
Draft Report

Distr.: General
20 December 2024

English only

Human Rights Council

Fifty-eighth session

Agenda item 3

**Promotion and protection of all human rights, civil,
political, economic, social and cultural rights,
including the right to development**

Report on the tenth session of the open-ended intergovernmental working group on transnational corporations and other business enterprises with respect to human rights*

Chair-Rapporteur: Marcelo Vázquez Bermúdez

* The annex to the present report is circulated in the language of submission only.

I. Introduction

1. The open-ended intergovernmental working group on transnational corporations and other business enterprises with respect to human rights was established by the Human Rights Council in its resolution 26/9 of 26 June 2014 and mandated to elaborate an international legally binding instrument to regulate, in international human rights law, the activities of transnational corporations and other business enterprises with respect to human rights.

2. The working group's tenth session, which took place from 16 to 20 December 2024,¹ opened with a statement from the United Nations High Commissioner for Human Rights.² He recalled past human rights abuses in the context of business activities and asked the working group to channel the outrage from such incidents when deliberating during the tenth session. He noted that the tenth session of the working group was a landmark moment in the business and human rights journey, following up on the endorsement of the Guiding Principles on Business and Human Rights in 2011, the creation of the working group in 2014, and the decision by the Human Rights Council in 2024 to give enhanced power to the working group. He thanked everyone, especially Ecuador, for their efforts thus far, and called for a redoubling of efforts to capitalize on the current opportunity. The High Commissioner highlighted the immense reach and impact of business enterprises, including transnational corporations, noting their potential to advance human rights, as well as to damage human rights. The prioritization of profit over other considerations, by the fossil fuel industry, artificial intelligence companies, the arms sector and others, had led to devastating consequences for both people and planet and exacerbated conflicts and suffering. However, the High Commissioner emphasized that human rights needed business, and business needed human rights. Respecting human rights was not simply about ethics; it made sense from a business perspective, an economic perspective and a long-term perspective. Like the rest of society, business benefitted from peace, justice and equality. He recognized recent important developments in the field of business and human rights, including the development and updating of numerous national action plans on business and human rights, and the adoption of mandatory human rights due diligence legislation. But he also recognized that this alone was not enough. The adoption of an international legally binding instrument that established a global standard of conduct would create a level playing field worldwide, ensure that no governments or companies would suffer a disadvantage for doing the right thing and ensure better access to justice for victims of business-related human rights abuses everywhere. He felt hopeful by recent developments of the working group – the renewed impetus provided by the Human Rights Council decision, the appointment of legal experts, advancements in the draft text, and the growing support of and engagement by States and civil society. He urged all to build on this momentum, to strengthen deterrence, enhance accountability, improve access to justice and support for victims, and prevent new human rights abuses, new disasters, new ecological devastation, and new victims.

3. A member of the Working Group on the issue of human rights and transnational corporations and other business enterprises (Working Group on business and human rights) also delivered opening remarks. He expressed his gratitude to the governments, organizations and experts that had contributed to the process and helped advance the business and human rights agenda. He recalled that the Guiding Principles on Business and Human Rights were the authoritative international standard on what responsible States and businesses should do with respect to human rights. As part of its mandate, the Working Group on business and human rights worked with civil society, businesses, States and others to support the global implementation of the Guiding Principles. He recognized progress made with respect to integrating human rights into business practices, but he acknowledged that many businesses still failed to respect human rights, resulting in child labour, modern slavery, environmental pollution and other abuses. Given the enormous power and influence of businesses, especially transnational corporations, he recognized the significance of the efforts of the

¹ Information about the modalities of the session is available at www.ohchr.org/en/hr-bodies/hrc/wg-trans-corp/session10. Webcasts of the meetings of the session in all United Nations official languages are available at <https://media.un.org/webtv/>.

² See www.ohchr.org/en/statements-and-speeches/2024/12/business-needs-human-rights-and-human-rights-need-business.

intergovernmental working group. The member considered it essential that the legally binding instrument align with, complement and reinforce existing applicable human rights norms and standards, such as those enshrined in the Guiding Principles and relevant instruments of the International Labour Organization and Organisation for Economic Co-operation and Development. He recalled past efforts of the Working Group on business and human rights in supporting the intergovernmental process, such as at global and regional forums. He also noted that the Working Group on business and human rights was available to provide support and resources to help accelerate the work to help shape a more just, accountable and human rights-oriented global economy.

II. Organization of the session

A. Election of the Chair-Rapporteur

4. The Permanent Representative of Ecuador, Marcelo Vázquez Bermúdez, was elected Chair-Rapporteur by acclamation following his nomination, on behalf of the Group of Latin American and Caribbean States, by the delegation of Uruguay.

B. Attendance

5. The list of participants is contained in the annex to the present report.

C. Documentation

6. The working group had before it the following documents:

- (a) Human Rights Council resolution 26/9 and decision 56/116;
- (b) The provisional agenda of the working group;³
- (c) The updated draft legally binding instrument to regulate, in international human rights law, the activities of transnational corporations and other business enterprises, together with the textual proposals submitted by States during the ninth session;⁴
- (d) The programme of work and methodology for the tenth session;⁵
- (e) The Chair-Rapporteur proposed 2025 Roadmap for the implementation of Human Rights Council decision 56/116;
- (f) Other documents, all of which were made available to the working group on its website.⁶

D. Adoption of the agenda and programme of work

7. The Chair-Rapporteur presented the draft programme of work and invited comments. As there were no comments by States, the programme of work was adopted. He then presented the methodology for the tenth session.

³ [A/HRC/WG.16/10/1](#).

⁴ [A/HRC/55/59/Add.1](#).

⁵ www.ohchr.org/sites/default/files/documents/hrbodies/hrcouncil/igwg-transcorp/session10/igwg10th-rev-draft-pow-methodology.pdf.

⁶ See www.ohchr.org/en/hr-bodies/hrc/wg-trans-corp/session10.

III. Opening statements

A. General statement and introductory remarks by the Chair-Rapporteur

8. The Chair-Rapporteur thanked the High Commissioner for his opening statement and the fundamental support received from the Office of the High Commissioner over the past ten years. He also thanked the States and other relevant actors that had participated in the working group, as well as the friends of the Chair for their support and leadership.

9. The Chair-Rapporteur recognized the challenges facing the working group over the years, in particular the need for more political will on the part of several States. Such challenges would need to be overcome in order to address gaps in international human rights law and help guarantee that victims of human rights violations and abuses obtained access to justice and effective remedy. He recalled that global efforts to achieve these and other related goals had started decades ago, and in those decades, important frameworks had been adopted, such as the Guiding Principles on Business and Human Rights, International Labour Organization Tripartite Declaration of Principles concerning Multinational Enterprises and Social Policy, and Organisation for Economic Co-operation and Development Guidelines for Multinational Enterprises on Responsible Business Conduct. However, the state of implementation of such frameworks demonstrated the need for binding instruments to further clarify and develop the obligations of States and the responsibilities of companies as regards protecting, respecting and remedying human rights violations and abuses resulting from transnational business activities.

10. The Chair-Rapporteur noted that the adoption of a legally binding instrument on this matter would not only contribute to ensuring adequate access to justice for victims of such human rights violations and abuses, but would help create a level playing field, promote legal certainty and the competitiveness of companies, and prevent potential adverse impacts from their operations and value chains.

11. The Chair-Rapporteur recognized important developments at the national and regional levels, and the growing participation of States in the negotiations of the working group. He noted that to ensure that the working group was better equipped with the tools needed to fulfil its mandate in Human Rights Council resolution 26/9, numerous measures had been adopted since the ninth session to facilitate the working group's efforts. Between the ninth and tenth sessions, the Chair-Rapporteur had published and implemented a roadmap towards the tenth session involving activities such as thematic and methodological consultations, engagement with the friends of the Chair, and the selection of legal experts to assist the working group (while ensuring the needed precautions to maintain the intergovernmental, State-led nature of the process). The Chair-Rapporteur also highlighted the milestone adoption by consensus of Human Rights Council decision 56/116 in 2024, which helped introduce a new stage of the process with enhanced capabilities of the working group. To facilitate the planning for the intersessional consultations mandated by the decision, the Chair-Rapporteur had already proposed the topics to be focused on during 2025, which was to be subject to a discussion to take place during the eighth meeting of the tenth session.

12. Despite such developments, the Chair-Rapporteur emphasized that the negotiations for the legally binding instrument were to be carried out exclusively within the framework of the official sessions of the working group. He therefore invited all participants to make their best efforts to take advantage of the tenth session to improve the instrument with a view to finding consensus.

13. Finally, the Chair-Rapporteur reaffirmed his commitment to conduct the working group on the basis of transparency, inclusiveness and independence as the group sought technical, legal and political solutions to those challenges facing victims of human rights abuses and violations in the context of business activities.

B. General statements

14. Delegations, non-governmental organizations and other stakeholders congratulated the Chair-Rapporteur on his election, expressed their confidence in his leadership and thanked him for the advancements made between the ninth and tenth sessions. Delegations and organizations also expressed their appreciation for the support of the High Commissioner and his office.

15. Many delegations and organizations recalled the primary duty of States to protect against human rights abuse by business enterprises and the independent responsibility of business enterprises to respect human rights. Numerous efforts at elaborating and implementing these principles were shared. At the international level, many participants highlighted the role of the Guiding Principles on Business and Human Rights, Guidelines for Multinational Enterprises on Responsible Business Conduct and instruments of the International Labour Organization, and references were also made to 2030 Agenda for Sustainable Development and the Pact for the Future. At the regional level, numerous European developments were discussed, in particular the directive of the European Parliament and of the Council on corporate sustainability due diligence. And at the domestic level, delegations shared several legal and policy initiatives, including mandatory human rights due diligence efforts, reporting requirements, the issuance of guidelines and the development or updating of national action plans on business and human rights. It was suggested that such initiatives be used to inspire the approach and content of the instrument being discussed at the working group.

16. Delegations acknowledged that business enterprises could help to promote sustainable development, address poverty and advance human rights more generally. However, many delegations and organizations recalled the myriad human rights violations and abuses connected to business activities, including with respect to labour rights, land grabbing, forced eviction, conflict, the exploitation of natural resources, climate change and irreversible damage to the environment. It was recognized that certain groups, such as women, Indigenous Peoples, and peasants, often experienced impacts in different ways and with greater severity.

17. Delegations and organizations acknowledged that existing efforts had not been sufficient in curtailing such violations and abuses or ensuring that, when impacts occurred, those affected had effective remedy. The development of a robust international legally binding instrument could help address such problems. By filling gaps in international law, such an instrument could help prevent business-related human rights abuses and violations, ensure corporate accountability, and enhance access to effective remedy for victims. Furthermore, such efforts could deliver benefits to business enterprises themselves, by clarifying corporate responsibilities, enhancing legal certainty and ensuring a level playing field globally. In the words of one delegation, companies should not see the treaty as a threat but as an opportunity.

18. Many delegations and organizations suggested what should be in the instrument in order to obtain such benefits. Strong provisions on the protection of and respect for human rights and victims, with an emphasis on those in situations of vulnerability, would be key. Many called for including provisions protecting the environment and addressing climate change. It was also emphasized that there should be comprehensive measures that ensure corporate accountability and access to remedy, including through provisions on legal liability that addressed common legal and practical barriers in business and human rights cases. Many organizations highlighted jurisdictional challenges in this regard. Delegations and organizations also considered it important for the instrument to promote sustainable development and include provisions addressing human rights in relation to trade and investment agreements. Participants noted the need for the instrument to be balanced, in particular to avoid overburdening developing States and small and medium-sized enterprises. At the same time, there were many calls for the instrument to be victim-centred, and to especially take into account the perspectives and needs of women, children, Indigenous Peoples, and persons in rural areas, among others.

19. Many delegations and some organizations noted that the instrument should align with and build on existing relevant instruments, notably the Guiding Principles on Business and Human Rights. They flagged how important it was for the instrument to be legally sound, coherent and compatible with existing systems and laws (both international and national). There were further calls to make sure the text was practical and realistically implementable in different legal systems. As expressed by several delegations and organizations, this was needed to ensure the instrument obtained the wide, cross-regional support needed for it to be effective.

20. Several delegations highlighted improvements in the most recent draft, noting its increased flexibility. They were grateful that some proposals from past sessions had been incorporated; however, others noted that past proposals had not been incorporated, and they asked for future drafts of the text to better reflect the inputs of all participants. Many organizations shared their concerns with language that had been changed or removed in the most recent draft, for instance regarding legal liability and the environment. Some delegations voiced their view that the text remained overly prescriptive in some areas, yet vague in others, and that the provisions on definitions, jurisdiction and legal liability, in particular, should be refined. Further, delegations and organizations expressed differing views as to the scope of companies that should be covered by the instrument. Many delegations and some organizations insisted that the text incorporate the precise wording used in Human Rights Council resolution 26/9; whereas, others maintained the wording used should allow for the instrument to cover all business enterprises, which they considered crucial for the instrument to be effective. Several delegations hoped that there would be clarity and agreement on the issue of scope soon considering the significant impact this had on the other provisions of the treaty.

21. Many delegations and organizations welcomed the advancements made between the ninth and tenth sessions, thanking the Chair-Rapporteur for his constructive efforts in organizing the intersessional consultations. They particularly welcomed the Human Rights Council decision adopted in 2024, considering it to be an important step that would help the working group make tangible progress. Further, many delegations and some organizations welcomed the selection of legal experts to assist the working group and looked forward to collaborating with them; though some highlighted the importance of preserving the intergovernmental nature of the working group. While some delegations welcomed the inclusive approach adopted thus far during the working group sessions, other delegations noted that there was still a lack of political will by States and that negotiations were moving too slowly. Several delegations and organizations indicated their hope that the speed of negotiations could increase, while maintaining the inclusive, multistakeholder nature of the discussions. Many delegations and some organizations thanked the Chair-Rapporteur for the proposed 2025 roadmap of activities, noting that they looked forward to future intersessional consultations, which they hoped could cover all areas of the instrument, including those involving divergent views.

IV. State-led negotiations of the legally binding instrument

22. During the sessions allocated for the negotiation of the updated draft legally binding instrument, discussions proceeded article by article. The Chair-Rapporteur presented each draft article and the changes that had been introduced. State delegations were then invited to present specific textual proposals on the various provisions of the article and to respond to any proposed text by expressing support, lack of support or suggesting amendments. Specific textual proposals and amendments to such proposals were captured with proper attribution on the projected screen. Requests for clarification and general comments were noted by the Chair-Rapporteur, in particular for consideration after the session. Following the discussion among States, time was given to specialized agencies and other international organizations, national human rights institutions and non-governmental organizations to share their textual proposals and comments on the article. Afterwards, States were given another opportunity to develop and support the proposals for the article, having been encouraged to build on the existing proposals that had been made by other delegations.

23. During the negotiations, States were able to suggest specific questions for the legal experts, some of which were selected by the Chair-Rapporteur to be asked to those legal experts present at the tenth session. Those legal experts were then given time to formulate a response, which they presented to the working group at designated moments.

24. Due to time constraints, the working group was able to negotiate only articles 4 to 11 during the tenth session.

25. Given the session's focus on State-led negotiations, article by article, the Chair-Rapporteur does not attempt, in the present report, to reflect all of the views expressed during the session. Rather, the addendum compiling the textual proposals made during the session should be consulted for an overview of States' positions. Full recordings of the session's deliberations are available in all official United Nations languages.⁷ Further, general statements and textual proposals and comments on articles made by non-State participants that were delivered during the tenth session or shared with the Secretariat are available on the web page dedicated to the tenth session of the working group.⁸

V. Consultation on the Chair-Rapporteur's proposed 2025 roadmap for the implementation of Human Rights Council decision 56/116, including intersessional thematic consultations

26. Following State-led negotiations, the working group devoted time to a consultation on the Chair-Rapporteur's proposed 2025 roadmap for the implementation of Human Rights Council decision 56/116, including intersessional thematic consultations.⁹ The Chair-Rapporteur reminded the working group that the extent to which the full mandate of Human Rights Council decision 56/116 could be implemented depended on the resources approved by the Fifth Committee of the General Assembly. He invited the Chief Financial Officer of the Office of the High Commissioner to share the process through which budgets are determined and allocated for mandates of the Human Rights Council. The Chief Financial Officer noted that, where decisions mandate activities, there is an estimate made of the resources needed to fully implement the activities, and he noted that there was a chance that the resources needed to fully implement a mandate would not be approved. He shared that, unfortunately, the Advisory Committee on the Administrative and Budgetary Questions had already recommended cuts to the resources needed to implement decision 56/116. The Chief Financial Officer also highlighted the distinction between what was approved in the budget and the allotment of resources given to the office for implementation, and he noted the chance that the Office of the High Commissioner would receive only a fraction of the resources needed for full implementation of the decision.

27. The Chair-Rapporteur provided an overview of the activities in the proposed roadmap, as well as a proposed methodology for such activities. He shared his plan to produce non-papers on the issues to be discussed at each intersessional consultation. These documents would be shared approximately two weeks ahead of time to provide participants "food-for-thought" for the meetings. The Chair-Rapporteur clarified that such documents would have no legal status. He would take sole responsibility for preparing them, with the assistance from the legal experts. Each consultation would begin with the introduction of the non-paper by the Chair-Rapporteur and a legal expert. Participants, including States and other stakeholders, would then be invited to discuss the content and propose updated textual proposals, taking into account the discussions in the consultations and past sessions of the working group. On the second day of each consultation, the Chair-Rapporteur, with the assistance of the legal experts, may present proposals or possible solutions addressing identified divergences. Participants would then discuss these options, aiming to identify elements of potential

⁷ See the webcasts available at <https://media.un.org/en/webtv>.

⁸ See www.ohchr.org/en/hr-bodies/hrc/wg-trans-corp/session10.

⁹ <https://www.ohchr.org/sites/default/files/documents/hrbodies/hrcouncil/igwg-transcorp/session10/chair-rapporteur-proposed-2025-roadmap-methodology-implementation-hrc-decision-56-116-12-12-24.pdf>.

agreement. The Chair-Rapporteur emphasized that any proposals or solutions discussed would have no legal status until they were considered at the official sessions of the working group.

28. Delegations and organizations then shared their views and questions regarding what had just been presented. They thanked the Chair-Rapporteur for his efforts thus far, for presenting the roadmap, and for clarifying a number of issues. Several delegations and organizations raised questions about the role of the legal experts and the status of their proposals, and it was suggested that there be more clarity about their role. Delegations and organizations also asked questions about the status of the consultations and their outcomes, as well as the plans for the eleventh session of the working group and beyond; several participants insisted that no decisions about the instrument be made outside the official sessions of the working group. Some participants made suggestions as to the topics to focus on during the consultations, and the Chair noted that, while the proposals in the roadmap were the result of a consultation held in November 2024, he was open to suggestions. Additionally, delegations and organizations shared their views on the dates and modalities of future consultations. Some insisted that businesses be prevented from participating in the discussions. Several delegations and organizations also requested that the consultations allow for remote participation and include interpretation. The Chair informed the working group that, subject to the approval and allocation of resources requested to implement Human Rights Council decision 56/116, the intersessional consultations would have interpretation and be webcasted, and he clarified that, due to the absence of a decision of the General Assembly to authorize hybrid meetings, such consultations were to be conducted only in person.

VI. Recommendations of the Chair-Rapporteur and conclusions of the working group

A. Recommendations of the Chair-Rapporteur

29. **Following the discussions held during the tenth session, and acknowledging the comments and concrete textual suggestions expressed therein on the updated draft legally binding instrument to regulate, in international human rights law, the activities of transnational corporations and other business enterprises, the Chair-Rapporteur makes the following recommendations:**

(a) **That the Secretariat post on the working group's website, as an addendum to the present report, the text of the updated draft legally binding instrument with the concrete textual proposals submitted by States during the ninth and tenth sessions;**

(b) **That the Secretariat post on the working group's website by no later than the end of January 2025 the following statements made during the tenth session or submitted to the Secretariat by 10 January 2025, reproduced in the language received:**

(i) **The general statements from States and non-State stakeholders;**

(ii) **The statements from States in relation to the State-led negotiations;**

(iii) **The statements from non-State stakeholders in relation to the State-led negotiations;**

(iv) **The questions posed by States to the legal experts and their corresponding preliminary views;**

(c) **That the Chair-Rapporteur continues to make use of the friends of the Chair, with a view to continue strengthening dialogue among States on this process, and to continue promoting an active participation of an increasing number of States from all regions in the direct intergovernmental negotiations on the legally binding instrument, and facilitate efforts towards convergence among States within those negotiations;**

(d) That the Chair-Rapporteur present a confirmed 2025 roadmap for the implementation of Human Rights Council decision 56/116, including the holding of intersessional thematic consultations for the purpose of discussing clusters of articles of the draft legally binding instrument, in line with the mandate established by the Human Rights Council in its resolution 26/9, with the assistance, as deemed necessary, of the legal experts. The intersessional thematic consultations will be guided by the updated methodology prepared by the Chair-Rapporteur prior to the tenth session and adjusted and circulated before the adoption of the report;

(e) That the Chair-Rapporteur prepare a programme of work and present a methodology for the eleventh session of the working group, to be held from 20 to 24 October 2025;

(f) That the Chair-Rapporteur promote State-led direct substantive intergovernmental negotiations during the eleventh session of the working group, on the basis of the updated draft legally binding instrument with the concrete textual proposals submitted by States during the ninth and the tenth session.

B. Conclusions of the working group

30. At the final meeting of its tenth session, on 20 December 2024, the working group adopted the following conclusions, in accordance with the mandate established by the Human Rights Council in its resolution 26/9:

(a) The working group welcomed the opening message of the United Nations High Commissioner for Human Rights and thanked the representatives who took part in the discussions on and negotiation of the updated draft legally binding instrument;

(b) The working group took note of the concrete textual suggestions, comments and requests for clarification received from States, intergovernmental organizations, national human rights institutions, civil society, business organizations, trade unions and all other relevant stakeholders;

(c) The working group acknowledged the discussions and negotiations focused on the content of the updated draft legally binding instrument, as well as the participation and engagement of States, intergovernmental organizations, national human rights institutions, civil society, business organizations, trade unions and all other relevant stakeholders;

(d) The working group welcomed the adoption by consensus of Human Rights Council decision 56/116, which will be implemented in accordance with the mandate established by Human Rights Council resolution 26/9 and in line with the recommendations and conclusions of the tenth session;

(e) The working group welcomed with appreciation the recommendations of the Chair-Rapporteur.

VII. Adoption of the report

31. At its tenth meeting, on 20 December 2024, after an exchange of views on the report and its content, the working group adopted *ad referendum* the draft report on its tenth session and decided to entrust the Chair-Rapporteur with its finalization and submission to the Human Rights Council for consideration at its fifty-eighth session.

Annex

List of participants

States Members of the United Nations

Albania, Algeria, Argentina, Armenia, Australia, Austria, Belgium, Benin, Bolivia (Plurinational State of), Brazil, Bulgaria, Cabo Verde, Cameroon, Canada, Chile, China, Colombia, Cuba, Czechia, Democratic Republic of the Congo, Denmark, Djibouti, Dominican Republic, Ecuador, Egypt, Eritrea, Estonia, Ethiopia, Finland, France, Gambia (Republic of The), Germany, Ghana, Greece, Guatemala, Honduras, India, Indonesia, Iraq, Ireland, Italy, Japan, Kenya, Lebanon, Luxembourg, Malawi, Mexico, Morocco, Netherlands (Kingdom of the), Norway, Pakistan, Panama, Paraguay, Peru, Philippines, Poland, Portugal, Republic of Korea, Romania, Russian Federation, Saudi Arabia, Slovenia, Somalia, South Africa, Spain, Sri Lanka, Sweden, Switzerland, Türkiye, United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland, United States of America, Uruguay, Venezuela (Bolivarian Republic of), Zambia.

Non-member States represented by an observer

Holy See, State of Palestine.

Intergovernmental organizations

Council of Europe, European Union, International Chamber of Commerce, Organization of Islamic Cooperation, South Centre.

National human rights institutions

Commission Béninoise des Droits de l'Homme, Commission nationale consultative des droits de l'Homme (France), German Institute for Human Rights, Global Alliance of National Human Rights Institutions, National Human Rights Commission (Democratic Republic of the Congo).

Non-governmental organizations in consultative status with the Economic and Social Council

Across Atlantic Development LTD; ActionAid; Africans in America for Restitution and Repatriation Inc; Alliance Defending Freedom; Asia Indigenous Peoples Pact; Association Malienne de Savoir Construire (A.M.S.C.); Associazione Comunita Papa Giovanni XXIII; Bischöfliches Hilfswerk Misereor e.V.; Center for Constitutional Rights Inc.; Center for International Environmental Law (CIEL); Centre Europe - tiers monde; Centre for Health Science and Law (CHSL); Christian Aid; CIDSE; Comité Catholique contre la Faim et pour le Développement; DoTheDream Youth Development Initiative; Dreikönigsaktion - Hilfswerk der Katholischen Jungschar; East Eagle Foundation; ESCR-Net - International Network for Economic, Social and Cultural Rights, Inc.; European Center for Constitutional and Human Rights; FIAN International e.V.; Franciscans International; Friedrich Naumann Foundation; Friends of the Earth International; Friends World Committee for Consultation; Global Policy Forum; Groupe d'action pour la promotion socioculturelle et l'alphabetisation: Nouvelle Energie; Institute for Policy Studies; International Commission of Jurists; International Federation for Human Rights Leagues; International Indian Treaty Council; International Organization of Employers; International Probono Legal Services Association Limited; International Trade Union Confederation; International Transport Workers' Federation; Justiça Global; Kobia; Make Mothers Matter; Maloca Internationale; Mouvement contre le racisme et pour l'amitié entre les peuples; Organização das Mulheres Maritimas Africanas - WIMAFRICA; Pax Christi International, International Catholic Peace

Movement; Peace Brigades International; Prajachaitanya Yuvajana Sangam; Protestant Agency for Diakonie and Development; Public Services International; Swiss Catholic Lenten Fund; United States Council for the International Business, Incorporated; Verein Sudwind Entwicklungspolitik; Women in Europe for a Common Future; World Organisation Against Torture.
