries and beyond attended the workshop, whereas 33 speakers presented their research on various aspect of the direct human rights obligations of corporations. The presentations examined direct human rights obligations of corporations in international law from the perspective of public international law, international human rights law, corporate law, tort law and criminal law.

Majority of presentations and discussions shared the conviction that responsible corporations that observe human rights can avoid legal, financial and other risks and can benefit in the marketplace by assuming a more competitive position. There is a strong incentive that companies that have corporate social responsibility policies included in their business activities will be the companies that will be more successful in the future. And it is becoming more debated that taking into account the moral values is the way to go forward in combating the economic crisis. Even though companies driven solely by profit might not be suited to mitigate economic governance problems as well as non-profit organization, it was suggested that companies with a strong drive towards sustainable development and a social dimension, might be better equipped to do so. When a corporation includes employees, consumers and other stakeholders into its decision making process, it can better anticipate the problems that might occur. Complying human rights may open access to new markets, which would remain otherwise closed. In other words, participants argued corporate social responsibility may open doors to new profits. It was argued that corporate social



FAKULTETA ZA DRŽAVNE
IN EVROPSKE ŠTUDIJE

10let

responsibility enables corporations to stay ahead of their competitors and prepare in advance of new normative framework and regulations, to reduce the cost of risky projects and, in doing so, attract investment from socially concerned consumers.

The workshop participants argued that human rights obligations of corporations derive at least indirectly from the international legal order. It appears that the positive legal obligations of corporations to observe fundamental human rights derive also from international treaties which are not directly addressed at corporations. What remains clear is that international norms may have applicability to corporations if there is no international mechanism established for enforcing this norm. Placing direct international legal obligations on corporations may create practical problems of enforcement. For this reason, some participants argued that legal soft law documents may in some instances illustrate evidences of human rights obligations of corporations in international law.

What is more, the workshop examined the Glothro objective of seeking for overreaching principles in the different fields of human rights obligations of foreign states, transnational corporations and international obligations. It identified what the adoption of overreaching principles across different human rights fields would mean for corporations, international organizations and non-state actors, and particularly for relevance of human rights law, which has traditionally focused on obligations of the territorial state. All in all, the workshop offered some novel answers on the direct human rights obligations of corporations in international law. What can be concluded from the discussions at the workshop is that national legal orders and international systems impose human rights obligations on corporations. In addition, voluntary commitments may offer a further evidence of such obligations. In this light, sources of the fundamental human rights obligations of corporations should be treated as mutually complementary not as mutually exclusive.

Impact of the event on the future directions of the field

The Glothro workshop on direct human rights obligations of corporations in international law showed that a number of experts in the field agree that corporations can be held responsible for human rights violations. **By bringing together academic and practical experience, the workshop made an important contribution to advancing the academic debate on the direct human rights obligations of corporations in international law, which will be made even stronger with forthcoming publication of an edited monograph.** Even though the precise content of the human rights obligations of corporations is somewhat unclear, it may appear self-evident that corporations are asked to at least comply with fundamental human rights standards. The question of the legal nature and scope of the human rights obligations of corporations has some influence on the very epistemology of corporate responsibility for fundamental human rights, i.e. what this concept is and how it can be identified. Some practitioners and commentators have so far argued that corporations do not have any obligations and responsibilities for human rights. However, workshop confirmed that no matter how plausible this conclusion might sound, it is unfortunately not persuasive as international treaties and declarations already nowadays include the human rights obligations of corporations. It is true, however, that the scope of substantive obligations and whether they are direct or indirect remains contested. In this light, the further development of substantive



FAKULTETA ZA DRŽAVNE
IN EVROPSKE ŠTUDIJE

10let

human rights obligations may require a translation of already existing human rights standards into a corporate context.

Against this background, it comes as no surprise that businesses do not see the approaches that these international legal obligations have or that they can exist independently from institutional framework to enforce them. The fact that international jurisdictions for legal persons are yet to be developed does not imply that a corporation does not have any legal obligations. This is because the human rights obligations of corporations primarily derive from national legal orders. To the contrary, it was argued that it would be to futile to state that a substantive obligation only arises when joined with a jurisdiction who can enforce it. In this way, it appears that corporations are obliged to *pro forma* observe the human rights of individuals. In other words, the problem is not that corporations and their officers would not have human rights obligations. The real, and far deeper, structural problem is that individuals do not have recourse to enforce their human rights and ideals. The discussions at the workshop showed and mapped out that there are no conceptual obstacles in imposing human rights obligations on corporations.

The Glothro workshop on direct human rights obligations of corporations in international law has had substantial effect on the future direction of the field. The organisers plan to publish an edited monograph on the topic of on direct human rights obligations of corporations in international law towards the end of 2013 with top international publishers. The edited book will examine both, theoretical and practical dimensions of the research. The research results will be in this way disseminated among the academic community and general public. Special attentions will be given to the dissemination of results of the workshop among governments and largest corporations.

4. Annexes: programme of the meeting

Glothro Slovenia exploratory workshop on 'The Direct Human Rights Obligations Of Corporations In International Law', Hotel Golf, Bled, Slovenia, 17-19 January 2013

Thursday, 17 January 2013

14:00 – Opening remarks by :

by Peter Jambrek, former president of the Constitutional Court of Republic of Slovenia and former judge at the European Court of Human Rights,
Matej Avbelj, Dean of the Graduate School of Government and European Studies,



FAKULTETA ZA DRŽAVNE
IN EVROPSKE ŠTUDIJE

10let

Jernej Letnar Čerňič, Vice-Dean of the Graduate School of Government and European Studies.

Janez Fajfar, Mayor of Bled

Keynote address : Surya Deva (City University of Hong Kong, Multinationals, Human Rights and International Law: How to Deal with the Elephant in the Room.

The first panel discussed **privatization of human rights law**
15:00-15:20 – Gentian Zyberi (Oslo), Ensuring the Protection of the Environment from Serious Harm: Towards Shared Responsibility between Corporations and the State?

15:20-15:40 – Cedric Ryngaert (Leuven, Utrecht), Transnational private regulation and human rights: The limitations of stateless law and the re-entry of the state

15:40-16:00 – Nicolas Zambrana Tavar (Pamplona), Right to Remedy under the Ruggie framework

16:00-16:15 - *Discussion*
short coffee break with snacks

Panel 2: Corporations, Human Rights Abuses, Right to Remedy

16:30-16:50 – Karin Lukas (Vienna), Right of access to remedy for victims of corporate abuses,

16:50-17:10 – Mary Footer (Nottingham), The role of due diligence in the responsible supply of gold and other precious metals from conflict-affected and high risk areas

17:10-17:30 - Humberto Fernando Cantú Rivera (Geneva, Paris), Corporations and compliance with international human rights law: from a “responsibility to respect” to legal obligations and enforcement

17:30-18:10 - *Discussion*

19:00 *conference dinner, vila Ajda, Bled*

Friday, 18 January 2013

Panel 3: The Direct Human Rights Obligations Of Corporations In International Law

9:00-9:20 – Jernej Letnar Čerňič, (Kranj) The Direct Human Rights Obligations Of Corporations In International Law, From Utopia to Reality?

9:20-9:40 – Tara L. Van Ho (Essex), “Due Diligence” in “Transitional States”: An Obligation for Greater Transparency?

9:40-10:00 – Jan Wouters and Ann Sofie Cloots (Leuven), Direct Human Rights Obligations of Business Corporations under International Law

10:00-10:20 Brigit Toebe (Groningen), Human rights responsibilities of non-state actors in the health sector



FAKULTETA ZA DRŽAVNE
IN EVROPSKE ŠTUDIJE

10let

10:00-10:15 - *Discussion*

coffee break

Panel 4: Direct obligations of companies in international investment law I

10:40-11:00 – Roos van Os (Amsterdam), Corporate Accountability, Human Rights and International Investment Agreements: Imbalances and Policy Options

11:00-11:20 – Adriana Espinosa González (Madrid): The conflict between international investment and human rights international regimes and its effects on human rights protection

11:20-11:40 – Lana Olup (Utrecht, Nova Gorica), Respecting human rights as an investment strategy

11:40-12:00 – Josh Curtis (Galway), Implications of the Obligation to Cooperate for the Renegotiation of International Investment Law

12:00-12:30 – Discussion

Parallel Panel 5: Direct obligations of companies in international investment law II

10:40-11:00 – Yannick Radi (University of Leiden), The Contribution of International Investment Law to the Horizontalization of Human Rights

11:00-11:20 – Juan Ochoa-Sanchez (Oslo), Do States Have, or Should Have, a Duty to Ensure the Observance of Internationally Recognized Human Rights by Transnational Corporations which are domiciled in Their Territory While Conducting Operations Abroad?

11:20-11:40 – Mikko Rajavuori (Åbo/Turku), State-owned Enterprises in Business and Human Rights Agenda

11:40-12:30 – Discussion

Lunch

Panel 6 : Soft law and human rights obligations of companies

13:40-14:00 – Tineke Lambooy (Utrecht), The development of soft law human rights standards for companies towards legal obligations'

14:00-14:20 – Anna Bulzomi (Brussels), Human Rights & Investment: Opportunities and Challenges in Conflict-Affected and High-Risk Areas The case of the Democratic Republic of Congo

14:20-14:40 – Damiano de Felice (London), Commercial banks and human rights: Why market-based initiatives and international proto-regulations are not enough

14:40-15:00 – Sisay Alemahu Yeshanew (Åbo/Turku), Beyond Intra-African State Obligations: The utility of the African human rights system to deal with violations emanating from transnational conducts involving non-African states



FAKULTETA ZA DRŽAVNE
IN EVROPSKE ŠTUDIJE

10let

15:00-15:20 – Discussion

Parallel Panel 7, Ethics, Criminal Law and Human Rights Obligations of Companies

13:40-14:00 – Vojko Strahovnik (Ljubljana), Corporations, group agents and responsibilities

14:00-14:20 – Andrew Spalding (Richmond), Understanding international corporate bribery as a human rights violation

14:20-14:40 – Genny Ngende (Brussels) Establishing corporate liability through vicarious liability

14:40-15:00 – Discussion

Coffee break with snacks

Panel 8 : Human Rights Obligations of Corporations and Tort Law

15:40-16:00 – Cees van Dam (Utrecht), The role of tort law in protecting human rights

16:00-16:20 – Wei Xiaohong (Rotterdam) The Alien Tort Statute after *Kobel*: A Substitute for the International Criminal Court?

16:20-16:40 – Dorothee Cambou, (Brussels), The Ogoni People vs. Shell: towards greater accountability of multinational corporations for human rights violations

16:40-17:00 – Sara Andersen (Florence), Gendered Harms in the Fashion Industry: Lifting the Veil of Multinational Corporations (MNCs) from an American and Scandinavian Perspective

17:00-17:20 - Silvia Scarpa (Rome) Direct obligations of Multinational Corporations for the Works Form of Child Labour in Cocoa Plantations

17:20-17:40 – Discussion

19:00 *conference dinner, Panorama*

Saturday, 19 January 2013

Panel 9: International law, core norms, direct human rights obligations of corporations

9:00-9:20 – Nicholas McMurry (Cork), Fulfilling Rights under Privatisation

9:20-9:40 – Charline Daelman (Leuven), The Issue of State-Owned Companies in the Case-law of the European Court of Human Rights

9:40-10:00 – Nicolás Carrillo (Madrid), Direct International Humanitarian Obligations of Corporations and Other Non-State Entities: Analysis of the *lex lata* and the *lex ferenda*

10:00-10:20 – Karin Buhmann (Copenhagen), The emergence of 'a government case for CSR'? How and why public policy interests are coming to govern CSR through establishing human rights relevant obligations on business



FAKULTETA ZA DRŽAVNE
IN EVROPSKE ŠTUDIJE

10let

10:20-10h40 - Discussion
short break

11:00-13h00 – **Final Group Workshop session (all participants)**

13:00 – Concluding remarks (organizers) on workshop and conference publication

5. List of participants

ESF - Participation List - Management

ESF ACTIVITY

Unit(s) : SCSS
Activity Title : Beyond Territoriality: Globalisation and Transnational Human Rights Obligations

PROJECT

Science Meeting : Workshop
Title of Science Meeting : GLOTHRO WORKSHOP ON THE DIRECT HUMAN RIGHTS OBLIGATIONS OF CORPORATIONS IN INTERNATIONAL LAW
Location : Bled, Slovenia
Date of Science Meeting : 17/01/2013 - 19/01/2013

[Add a Convenor](#)

Convenor(s)			1
Name	City, Country	Type	
Dr. Jernej Letnar Cernic	Kranj, (SI)	Convenor	Edit

[Add a Speaker](#)

Speakers			33
Name	City, Country	Type	
Dr. Sisay Alemahu Yeshanew	Ábo, (FI)	Speaker	Edit DELETE
Dr. Matej Avbelj	Kranj, (SI)	Speaker	Edit DELETE
Professor Karin Buhmann	Roskilde, (DK)	Speaker	Edit DELETE
Ms. Dorothee Cambou	Brussels, (BE)	Speaker	Edit DELETE
Mr. Humberto Fernando Cantú Rivera	Paris, (FR)	Speaker	Edit DELETE
Mr. Nicolás Carrillo	Madrid, (ES)	Speaker	Edit DELETE
Ms. Ann Sofie Cloots	Leuven, (BE)	Speaker	Edit DELETE



FAKULTETA ZA DRŽAVNE
IN EVROPSKE ŠTUDIJE

10let

Mr. Josh Curtis	Galway, (IE)	Speaker	Edit	DELETE
Ms. Charline Daelman	Leuven, (BE)	Speaker	Edit	DELETE
Mr. Damiano de Felice	London, (UK)	Speaker	Edit	DELETE
Professor Surya Deva	Hong Kong, (HK)	Speaker	Edit	DELETE
Ms. Adriana Espinosa González	Madrid, (ES)	Speaker	Edit	DELETE
Professor Mary Footer	Nottingham, (UK)	Speaker	Edit	DELETE
Professor Peter Jambrek	Kranj, (SI)	Speaker	Edit	DELETE
Professor Tineke Lambooy	Utrecht, (NL)	Speaker	Edit	DELETE
Dr. Karin Lukas	Vienna, (AT)	Speaker	Edit	DELETE
Dr. Nicholas McMurry	Cork, (IE)	Speaker	Edit	DELETE
Ms. Genny Ngende	Brussels, (BE)	Speaker	Edit	DELETE
Dr. Juan Ochoa Sanchez	Oslo, (NO)	Speaker	Edit	DELETE
Dr. Yannick Radi	Leiden, (NL)	Speaker	Edit	DELETE
Mr. Mikko Rajavuori	Turku, (FI)	Speaker	Edit	DELETE
Dr. Cedric Ryngaert	Leuven, (BE)	Speaker	Edit	DELETE
Ms. Andersen Sara	Florence, (IT)	Speaker	Edit	DELETE
Dr. Silvia Scarpa	Rome, (IT)	Speaker	Edit	DELETE
Dr. Andrew Spalding	University of Richmond, (US)	Speaker	Edit	DELETE
Dr. Vojko Strahovnik	Ljubljana, (SI)	Speaker	Edit	DELETE
Dr. Brigit Toebes	Groningen, (NL)	Speaker	Edit	DELETE
Professor Cees Van Dam	Utrecht, (NL)	Speaker	Edit	DELETE
Ms. Tara Van Ho	Colchester, (UK)	Speaker	Edit	DELETE
Ms. Roos van Os	Amsterdam, (NL)	Speaker	Edit	DELETE
Ms. Xiaohong Wei	Rotterdam, (NL)	Speaker	Edit	DELETE
Professor Nicolas Zambrana Tavar	Pamplona, (ES)	Speaker	Edit	DELETE
Dr. Gentian Zyberi	Oslo, (NO)	Speaker	Edit	DELETE

[Add a Participant](#)

Participants			16	
Name	City, Country	Type		
Mr. Tamo Awung Atabongawung	Antwerpen, (BE)	Participant	Edit	DELETE
Professor Wolfgang Benedek	Graz, (AT)	Participant	Edit	DELETE
Mr. Erazem Bohinc	Nova Gorica, (SI)	Participant	Edit	DELETE
Ms. Ana-Spela Gomboc	Kranj, (SI)	Participant	Edit	DELETE
Ms. Rosemarie Hordijk	Utrecht, (NL)	Participant	Edit	DELETE
Dr. Nicola Jaegers	Tilburg, (NL)	Participant	Edit	DELETE
Mrs. Maša Kovič Dine	Ljubljana, (SI)	Participant	Edit	DELETE
Mr. Lana Olup	Nova Gorica, (SI)	Participant	Edit	DELETE
Dr. Vasilka Sancin	Ljubljana, (SI)	Participant	Edit	DELETE
Professor Martin Scheinin	Florence, (IT)	Participant	Edit	DELETE
Mr. Dejan Valentinčič	Kranj, (SI)	Participant	Edit	DELETE
Professor Willem van Genugten	Tilburg, (NL)	Participant	Edit	DELETE
Mr. Arne Vandenbogaerde	Antwerpen, (BE)	Participant	Edit	DELETE
Professor Wouter Vandenhole	Antwerpen, (BE)	Participant	Edit	DELETE



FAKULTETA ZA DRŽAVNE
IN EVROPSKE ŠTUDIJE

10let

Professor Jens Vedsten-Hansen

Aarhus, (DK)

Participant

Edit

DELETE

Mrs. Petra Zagoričnik Marinič

Nova Gorica, (SI)

Participant

Edit

DELETE

Please click on the "End" button below when you have finished entering participants.

>> End >>

Page maintained by [Patrice VALLET](#), ESF



European
University
Institute



Universiteit
Antwerpen



FAKULTETA ZA DRŽAVNE
IN EVROPSKE ŠTUDIJE

10let

UALS
UNIVERSITY OF ANTWERP LAW RESEARCH SCHOOL