

Indigenous Peoples, Human Rights and Business

*DTP's Regional Capacity
Strengthening Program for
Indigenous Peoples Advocates*

*In partnership with FORUM-ASIA
and Asia Indigenous Peoples Pact*



Program Report

... the knowledge and skills that I learned from this training are very crucial for me, as I am myself directly involved in constant struggles and land dispute related problems in my own area in Sarawak.

**Bangkok, Thailand
8 – 11 June 2019**



The Diplomacy Training Program's Indigenous Peoples, Human Rights and Business capacity building program received support from the Australian Government through the [Australian NGO Cooperation Program \(ANCP\)](#)

1. Executive Summary

In June, 2019, the Diplomacy Training Program (DTP) partnered with FORUM-ASIA and Asia Indigenous Peoples Pact (AIPP) to organise and facilitate a training program in Bangkok for human rights defenders and Indigenous advocates from Asia in the lead-up to the OECD's Global Forum on Responsible Business and Human Rights. The program combined two of DTP's thematic capacity building priorities, Business and Human Rights (BHR) and Indigenous Peoples (IPs).

Over 20 participants from 10 countries participated in this specialist program building knowledge of international standards on human rights and business, grievance mechanisms and advocacy approaches to influence businesses and hold them accountable for their impacts. There was a special focus on gender – and the way that business impacts differently on women and affects access to remedies when harms occur. There was also a focus on advocacy and engagement skills and network building.

Pro-bono trainers included Professor Surya Deva, Chair of the UN Working Group on Business and Human Rights, Professor Justine Nolan, HE, Yuyun Wahyuningrum Representative of ASEAN's Intergovernmental Commission on Human Rights (ACHR), Debbie Stothard, Secretary General of the International Federation of Human Rights, Bobbie Sta Maria of Business and Human Rights Resource Centre and Adjunct Professor John Southalan .

Participants shared experiences of land grabbing, mining, dams, logging and palm-oil plantations. Potential benefits of development are undermined by the lack of participation by Indigenous peoples in decision making, the failure of companies to obtain Free, Prior and Informed Consent (FPIC) from Indigenous peoples, and the lack of benefit sharing. Loss of land leads to the loss of cultures, languages and livelihoods linked to these lands. Participants shared moving personal stories – of seeing their pristine environments destroyed, of being displaced, of threats and harassment when they tried to stop developments. They also shared knowledge and practical tips – inspiring each other and building their networks of support.

... the knowledge and skills that I learned from this training are very crucial for me, as I am myself directly involved in constant struggles and land dispute related problems in my own area in Sarawak. DTP and its allies really equip and empower us with the relevant knowledge, networking and new alliances in our struggles.¹

Nine participants joined other DTP alumni participating in the Global Forum on Responsible Business and Human Rights on June 12-13 – the first time it has been held in Asia.

Our deepest thanks to DTP, FORUM-ASIA, and AIPP for organizing the training in Bangkok and for providing opportunity to participate and engage in the annual OECD forum. It was truly helpful that the OECD Responsible Business and Human Rights Forum has somehow served as a post-training practicum experience – putting into practice the salient lessons gained from the training as to human rights instruments/mechanisms relating to business.

[Quote from follow-up email from participant]

Participants evaluated the course positively in the post training evaluations. This report draws on those evaluations. It gives an overview of course content and highlights and makes some recommendations for future programs and capacity building.

¹ This and other quotes in the report are taken from participant evaluations completed at the end of the workshop unless otherwise indicated.

DTP acknowledges with appreciation the funding support given to this program by the Australian government. DTP also thanks the participants and the trainers who shared their knowledge and expertise on this program.

2. Program Objectives

The overall objective of the program was to strengthen the knowledge and skills of IPs advocates to protect and promote human rights in the context of rapid economic development and the impact of large-scale development on the lands and livelihoods of Indigenous peoples.

Specific objectives of the program were –

- To strengthen the advocacy capacity of IPs advocates in the Asia-Pacific to use BHR standards in their advocacy strategies
- To build knowledge of how international human rights standards relate to issues such as land-grabbing, the environment, participation and corporate accountability
- To strengthen networks across the region to support more effective regional networking and experience sharing in advocacy on IPs rights and business and human rights.

3. Program Content and Description

The program was opened by DTP alumna and Indonesian AICHR Commissioner, Yuyun Wahyuningrum, who highlighted the importance of civil society advocacy (and capacity building) and emphasised the importance of DTP's focus on BHR. Yuyun expressed hope that through this training a new batch of human rights defenders (HRDs) will take on the work of holding businesses accountable.

At the opening session Marte Hellema of FORUM-ASIA, Frederic Wilson of AIPP, and Patrick Earle of DTP welcomed participants and provided background of their organisations. Patrick further provided rationale and context for the program.

Participant Expectations

- Best practices on advocacy on BHR for IP groups – tools, mechanism, strategies used
- How to engage with businesses and hold them accountable for violations
- Solidarity building mechanisms to address HR violations related to BHR
- Relation between national and International law – how do you lobby for policy coherence between the two?
- Challenges of implementation of the UN Declaration on the Rights of Indigenous Peoples (UNDRIP)
- Specific rights/issues that affect women in relation to BHR
- Rights of children in relation to BHR
- Trends and concerns of IPs groups in different Asian countries
- Using existing mechanism to address HR violations
- Safety and security of HRDs
- Link between BHR and IPs rights

Introduction to human rights advocacy: Using Human Rights and the UN System for Human Rights and Justice – Patrick Earle

Patrick introduced the human rights standards and mechanisms that advocates can use when they experience or witness harms and emphasised that by linking concerns to specific rights, it is more possible to build claims on government/business and to the international community/mechanisms - and to build international solidarity. The session focused on

building understanding how the international standards and mechanisms can be used in advocacy – tools to be used.

Putting Business on the Agenda of the ASEAN Intergovernmental Commission on Human Rights (AICHR) / Building Advocacy and Lobbying Skills – Yuyun Wahyuningrum

When ASEAN was founded in 1967, human rights were not mentioned at all. ASEAN started to incorporate human rights regionally only in 1991-93. AICHR and ASEAN Commission on Women and Children (ACWC) are the two major regional human rights mechanisms established by ASEAN. AICHR has been criticised for being more about human rights promotion than protection. ASEAN's commitment to consensus and non-interference impede AICHR's development and effectiveness.

Despite the many human rights issues in the region, AICHR receives few complaints. Without complaints AICHR representatives cannot raise concerns, initiate actions. CSOs need to put more efforts on advocacy on AICHR. The nexus between business and human rights has been identified as a priority area by AICHR.

UN Declaration on the Rights of Indigenous Peoples (UNDRIP) & the Right to FPIC – Dilip Kanti Chakma and John Southalan

UNDRIP is the key international standard recognising the rights of Indigenous peoples. Although its adoption was supported by every government in Asia, many governments reject its applicability to them, refusing to recognise their own Indigenous peoples.

The Right to Free Prior and Informed Consent (FPIC) is one of the key rights in UNDRIP – and very relevant to business, which must respect Indigenous peoples' right to FPIC in all matters including land, development, hazardous materials, among others. This right is a group right.

Participants were divided into groups and asked to find and elaborate on the meaning of each word of FPIC. Below are some of their responses:

- **Free** – *not using force, coercion, manipulation, should be voluntary with respect*
- **Prior** – *need to ask for permission before something starts; before the government makes any commitment, giving time for the group to make decisions*
- **Informed** – *provide information which should be detailed and includes both positive, negative, risks, benefits; this should be done transparently*
- **Consent** – *full proper agreement and permission to do or not to do something, to be or not to be; with periodical assessment and consultation*

FPIC is a critical right for Indigenous communities, and AIPP have developed resources in many languages to explain its scope and meaning, and to provide guidance to communities on how it can be used in practice as communities negotiate with companies and governments.

DIFFERENCE BETWEEN A TREATY AND DECLARATION

A treaty is a formal legal agreement that Governments can sign and ratify and agree to be accountable to the treaty. Treaties have monitoring mechanisms to ensure their national enforcement.

A declaration is a resolution/ statement adopted by the UN General Assembly. It is not enforceable nor legally binding. It is a statement of moral force. For example, UDHR is not a treaty, however, it has become a part of customary international law.

The Human Rights Responsibilities of Businesses & Holding them to Account – Introducing the UNGPs – John Southalan

While human rights have traditionally focused on State duties to respect, protect, and fulfil human rights, the growing power, influence and impacts of business have led to a greater focus on their responsibilities. The cornerstone document is the UN Guiding Principles on

Business and Human Rights (UNGPs), calling on businesses to take responsibility to respect human rights by doing no harm, to establish a human rights policy, do their due diligence, and ensure access to remedy.

UN Guiding Principles on Business and Human Rights (UNGPs) – Businesses should:

Have policy commitment to meet their responsibility to respect human rights

Conduct human rights due-diligence to identify, prevent, mitigate and account for human rights impacts

Ensure remediation of human rights impacts they cause/contribute to. Creation of moral, social expectation from business – their social licence to operate.

The UNGPs have been supported by governments, business and civil society. They can, however, be used to hold businesses accountable – for instance – in public advocacy, incorporating the principles of the UNGPs into national legislations and business contracts – which are legally binding. The UNGPs are also being implemented through requirements from banks and lenders, and through the complaints function of the *OECD Guidelines for Multinational Enterprises*.

The UN Working Group on Business and Human Rights (UNWG) and Engaging with the UN Special Procedures/ Focus: IPs and Gender – Professor Surya Deva

Professor Deva elaborated on the UNGPs and introduced the guidance that the UNWG has just developed on the gender dimension of the UNGPs. The UNGPs are based on three pillars, defining the States duty to protect human rights, the private sector's duty to respect human rights, and a shared responsibility to ensure remedy in case of violation.

Businesses differently impact women and people with different identities, acting to reinforce existing marginalisation, discrimination and vulnerability. UNGPs define obligations to address the relevant inequalities and barriers to realisation of human rights. Business need to move away from '*gender tokenism*' to promote substantive gender equality and respect women's human rights.

A **3-step gender framework** has been developed by the UNWG, which includes –

- 1. Gender responsive assessment*
- 2. Gender transforming measures*
- 3. Gender transforming remedies*

Guidance on implementing this framework has been published by OHCHR and UNDP.

Submitting Cases to the UN Special Procedures – Professor Surya Deva

The UNWG is one of over 40 of the UN's Human Rights Special Procedures (SPs) – international human rights accountability mechanisms. Professor Deva focussed his second session on developing understanding of how the UN's SPs work, what they can do for human

rights, and how advocates can engage with them. The UN WG has been influential and effective in promoting the UNGPs and developing understanding of their content and applicability. The UNWG also operates like other SPs (e.g. UN Special Rapporteur on the Rights of Indigenous Peoples) - receiving complaints from groups or individuals, making representations to government and business, undertaking country visits, issuing thematic reports and more.

- **UNWG's country visits (up to two country visits a year)** – during a country visit, the UNWG members spend 10 to 12 days meeting different stakeholders (NHRI, CSOs, investors, trade unions, and companies). Based on the inputs received from CSOs, UNWG ask questions and make recommendations to government and companies.

Tips: As time limitation is the main challenge during the visit, when CSOs meeting the UNWG they need to present issues in an efficient way– as precise as possible (facts, numbers, demography, name of the company, rights violated etc). In addition, it is useful to prepare information in writing– no more than two pages in summary with web links and concrete recommendations and supporting documents if necessary.

- **Complaints mechanism (Communications Procedure)** – All of the SPs rely on information from NGOs and CSOs for information to act on immediate cases of human rights violations. When they receive information, they can make two types of representation to government:
 1. Urgent Appeals: to highlight some serious issue/s (e.g. arrest, threat of violence, life, liberty of people)
 2. Allegation Letters: regarding a situation which is either ongoing, past or future, when the violation has not yet occurred but is likely to happen in the future

Tips: Communications should be specific on the allegations and on the government and company involved. Consent of the people is crucial when submitting the complaints.

Complaints to the UN SPs can be submitted here through the UN's human rights website: <https://spsubmission.ohchr.org/>

Beyond the UNGPs and Exploring Due Diligence – Professor Justine Nolan

The UNGPs are complemented by other standards and guidelines on BHR. Professor Nolan introduced the OECD Guidelines for Multinational Enterprises (MNEs) as the only government-backed international instrument on responsible business conduct with a built-in grievance mechanism – National Contact Points (NCPs). Every OECD country establishes an NCP which has a responsibility to mediate complaints. NCPs make an initial assessment on whether to accept a complaint, before mediation takes place. The OECD Guidelines have content on human rights, the environment, corruption and labour and consumer rights. Guidance and help in submitting complaints is available through OECD Watch (www.oecdwatch.org/)

Professor Nolan also highlighted the growing number of national laws that have extra-territorial reach through extended supply chains e.g. France's Duty of Vigilance Law 2017, Netherlands Child Labour Act 2019 and the Modern Slavery Acts of UK and Australia.

There are ongoing discussions on developing a BHR Treaty. One of the key issues is that businesses cannot sign up to treaties. Treaties are developed only for States. The UN is working-on a draft where States [that sign-on to the treaty] will ensure that businesses in their jurisdiction are held accountable.

Due diligence vs human rights due diligence

- Due diligence is about contemplating the risks posed to the company
- Human rights due diligence is thinking about what risk the company could pose to others (community, environmental, stakeholders etc)

Due diligence has emerged as a critical responsibility of business. Justine outlined the four key steps in a due diligence process: **assessing and identifying** human rights risks; **integrating findings** of risk assessment; **tracking** effectiveness of integration; and **reporting** on human rights impacts.

China Using Supply Chain Mechanisms to Address HR Impacts

Chinese Due Diligence Guidelines², adopted in 2015, apply to all businesses from China engaged in mining of mineral resources and their related products. It requires the companies to look into the supply chain and investigate potential impacts on human rights and if they find a risk, it obliges the companies to mitigate this impact. Under the Guidelines, it is considered a human rights risk if businesses do not have free, prior and informed consent of the community – even if they have a government permit to operate. The Guidelines are, however, still very new, and many businesses are still not aware about them. Advocates also have limited experience in using them.

Holding Companies to Account: Mapping Value Chains, Stakeholder Mapping & Building Advocacy Strategies – Debbie Stothard

Debbie highlighted that Indigenous communities are often at the beginning of a complex supply chain. Something is produced/extracted on/from their lands – and may go into manufacture of a mobile phone, or processed food, or biofuel or furniture. At every stage of company/product supply chains there are linked human rights and environmental impacts. Supply chains present risks for companies, but may provide opportunities and leverage for advocates wanting to address harmful impacts on Indigenous communities. The value of many companies selling products to consumers is in their brand and reputation.

Companies with a supply chain face 3 types of risks:

Reputational risks (related to the quality of company's product/service but also to its human rights impact)

Operational risks (companies cannot operate if there occur events like work site closure, industrial action etc.)

Legal risks (court-related costs)

Community advocates should be aware of these risks – and factor them into developing effective advocacy strategies.



Debbie also emphasised that **investment** also needs to be considered as part of the supply chain. The investment might be private (e.g. banks/shareholders/pension funds) or it might be public (government/World Bank/IFC). The UNGPs and others standards apply to investment and can be used in advocacy. There is a growing advocacy focus on responsible investment – linking to implementation of the UNGPs.

² <https://mneguidelines.oecd.org/chinese-due-diligence-guidelines-for-responsible-mineral-supply-chains.htm>

Debbie shared some tips on developing advocacy strategies

- **Documentation is important to provide evidence**
- Communities/ advocates need to be clear in demanding remedies, knowing what they want - as companies normally prefer to provide money compensation, and this can be divisive, short term and limited
- Non-judicial remedy mechanisms should be considered in advocacy strategies (NHRIs/OECD's NCP etc)

DOCUMENTATION AND EVIDENCE

30% of all complaints under the OECD Guidelines are rejected, many because of lack of evidence. Evidence is therefore key. It is important to show what are the impacts based on facts – taking into consideration physical, social, cultural and cumulative impacts of the violations.

- John Southalan

Reaching out Beyond Borders for International Solidarity and Support

Participants were introduced to two specialist organisations with extensive knowledge, experience and expertise on BHR –

Business and Human Rights Resource Centre (BHRRC) – Bobbie Sta. Maria introduced BHRRC which is the leading international NGO focused on BHR with specialist expertise in research, documentation and corporate engagement. The centre collects BHR information, materials including court cases and information on corporations, serving as transparency tool to collaborate with NGOs. It works with communities/NGOs to bring specific concerns to companies to provide a response to the issues/concerns. Some of its campaign and advocacy tactics include mass action, litigation, documentation, strategic engagement, shareholder activism, consumers and media campaigns.

OECD Watch – Marian Ingrams introduced the work of OECD Watch – a network of 130 NGOs from 50 countries overseeing the implementation of OECD Guidelines. They provide assistance to communities to file complaints against businesses from OECD countries, conduct analysis and research about the cases and the NCPs, and advocate for better implementation of OECD Guidelines.

4. Program Evaluation

The final session of the program included time for individual written evaluations and a final group evaluation of the program. The group evaluation enabled participants to reflect on whether the training had met expectations, what the most important things were about the program and what could have been better.

There was a good balance between theory and practice, the training was focused on participation of attendees. Practical session (simulation of meetings) were the most useful

Overall the trainers demonstrated great skills to pass their knowledge to a group of participants within few days and sessions that were engaging and never too heavy.

I expected to learn about the gender perspective in HR advocacy and I got in this training

It was definitely very useful and informative for me, the sessions held were concise, specific and relatable, keeping in mind the Indigenous perspectives

The positive remarks of the group evaluation were echoed in the written evaluations. In the written evaluation 16 participants noted that the program met their expectations while 5 believed the expectations were met partially. Both processes provided insights into the value of the program – the knowledge gained and how it could be used, the skills developed, and the confidence and networks built.

Some commented that the program could be more participatory to allow sharing from participants – and that the content was very technical and heavy.

Overall participants valued content and process. Asked what was most useful they identified the international standards and mechanisms on BHR; role-playing exercises and practical mediation and negotiation sessions; and learning from each other about issues and building their network of support.

... the most useful [sessions] were about how human rights, Indigenous peoples and businesses are intersectional and it helped me to form strategy to advocate for IPs Rights.

... spending time on discussions on sharing about issues that is why it is easy to understand the lessons

Practicing negotiation and mediation, sharing with each other about the issues faced was helpful

The participants quickly established a supportive and safe learning environment amongst each other. This was evident to all of the trainers and facilitators. The sharing of experience, stories, practical guidance and tips was a clear highlight of the program.

Participants also provided inputs to improve the subsequent programs. DTP alumni have voiced the need for a follow-up capacity building program to build more specialised knowledge and skills in the area of business and human rights.

5. Reflections and Next Steps

This was intended as a second-level training – to provide more specialised BHR training to participants who had previously participated in previous human rights training programs (especially DTP courses). 11 of the 21 participants were DTP alumni. They believed that the follow-up program was helpful in strengthening their skills and building in-depth understanding of BHR standards.

DTP and the program partners saw the opportunity of the OECD Global Human Rights and Responsible Business Forum, being held in Bangkok for the first time, as a good opportunity to bring advocates together for a more in-depth training.

Nine of the program participants were able to participate in the subsequent OECD Forum which served as a post-training practical learning experience – an opportunity to engage companies and governments and to build networks.

- **Specialised 2nd level training on BHR in Asia is needed**

BHR includes an increasing body of standards, guidelines, mechanisms and advocacy strategies. This information is easier to absorb and use if advocates already have some knowledge of international human rights standards and mechanisms. Specialised trainings can help to address the tension between depth and breadth of program content.

DTP and its partners will further develop this approach to specialised/second level training.

- **Linking capacity building with regional BHR Forums adds value**

DTP and its partners agree on the value of linking capacity building programs with regional BHR Forums. It can save costs, but more importantly it enables more effective and informed civil society participation in forums, provides opportunities for engagement with business and government and helps to build networks of support.

- **Indigenous peoples' rights advocates can use standards to have a more effective voice on the impacts of business on development**

The UNGPs provide a basis for engaging governments and business at different points of the supply/value chain, and together with UNDRIP and the SDGs, emphasise the importance of hearing Indigenous voices.

- **Capacity building partnerships and collaborations can have a multiplier impact**

The partners in this program played complementary roles. FORUMASIA and AIPP nominated participants from their networks, who will contribute to their networks ongoing work on BHR. Trainers came from organisations that can/will provide ongoing support and advice to advocates. With a longer-term strategy more consideration could be given to developing a regional BHR network that draws from, and contributes to, the various movements active on human rights in the region.

- **Target advocates working along supply chains for program participation**

A number of participants commented that it would be valuable to have advocates from countries along the supply (investment, manufacturing/consumption) chain in Asia - Taiwan, South Korea, China, Malaysia, Singapore as this would help with development of networking and advocacy strategies. DTP and its partners will build this into future strategies.

- **Program content and methodology**

Participants called for more content on trade frameworks, IFIs, investment agreements, as well as more focus on building skills in documentation, media advocacy, and bargaining/negotiation – as well as more focus on case studies from the region.

Participatory methodology is essential. DTP will discuss with its partners doing a more comprehensive Training Needs Analysis as part of developing a longer capacity building strategy on BHR and will include developing local case studies as part of this strategy.

DTP, FORUM-ASIA and AIPP have subsequently discussed and reflected on the program and have agreed on a longer-term partnership and the need for development of a longer-term capacity building strategy on BHR and IPs in the Asia-Pacific.

DTP expresses its thanks and appreciation to its partners, the participants, program participants – and especially to the trainers who gave so generously of their time and expertise.

Appendix 1: Program Partners

Asia Indigenous Peoples Pact (AIPP) is a regional organization founded in 1988 by indigenous peoples' movements. AIPP is committed to the cause of promoting and defending indigenous peoples' rights and human rights and articulating issues of relevance to indigenous peoples. AIPP strengthens the solidarity, cooperation and capacities of indigenous peoples in Asia to promote and protect their rights, cultures and identities, and their sustainable resource management systems for their development and self-determination.

Asian Forum for Human Rights and Development (FORUM-ASIA) works to promote and protect human rights, including the right to development, through collaboration and cooperation among human rights organisations and defenders in Asia and beyond. FORUM-ASIA is committed to building a peaceful, just, equitable and ecologically sustainable community of peoples and societies in Asia, where all human rights of all individuals, groups and peoples – in particular, the poor, marginalised and discriminated – are fully respected and realised in accordance with internationally accepted human rights norms and standards.

Diplomacy Training Program (DTP) is an independent NGO affiliated with the Faculty of Law at UNSW providing practical training in human rights and people's diplomacy in the Asia-Pacific region. It seeks to advance human rights and empower civil society in the region through quality education and training and the building of skills and capacity in NGOs. The DTP was founded in 1989 by José Ramos-Horta, the 1996 Nobel Peace Laureate and President of Timor-Leste.

Appendix 2: Program Schedule

	Saturday June 8	Sunday June 9	Monday June 10	Tuesday June 11
Morning 1 9:00 - 10:30	8.30 – 9.00 Registration Opening Ceremony & Welcomes AIPP, Forum-Asia, DTP Keynote: <i>Yuyun Wahyuningrum</i> , Indonesian Representative, AICHR	UNDRIP, the Right to Free Prior Informed Consent - and How to Use it in Advocacy on Businesses	Approaches to Corporate Accountability - Beyond the UNGPs – and Exploring Due Diligence - New laws with extra-territorial reach – US, Canada, EU, Australia - A new international treaty on BHR?	Building Documentation Skills
Facilitator(s)	AIPP/FA/DTP	AIPP/John Southalan	Professor Justine Nolan	John Southalan
Tea 10:30 - 10:45	Morning Tea	Morning Tea	Morning Tea	Morning Tea
Morning 2 10:45 - 12:30	Participant Introductions & Expectations Identifying key issues on Human Rights, Indigenous peoples and Business	Shifting the Focus to the Private Sector – The Human Rights Responsibilities of Businesses & Holding them to Account - Introducing the UNGPs	Introducing the OECD Guidelines	- Recap Session – Standards/Mechanisms
Facilitator(s)	DTP/AIPP/FA	John Southalan	Professor Justine Nolan	John Southalan/DTP/AIPP
Lunch 12:30 - 1:30	Lunch	Lunch	Lunch	Lunch
Afternoon 1 1:30 - 3:00	An introduction to human rights advocacy – Using Human Rights and the UN System for Human Rights and Justice	The UN Working Group on Business and Human Rights and Engaging with the UN Special Procedures: Gender dimensions of the Guiding Principles on Business and Human Rights Focus: Indigenous Peoples and Gender	Using the OECD Guidelines - Negotiation & Mediation Exercise	Reaching out Beyond Borders for International Solidarity and Support – the Business and Human Rights Resource Centre
Facilitator(s)	DTP - Patrick Earle	Professor Surya Deva	John Southalan	Bobbie Sta. Maria
Tea 3:00 - 3:15	Afternoon Tea	Afternoon Tea	Afternoon Tea	Afternoon Tea
Afternoon 2 3:15 - 5:00	Putting Business on the Agenda of The ASEAN Intergovernmental Commission on Human Rights Building Advocacy and Lobbying Skills – Practical Session	Engaging with the UN Working Group on Business and Human Rights - Practical Exercise – Presentations to the UN Working Group on Business and Human Rights	3:45 - 5:30: Holding Companies to Account - Mapping Value Chains - Stakeholder Mapping - Building Advocacy Strategies - Practical Exercise	Next Steps – Knowledge/Skills Gaps– Course Feedback and Evaluation and Closing Ceremony
Facilitator(s)	Yuyun Wahyuningrum	Professor Surya Deva	Debbie Stothard - FIDH	AIPP/FA/DTP
Evening Activity	Welcome Dinner	Dinner Out	Cultural Night	Dinner

Appendix 3: Participant List

SNo.	Name	Organisation	Country
1	Dilip Kanti Chakma	ASIAN CENTRE FOR HUMAN RIGHTS	India
2	Dominique Calanas	FORUM-ASIA	Thailand
3	Elna Diana Sipail	PACOS TRUST	Malaysia
4	Fransiskus De Sales Lake	JPIC Kalimantan	Indonesia
5	Frederic Wilson	Asia Indigenous Peoples Pact (AIPP)	Malaysia
6	Gebril Atong	Society for Rights of Indigenous Peoples of Sarawak (SCRIPS)	Malaysia
7	KAI LAWY	Kachin Development Networking Group	Myanmar
8	Kim Chishi	Naga Peoples Movement for Human Rights (NPMHR)	India
9	Lady Diana Tiangco	KALUMARAN-Kusog sa Katawhang Lumad sa Mindanao	Philippines
10	Laxmi Gurung	Indigenous Women League Nepal	Nepal
11	Linda Sudiono	Serikat Pembebasan Perempuan (SIEMPRE)	Indonesia
12	Mane Yun	Cambodia Indigenous Peoples Organization [former]	Cambodia
13	Matcha Phornin	Sangsan Anakot Yawachon Development Project (SangSan)	Thailand
14	Melvin Guilleno	Sentrong Pagpapalakas ng Negritong Kultura at Kalikasan	Philippines
15	Raju Rai	NGO-Federation of Nepalese Indigenous Nationalities	Nepal
16	Rana Sengupta	Mine Labour Protection Campaign Trust	India
17	Shiyani Wangkheirakpam	Indigenous Perspectives	India
18	Syme Priscilla Usabal De Leon	FORUM- ASIA	Thailand
19	THEOPIL GOMANGO	Indigenous Peoples Forum, Odisha	India
20	Valerio Loi	FORUM- ASIA	Thailand
21	Yi-Lan Chou	FORUM-ASIA	Thailand