GLOBAL FORUM ON RESPONSIBLE BUSINESS CONDUCT

2017 OECD Global Forum on Responsible Business Conduct
SUMMARY REPORT

29-30 June 2017 – Paris, France

The OECD Global Forum on Responsible Business Conduct held on 29-30 June 2017 gathered participants from governments, businesses, trade unions and civil society to discuss responsible supply chains through due diligence; driving responsible institutional investment; the role of National Contact Points in evolving contexts; lessons from the climate agenda; responsible business conduct in state-owned enterprises; mainstreaming RBC in companies; responsible employment of migrant workers; comparing anti-corruption and human rights due diligence approaches; contributing to the Sustainable Development Goals through RBC; developing responsible leadership; responsible disengagement; tools for promoting responsible finance; using technology for RBC; and infrastructure.

Welcoming remarks by Angel Gurría
Opening panel on Responsible global supply chains through due diligence

The opening remarks and first panel discussion focused on the challenges and opportunities for governments and business to ensure responsible global supply chains. A combination of high-level political pressure (e.g. from the G20 and G7), regulatory interventions (e.g. in the EU, UK and USA), as well as consumer, worker and industry leadership have made this issue more visible than ever. Panellists recognised that responsible supply chains were at the heart of the 'making globalisation work for all' agenda. Panellists also acknowledged OECD leadership as standard-setter on due diligence for responsible supply chains and encouraged governments to focus on both the "carrots and the sticks" of responsible supply chains, in particular to further explore incentives for companies to implement supply chain due diligence, including by looking at tax incentives, government-backed financing and public procurement benefits. These proposals helped to tie the opening discussions to the Roundtable for Policy Makers held the day before the opening of the Global Forum.

Key takeaways:

- The current rapidly changing policy environment is not only defined by emerging threats and opportunities, but creates uncertainty and risk for businesses, making our work on RBC ever more challenging, more pressing and more relevant.
- Industry collaboration is key for driving change and ensuring a level playing field.
- The hardening of soft law expectations on responsible business conduct sees an increasing trend towards firmer requirements, such as investor requirements or even regulations.

Driving responsible institutional investment: operational and regulatory approaches

This session presented a recent OECD publication explaining the application of the OECD Guidelines for Multinational Enterprises in the context of institutional investors. It also discussed a recently published OECD paper examining how environmental, social and governance (ESG) analysis is being reconciled with risk-based regulations in the context of institutional investment.

OECD

Institutional investors have an important role to play in promoting responsible business conduct amongst the companies they investment in. In this context engagement is a powerful tool investors can use. This includes engagement with companies in their portfolio to promote better conduct, engagement with stakeholders to understand most significant risk and engagement with policy makers to drive systemic change.

The OECD paper Responsible Business Conduct for Institutional Investors provides guidance on how investors can carry out due diligence to manage environmental and social risks among the companies they invest in and articulates a common position on several complex issues which were previously not recognised nor well understood. Specifically:

- It identifies alignments between responsible business conduct (RBC) standards and fiduciary duty or prudential investment.
- It clarifies that shareholders, including minority shareholders, in a vast majority of cases, will be directly linked to adverse impacts caused or contributed to by companies in their portfolio.
- It also notes that investors should take into account risks to society and the environment, rather than simply commercial risks when carrying out due diligence.

Increasingly the relationship between environmental and social risks and commercial performance is being recognised. However at best current regulation takes barriers to responsible investment but does not incentivise responsible behaviour. Competing priorities, a lack of standardization and methodology for measuring ESG risks, and an ongoing perception that ESG risks are non-financial continue to act as barriers to responsible investment.

Key takeaways:

- Investors have an important role to play in promoting responsible business conduct amongst the companies they investment in. Asset owners and well as investment managers should actively promote responsible investment strategies.
- Traditionally ESG investment management does not take into account risks to society independently of commercial risks. Reframing approaches to consider how to "do no harm" through investment activity is an important contribution of the OECD work on Responsible Business Conduct for Institutional Investors.
- Current regulatory frameworks at best do not impede consideration of ESG risks in investment decisions. Additional thinking is needed as to how regulatory frameworks can promote and facilitate responsible investment.

National Contact Points: how are NCP cases impacting responsible business conduct?

National Contact Points (NCPs) play an important role in explaining the Guidelines in the context of increasingly complex business operations and changing economic landscapes. To date NCPs have handled over 400 cases (known as "specific instances"), covering issues in over 100 countries and territories. The human rights chapter continues to be the most frequently cited chapter, referenced in over 50% of cases since 2011. Cases involving the financial sector accounted for 20% of all new submissions in 2016.

This session covered several recent cases which required NCPs to consider important conceptual issues. Panellists spoke about a number of such cases. NCP involvement in following-up on recommendations was also highlighted. In addition, OECD Watch, TUAC and BIAC put forward views on the circumstances that are most likely to lead to a successful outcome. Ongoing cooperation which followed cases was also cited as an example of successful relationship-building between trade unions and business.

Panellists also set out the importance of managing the expectations of business and the expectations of parties bringing forward cases to NCPs. All stakeholders underscored the importance of well-resourced, high-functioning NCPs in the resolution of issues brought to the process. In addition, the role of professional mediators was also highlighted as a helpful resource for case-handling.

Key takeaways:

- NCPs have a key role to play in assessing critical RBC issues through the specific instance mechanism
- NCP cases work well when all parties understand the use of the mechanism and engage constructively in the process
- Fully functioning and adequately resourced NCPs are important in the resolution of cases

Lessons from the climate agenda

The transition to a low-carbon economy is supported by the development of new policies and business tools to encourage climate-friendly business conduct. The experience gained in the development and implementation of these policies and tools can help address issues in other areas of corporate responsibility, such as human rights. The session focused on four key areas, all of which are closely inter-related.

One of them relates to the importance of obtaining reliable data on companies' own impacts and those of their suppliers and the costs of those impacts on society It also discussed the need for society and investors to benchmark companies. Initiatives such as the CDP's surveys of company climate disclosures provide tools for investors to compare companies' performance and level of engagement in addressing climate related risks and opportunities. Similar approaches are being taken in other areas, e.g. under the Corporate Human Rights Benchmark. The latter was developed to support a "race to the top" in dealing with companies' impacts. It provides a proxy to measure how companies perform under the UNGPs, but could be used to measure performance in handling other kinds of corporate impacts.

Secondly, while there is broad recognition of the crucial role of boards can and should play to address climate-related and other sustainability risks, recent surveys indicate that sustainability and climate change generally still rank low on boards' agendas. However, this is changing, as companies are increasingly seeing climate risks as material risks. Holding boards liable for the harms caused by a company is an important trigger for change but as the Rana Plaza tragedy showed, this also has limits, and governments have a crucial role to play in providing the necessary conditions to avoid and address negative impacts.

A third important area is that of disclosure and reporting. The recommendations of the Task Force on Climate-related financial disclosures shift the way in which boards should engage in dealing with climate change, and this should also be reflected in broader frameworks such as the OECD Principles of Corporate Governance. There is also a great need for training, both within companies and among investors, to integrate climate-related information into decision-making where governments can play a role, e.g. in developing standard scenarios.

Finally, companies' engagement with suppliers is a good indicator of their commitment to addressing negative impacts more generally. Management of climate risks through supply chains is still at an infant stage, and in many cases, engagement remains limited to first tier suppliers. There is a lot to learn from how companies are dealing with climate issues along their supply chains and the way in which they engage with suppliers in identifying and addressing climate-related risks.

Key takeaways:

- Measuring their own (environmental and other) impacts helps companies in their decision-making, and is also an indicator for investors of the level of engagement of the company to address those impacts.
- Disclosure should not only the responsibility of companies, but of the whole capital value chain, including investors, stock exchanges, pension schemes etc.; this will also lead to integrated thinking and integrated approaches to sustainability, including climate, human rights, social issues, etc.
- Engagement with suppliers also requires developing incentives for suppliers to reduce their risks, as well as incentives to innovate, and to work towards a positive goal. Science provides a good basis to promote innovation and going beyond compliance.

RBC and state-owned enterprises

This panel discussed the latest research and examples on how governments are linking the governance of SOEs with creating value for citizens and supporting the broader agenda on sustainable development and RBC. The main international instruments on RBC are clear on their application to SOEs. The importance of RBC in SOE activities has also been recognised beyond main RBC instruments (e.g. in the 2015 OECD Guidelines on Corporate Governance of State-Owned Enterprises). However, in practice there is very limited research on RBC and SOEs and seemingly in general a lack of knowledge about how and if the state is implementing their RBC and ownership policy objectives. There is a need to address this misalignment; this is also important for ensuring a level-playing field for private enterprises which are expected to follow RBC principles and standards. A clear entry point could be corporate governance.

Some SOEs have cited that there is no clarity on what is expected regarding RBC from either their owners or from host governments where they are operating. Making RBC expectations clear and in the context of a transparent ownership rationale is a role and an opportunity for governments.

Due to the size of the SOE sector, their internationalization and deepening of commercial links in global supply chains, SOEs could serve as a main driver for ensuring that environmental and social risks are adequately considered in core business operations, and therefore, potentially serving as a transformative actor for levelling the playing field for RBC.

Key takeaways:

- There is limited knowledge on RBC of SOEs and how governments are implementing their RBC and SOE ownership policy objectives.
- RBC will become increasingly important to and for SOEs due to the size of their economic activity and expected involvement in major projects such as China's Belt and Road Initiatives.
- Main international standards on RBC and on corporate governance of SOEs are clear on the application of RBC expectations on SOE. Future work is needed in this regard in order to implement these standards in practice. Corporate governance is a good starting point.

Mainstreaming RBC in companies

This panel explored how businesses are mainstreaming RBC within their companies, for example, by reflecting RBC objectives in incentive structures, recruitment criteria, business models, and corporate governance structures.

The role of top management goes beyond just setting the tone. The board must lead and support transformational change in companies. Board members should be more open to engage with stakeholders, and sustainability values and RBC should be reflected in the corporate bylaws and requirements of board members. Top managers need to also sign on to operationalise RBC policies. If there is no buy-in from managers, RBC initiatives are not sustainable. Recognition of the importance of integrating responsibility for RBC at the board level is increasingly being reflected in corporate governance policy.

RBC should be integrated across business functions. In order for RBC to be meaningful and impactful, it should be a core aspect of business operations. RBC should be integrated into different aspects of the company's activities (i.e. marketing, privacy policies, security, etc.) and training on these issues should happen at the management level as well as the on-the-ground level.

Global business operations need to consider local contexts in developing RBC policies and strategies and local actors should be involved in developing and defining approaches to ensure buy-in and appropriateness.

Key takeaways:

- Responsible business values should be integrated across business operations and throughout the supply chain in order to make it meaningful.
- Boards play an important role in mainstreaming RBC.
- Government regulation is important to level the playing field and rein in some of the worst practices. Investors should also be putting pressure on companies.

Responsible employment of migrant workers

This session addressed how companies can carry out human rights due diligence in their own operations and supply chains on the recruitment and employment of migrant workers.

Short-term foreign-born migrant workers fill important niches both in fast-growing and declining sectors of the economy, and contribute significantly to labour-market flexibility, as well as to human capital development. Despite the potential economic benefits that short-term migrant workers bring to the economy and that they gain from formal employment, globally migrant workers are often marginalised economically, socially and geographically and therefore are particularly vulnerable to exploitation including low wages, precarious work, harassment, coercion and forced labour, and restrictions on the right to freedom of association.

The exploitation of migrant workers often times takes place before workers arrive at the place of employment due to the payment of recruitment fees**.** Such fees, which are extracted by third-party labour recruitment agencies and contractors engender vulnerability because workers often enter into debt in order to pay them. In some cases workers have difficulty servicing debts and therefore enter into a cycle of debt-bondage.

Recognition of these risks has led to the commitment by many companies, including those engaged in the IHRB Leadership Group for Responsible Recruitment, to cover the expenses of recruitment fees.

While companies in some cases have committed to paying the cost of recruitment fees, the informality of recruitment networks and payments, including to family members and local community members, can make it difficult for companies to carry out a no-fee policy in practice. For example, such informality can create barriers for workers to be reimbursed by their employer as no formal documentation exists to prove payment of the fees. Worker training and extensive worker engagement is necessary to ensure that workers are informed of their rights to be reimbursed for fees and to flag where fees were requested of them.

A cross-sectoral approach is necessary to support the responsible recruitment and employment of migrant workers. Because many of the challenges facing migrant workers originate in home countries, it can be difficult for companies operating in host countries to leverage change over their third party recruitment agents. Recruitment agencies often work across a number of sectors. In light of this context, collaboration across sectors is necessary to use joint leverage to stop the practice of extracting recruitment fees from workers rather than the employer.

While exploitative recruitment practices remain a key challenge, low-skilled migrant workers also face low wages and delayed payment of wages in the destination country. Governments have a responsibility to protect migrant workers. One method of doing so is through bilateral agreements. Trade Unions called on governments to make the conditions of recruitment and employment of migrant workers clear in such agreements between governments, that the content of agreements are transparent and that they harmonised across agreements.

Key takeaways:

- Although much has been done on the concept of “no fees”, workers continue to pay for work due to the informal nature of the recruitment fees and deducted payments (e.g. housing payments).
- A cross-sectoral approach to mitigating the exploitation of migrant workers is necessary.
- Migrant workers should have the opportunity to elect representatives to address issues in the workplace on their behalf, including wages.

Comparing anti-corruption and human rights due diligence approaches

This session explored best practices that can be transposed between the anti-corruption and human rights due diligence approaches in order to better help companies understand how they could develop more robust internal and collective ways of addressing these issues. While there is no one-size-fits-all program for adhering to the multitude of anti-corruption and human rights due diligence legislation and commitments, common threads and best practice exist. These include support and commitment from company leadership, a clearly articulated and visible corporate policy, making compliance the duty of individuals at all levels of the company, prioritising and addressing risk, and risk based due diligence of business partner.

Companies should not address anti-corruption compliance and human rights due diligence in silos. Due to potential criminal and civil penalties associated with bribery, companies tend to focus on this issue in isolation, only considering legal compliance to avoid sanctions on the enterprise. Companies should reorient their due diligence efforts to consider adverse human impacts they may create or be involved in through their web of business relationships, for example through their supply chain.

Corruption risks and human rights risks are significantly linked. It is important to educate and sensitise compliance officers and company leadership on the connectedness of these two issues, so that robust corruption compliance and due diligence procedures can be effectively utilised to address all adverse impacts. Greater awareness could lead to stronger dialog and collaboration between the distinct parts of the firm that may handle these issues.

Key takeaways:

- Companies should take advantage of tools and guidance available from the OECD to build or strengthen existing supply chain due diligence processes to address anti-corruption and adverse human rights impacts simultaneously.
- The lack of industry initiatives or response could lead to greater regulatory pressure as exemplified by recent French legislation on due diligence.

Contributing to the Sustainable Development Goals (SDGs) through RBC

This session explored the current intersection between RBC and the SDGs and discussed how and why RBC can be a transformative and practical way for private sector contribution to the SDGs.

Recent surveys show that businesses are not yet clear on how to take the SDGs from paper to practice. SDGs require a more robust role for the private sector in global development than has traditionally been the case. This is true both in terms of delivery of the SDGs, as well as financing and building partnerships (Goal 17). Mobilising the private sector will be a crucial element of the SDGs success. There are also expectations that RBC principles and standards like the OECD Guidelines for Multinational Enterprises and the UN Guiding Principles for Business and Human Rights be implemented.

Making the link between RBC and the SDGs has not happened widely in practice. RBC has so far been seen as a compliance issue in the context of the SDGs, rather than a comprehensive way for the private sector to contribute to the SDGs. The discussion in the context of the SDGs has mainly focused on new business and financing models, social impact investing and entrepreneurship. These areas are quite important, but it is a missed opportunity not to consider RBC through a positive lens of contribution to the SDGs. RBC is not just about compliance – for example, the stated purposed of the OECD Guidelines is to encourage the positive contributions that businesses can make to economic, environmental and social progress and to minimise the difficulties to which business operations may give rise.

Some leading companies are building on their RBC supply chain due diligence programmes to articulate their SDG contributions. For example, one company identified materials risks in the entire supply chain and connected them to the SDGs on an operational level (including also using SDG targets as a measurement framework) as a jump off point for ensuring that their contribution to the SDGs was meaningful and not just ad-hoc. Mitigating negative impacts – an expectation under RBC – can help people realize their rights (e.g. addressing discrimination for women in the workplace allows them to realise their economic opportunities; engaging with the government and industry initiatives as part of remediation efforts to address child labour in the supply chain as an *access to education* issue under SDGs can help get to the core issues of why child labour happens).

Governments should lead by example in making the link between RBC/SDGs. They should make a clear and demonstrable commitment to RBC a condition of any partnership with the private sector and should use tools like procurement, trade support, etc. to level the playing field for businesses that are responsible. They also need to make the connections in practice between different policy areas. For example, development practitioners can bring in a lot of expertise relevant to RBC from their field experience and RBC practitioners can bring in expertise on multi-stakeholder platforms and engaging with the private sector on the basis of RBC. Governments should make the link between RBC and the SDGs clear, including in related policy areas such as investment, export credits, development finance, procurement and the provision of access to remedy.

Key takeaways:

- The link between RBC and the SDGs should be made at all levels. Implementation of RBC principles and standards like the OECD Guidelines and UN Guiding Principles can be a transformative (but is so far an under-utilised way) for businesses to interact with the SDGs and ultimately maximise their contribution to the SDGs.
- Some businesses are using RBC as a baseline for their SDGs contributions, but there is a need to scale up these practices among all businesses.
- Governments should lead in making the links between RBC and the SDGs and should ensure there is policy coherence.

Developing responsible leadership: the role of business schools

Organised in collaboration with the UN Principles for Management Education (PRME) initiative, this session highlighted some of the expectations of governments and of the private sector for the leaders of tomorrow. It discussed certain existing international initiatives to integrate RBC in business curricula and gave guidance to business schools on how to do so. Learnings from this session are also applicable to other types of higher education, beyond business schools.

Business schools can help develop responsible leaders by teaching transversal leadership skills, such as holistic thinking and the ability to engage with other societal actors with different communities and stakeholders. These skills are valued across different departments of an organisation, beyond departments dedicated to CSR. Curricula can integrate learning on collaboration, going beyond developing traditional competitive skills. This can be done through case studies (for example on specific instances handled by NCPs) and the contributions of students in real-life business projects. Certain standardised tools can also be used by business schools to assess knowledge of the main RBC issues.

Creating the right incentives is key to supporting business schools in the development of responsible leaders. Many students and companies rely on rankings. Rankings should integrate efforts to integrate responsible management in curricula, this is however often overlooked. Coherent with NCPs' mandate to promote the OECD Guidelines, NCPs should consider how they can be integrated into management education.

Key takeaways:

- Business schools should teach transversal leadership skills such as holistic thinking and the ability to collaborate with different communities, for future leaders to behave in accordance with the OECD Guidelines for Multinational Enterprises
- NCPs have a role to play in promoting the OECD Guidelines in business schools
- Rankings should recognise efforts of schools to develop responsible leaders rather than dis-incentivising them

Responsible disengagement

While the OECD Guidelines promote engagement with suppliers and business relationships during the course of risk prevention and mitigation, they do recognise that disengagement may be necessary as a last resort […] either after failed attempts at mitigation, or where the enterprise deems mitigation not feasible, or because of the severity of the adverse impact. This session explored what 'responsible disengagement' looks like in practice as a component of a company's human rights, labour or environmental supply chain due diligence in the gold, apparel, cotton and financial sectors. The session addressed questions pertaining to when should companies disengage, what policies should govern disengagement and what the disengagement process looks like once a decision has been taken.

Clearly articulating the company's policy on disengagement in contracts ensures that the company's expectations and resulting actions are clearly understood by the company and its supplier and reduces potential legal risks of disengagement.

Developing and communicating a clear escalation process with suppliers provides opportunity for constructive engagement with the supplier to address concerns prior to disengagement and prevents the company from 'cutting and running'. For example, the Accord on Fire and Building Safety establishes a clear escalation process which includes a letter sent to the supplier from the Accord, followed by a letter sent from all Accord signatory brands, followed by the termination of the supplier relationship. Engagement with the supplier on corrective action measures is encouraged at each stage of the process to reduce the likelihood of disengagement.

Defining a cool-down period before orders are placed again as well as a process for re-engagement makes the threat of disengagement credible (i.e. disengagement has economic impacts) while also incentivising improvement through the potential for re-engagement once the decision to disengage has been taken.

Key takeaways:

- Companies should front-load leverage with their suppliers by including the expectations in contracts along with the escalation and disengagement process if such expectations are not met.
- A level playing field is important across a sector to ensure that the disengagement of responsible firms does not simply lead to the engagement of irresponsible actors.
- More information, such as case studies, is needed on when and how companies are disengaging in practice in order to promote best-practices on responsible disengagement.

Innovative tools for promoting responsible finance

Financial service providers play an important role in promoting responsible business conduct among the companies they provide financing to. Increasingly financial service providers and other organisations are exploring innovative approaches to promote RBC among their clients. For example, in a recent EUR1 billion loan deal concluded between a consortium of banks, including ING, and Philips, a large electronics company, interest rates were linked to annual sustainability performance. Green bonds (bonds which finance projects that meet certain environmental criteria) represent another innovative tool for promoting responsible finance. The green bond market is growing exponentially, from approximately USD2.6 billion in 2012 to USD93.4 billion in 2016. Recently, efforts have begun to build on the success of green bonds to create bonds with social or development objectives. For example, this year the World Bank in partnership with BNP Paribas launched bonds directly linked to the Sustainable Development Goals.

International organisations have also been active in identifying innovative approaches to promote responsible finance. The International Finance Corporation (IFC) Environmental and Social Performance Standards define IFC clients' responsibilities for managing their environmental and social risks, including specific risks associated with labour, local communities, resettlement, biodiversity and indigenous peoples. On a multilateral level the United Nations Environment Programme – Finance Initiative (UNEP FI) was developed specifically to bring together finance practitioners, supervisors, regulators and policy-makers to identify approaches to promoting sustainable finance. The OECD is currently undertaking work to support enterprises in the financial sector by describing practical and relevant approaches for different types of financial service providers to carry out due diligence as recommended by the OECD Guidelines for Multinational Enterprises.

Key takeaways:

- There is growing demand for sustainable financial products driven by the global agendas such as the Paris Climate Agreement and Sustainable Development Goals (SDGs), client demand, as well as commercial performance. For example, green bonds have the same returns as corporate bonds on average, but less risk.
- Environmental and social risk management and sustainable development are inextricably connected; financial institutions are moving beyond risk management and compliance towards identifying opportunities and innovative approaches.
- Regulatory support is needed to overcome systemic barriers to sustainable finance such as short term pressure from shareholders and to protect companies that seek to balance profitability and long term sustainability and de-risking certain sectors or contexts to promote investment.

Using technology for due diligence

The session discussed a range of technology solutions that support companies in carrying out supply chain due diligence and other stakeholders to monitor risks related to company activities. Global supply chains are increasingly complex, information on suppliers – often many tiers away – difficult to come by and sourcing-related risks manifold. A one-size fits all model for how to carry out due diligence and identify and monitor risks cannot be applied when it comes to supply chain mapping and risk assessment.

A variety of solutions for recording, storing and retrieving data on global supply chains were presented during the session, including block chain, integrated supply chain solutions, a human rights impact assessment tool for local communities, a web crawler to analyse big data, as well as new tools being developed for the UN OHCHR for their monitoring of human rights globally.

Key takeaways:

- Tools need to be adapted to the relevant, sector, segment of the supply chain and geography.
- The use of technology should not lead to exclusion of stakeholder groups with limited access to internet and technology; there is a need for both high and low-tech solutions.
- Industry collaboration will be key in driving the increasing use of technology and ability to scale such technologies, making them cost-effective.

RBC and infrastructure

The session discussed key challenges and opportunities to integrate responsible business conduct across all the steps of infrastructure life cycles, in order to deliver high-quality infrastructure and meet the Sustainable Development Goals and the Paris Climate Agreement.

Panellists discussed key priorities in order to mainstream responsible investment practices and RBC across investment decision-making process in infrastructure projects and asset portfolio management. The session also addresses key priorities to encourage private sector participation, drawing on relevant OECD tools and instruments. It also explored issues for enhancing stakeholder engagement, and ensuring that the decision-making for infrastructure projects involve local communities and other affected stakeholders. Finally, the session discussed challenges to increase integrity and transparency in order to fight corruption in infrastructure procurement.

Key takeaways:

- It is Important to mainstream RBC factors through the infrastructure investment process.
- There is a need to distinguish between ESG factors and broader RBC issues in order to deliver high-quality infrastructure.
- Priorities across different country contexts, whether advanced, emerging, developing countries or event fragile states need to be considered.

Closing Remarks

The closing session was an opportunity to highlight the key role of governments in supporting RBC through enabling policy frameworks, leading by example, including as an economic actor, and by promoting policy coherence, involving key parts of the government, such as those working on public procurement, anti-bribery, corporate governance, and others. Discussions at the G20 and at the OECD Ministerial Council Meeting on making globalisation work for all show the importance of creating a level playing field on RBC through, for example, adherence to the OECD Guidelines by all G20 economies. Another key responsibility of government support to RBC is to provide access to remedy, and over the years the National Contact Points have become increasingly visible and recognised. The closing session underscored the importance of cooperation and partnership between governments and institutions. The next UN Forum on Business on Human Rights, to be held in November 2017, will focus on access to remedy and will provide an opportunity to continue the discussions held at this Global Forum on Responsible Business Conduct.

Find the programme, webcast, documents, photos and more at mneguidelines.oecd.org

For more information, visit:

oe.cd/gfrbc

Join the discussion on Twitter:

@OECD_BizFin ●#OECDrbc

OECD