



United Nations Global Compact

The CEO Water Mandate

Fifth Working Conference

April 14-16, 2010

New York City

MEETING SUMMARY



Table of Contents

| | |
|--|-----------|
| Background | 3 |
| Key Learnings and Outcomes | 4 |
| Multi-Stakeholder Working Conference Summary | 6 |
| Endorser-only Meeting Proceedings | 12 |
| Appendix A: List of Working Conference Participants | 14 |
| Appendix B: Meeting Ground Rules | 17 |

Meeting summary prepared by the Pacific Institute, a non-profit sustainability policy research and advocacy center based in Oakland, California. (www.pacinst.org)





Background

In July 2007, the UN Secretary-General in partnership with international business leaders and under the auspices of the UN Global Compact launched the CEO Water Mandate – an initiative established to better understand and advance water stewardship in the private sector. The Mandate is built upon six core elements considered to be critical in addressing corporate water management: Direct Operations, Supply Chain and Watershed Management, Collective Action, Public Policy, Community Engagement, and Transparency.¹

Following meetings in New York City (March 2008), Stockholm (August 2008), Istanbul (March 2009), and Stockholm (August 2009), the UN Global Compact – with support from the Pacific Institute – convened the Mandate’s fifth working conference on April 14-16, 2010 at the Permanent Mission of Germany to the United Nations in New York City. This workshop consisted of over 90 participants representing 28 endorsing companies, nine UN and government agencies, 16 civil society groups, and various other organizations. In addition to the multi-stakeholder working conference, the Mandate held three other events: 1) a meeting of the initiative’s Human Rights Working Group (HRWG); 2) a seminar focusing on corporate water accounting methods and tools; and 3) an endorser-only planning meeting.

The multi-stakeholder working conference’s overarching goal was to discuss, shape, and advance the initiative’s three primary current workstreams/areas of focus:

- 1) Business engagement with water policy,
- 2) Corporate water disclosure, and
- 3) Water and human rights.

The conference sought to build on prior Mandate discussions, to further share learnings and experiences, and to determine how the initiative can move forward in regard to these topics. The discussion on business engagement with water policy centered primarily on discussing the near-final draft of the initiative’s upcoming *Guide to Responsible Business Engagement with Water Policy*. The corporate water disclosure sessions explored current corporate reporting practice and potential areas for improvement, as well as emerging initiatives that provide frameworks and metrics for reporting. Finally, the segment on human rights discussed the potential for formal corporate policies on the human right to water, as well as how the Mandate specifically can help advance best practice on this topic.

The Mandate Secretariat recently conducted a survey of endorsers regarding their current practices relating to the human right to water. The Human Rights Working Group meeting provided an opportunity to discuss key themes and conclusions from this exercise, common and divergent approaches and practices, and possible ways the Mandate can advance its work in this space.

The corporate water accounting seminar brought together key stakeholders (i.e.; Water Footprint Network, Life Cycle Assessment practitioners, academia, civil society groups, and companies that have piloted water accounting methods) to discuss key issues relating to emerging practice and to identify opportunities for alignment and/or coordination.

The endorser-only meeting served as a forum for companies to: 1) digest feedback from the multi-stakeholder working conference, 2) decide on how the initiative should pursue further activities relating to existing workstreams, and 3) determine next steps on the Mandate’s funding, recruitment efforts, potential partnerships, and future working conferences.

¹ To learn more about the CEO Water Mandate and its six elements, go to: http://www.unglobalcompact.org/docs/news_events/8.1/Ceo_water_mandate.pdf

Key Learnings and Outcomes

The working conference set out to garner an array of perspectives and opinions on material, water-related issues as a way to build companies' understanding and determine how the Mandate can best promote good practice. There were many concepts and sentiments for which there was widespread agreement amongst different endorsers, civil society organizations, and other stakeholders. At the same time, many of the discussions revealed emerging or controversial issues for which there is a need for further discussion. Below is a summary of the key learnings as well as the major outcomes and next steps that resulted from the meeting. A more detailed description of outcomes and next steps can be found in the Endorser-only Meeting Proceedings section.

Responsible Business Engagement with Water Policy

The primary goal of the one-day discussion on policy engagement was to garner feedback on the near-final draft of the Mandate's upcoming *Guide to Responsible Business Engagement with Water Policy* that could inform the final product. While reception to the draft was quite positive, there were many (sometimes conflicting) suggestions on how to strengthen the Guide. Some participants believed that the *Guide* must be more succinct in order to be palatable to upper-level corporate executives, while others felt that it should provide more specific tools and mechanisms (in addition to the conceptual underpinnings) to operationalize engagement on the ground. A number of participants expressed their desire to include case studies throughout the document, while others wanted a tool or set of metrics that allowed companies to assess their performance with respect to engagement. More specific recommendations are provided later in this summary.

The Mandate Secretariat clarified that while the Guide hopes to be applicable to many types of private actors (e.g.; private water service providers, investors) and even provide some value for public and civil society entities, it is primarily intended for private water users and wastewater dischargers.

Outcomes and Next steps

- The Guide will be broken into two products: 1) a short "Framework" (5-10 pages) that outlines the business case, key concepts, and principles to be completed in advance of the UN Global Compact Leaders Summit in June 2010, and 2) the full length *Guide* (~50 pages) where the framework is explained in greater detail.
- The full-length document will incorporate many of the "practical how to" suggestions heard during the New York meetings and add a number of case studies to illustrate the concepts and best practice highlighted in the *Guide*.
- The Mandate Secretariat will work with the Policy Engagement Working Group (PEWG) to determine which suggestions to address and how. Any and all endorsers are welcome to participate in the PEWG meetings held by teleconference.

Water and Human Rights

Discussions at the HRWG meeting and multi-stakeholder conference indicated that a majority of companies are only beginning to explore explicitly the full implications of a human right to water for corporate policy and operations. Many companies expressed a need to better clarify what specifically is expected of them on this front and how they might follow through with those expectations on the ground. These meetings demonstrated a wide range of ways in which companies publicly express their position on this issue and of how they in practice address the issue. Companies also provided a range of perspectives on the nature of an appropriate corporate commitment and obligation in this arena.

Stakeholders noted that many countries have formally established a human right to water and expect private businesses operating within their jurisdictions to respond accordingly. For this reason, many see operational guidance as a timely, valuable, and necessary tool for business. Stakeholders, however, also



expressed the belief that social expectations, rather than legally derived obligations, are the primary driver compelling business attention to this need.

The discussion suggested that the Mandate can provide value in this space by exploring current corporate practice and determining the state of play with respect to emerging frameworks and guidance (e.g., the Ruggie Framework). Such an analysis would inform where the Mandate can provide the most value in terms of operational guidance and whether it collectively takes a public position on a human right to water.

Outcomes and Next steps

- The Mandate Secretariat will draft a white paper with background information that will inform both how individual companies and the Mandate itself can advance action on the human right to water.

Corporate Water Disclosure

An analysis of the first round of endorsers' *Communications on Progress – Water* found that companies have largely improved their reporting since the Mandate's *Water Disclosure 2.0* study, particularly with respect to process-oriented Mandate elements, such as Collective Action, Public Policy, and Community Engagement. It also showed a broad trend toward understanding and reporting on the local context in which water is used, as well as how water is used across a company's value chain.

Discussion on disclosure expectations of companies demonstrated that there are a number of emerging initiatives that have relevance/bearing for companies' water-related disclosure. Mandate endorsers acknowledged the value of these initiatives, but also identified the breadth and diversity of reporting requirements to be a potential problem. Many participants suggested that the Mandate could play a role in shepherding harmonization and convergence in this field.

Outcomes and Next steps

- The Mandate will form a Water Disclosure Working Group (WDWG) comprised of Mandate endorsers to determine how the Mandate can facilitate the identification of material issues and the development of user-friendly metrics and criteria, as well as encourage harmonized and complementary disclosure frameworks and approaches in the field.

Other Outcomes

- The Mandate agreed to expand Steering Committee terms to two years and stagger them so that only half of the Steering Committee is replaced every year.
- The Steering Committee will draft a letter to non-reporting endorsers, co-signed by any interested Mandate endorsers, encouraging them to fulfill their requirements and become more actively engaged with the initiative.
- The Sixth Working Conference of the CEO Water Mandate will be held in South Africa in the fourth quarter of 2010, likely in mid-November.



Multi-Stakeholder Working Conference Summary

Broad Goals

The CEO Water Mandate's working conferences are meant to shape and advance the initiative's work by:

- Discussing key issues relating to each focus area and identifying common interests among companies, governments, civil society groups, and local communities regarding how companies (and the Mandate) can address them;
- Garnering feedback from Mandate endorsers and key stakeholders on the scope, objectives, and approach for outputs in existing workstreams/focus areas; and
- Exploring options for increased participation and engagement in the initiative and its workstreams by key stakeholders from the private sector, government, civil society, and other interests.

Specific Objectives

Discussions at the Fifth Working Conference explored the initiative's three current workstreams: 1) water policy engagement, 2) water and human rights, and 3) corporate water disclosure, aiming specifically to:

- Discuss the recent draft of the *Guide to Responsible Business Engagement with Water Policy*, garner feedback on how to improve it, and understand where common ground exists on key substantive elements;
- Better understand the landscape of corporate water disclosure initiatives and what is expected of corporate water-related reporting;
- Elucidate the state-of-play with respect to corporate water disclosure and evaluate how the Mandate can best contribute to improved practice;
- Discuss the potential drawbacks and pitfalls of various formal corporate policies on the human right to water;
- Identify and discuss options for how the Mandate can best advance good corporate practice on water and human rights.

Welcoming Remarks from Mr. Power, Ambassador Wittig

The workshop began with an introduction from Gavin Power (Head, CEO Water Mandate) who recapped the origins, mission, and approaches of the UN Global Compact and CEO Water Mandate. He provided background on the Mandate's previous meetings, actions, and research leading up to this meeting and outlined broad goals for the initiative moving forward.

Ambassador Peter Wittig (Permanent Representative of Germany to the United Nations) followed by welcoming attendees to the Permanent Mission of Germany and noting Germany's ongoing support of the UN Global Compact. Dr. Wittig stressed the urgency of water and sanitation issues across the world, as well as the importance of developing solutions to these problems in multi-stakeholder settings.

Introductions and Event Orientation from Mr. Greenwood

Meeting facilitator Rob Greenwood (Ross & Associates) then provided an overview of the working conference agenda and ground rules², as well as a brief introductory exercise to better understand the different sectors represented in the room. Mr. Greenwood emphasized that - though under contract with the Pacific Institute – he is a neutral third-party who has no stake in the outcome of decisions and whose main role is to ensure that discussion is on topic and balanced.

² The ground rules for the meeting are summarized in Appendix B.

First Day Sessions

The first day of the working conference focused exclusively on the Mandate's policy engagement workstream. Specifically, it sought to garner endorser and stakeholder feedback on the recent draft³ of the upcoming *Guide on Responsible Engagement with Water Policy* to ensure that it is readable and concise, the business case is realistic and persuasive, the core principles are appropriate and well-defined, and that the operational guidance is cogent and applicable on the ground, among other things.

Review of the Guide to Responsible Business Engagement with Water Policy⁴ (Session 1)

Jason Morrison (Globalization Program Director, Pacific Institute) and Stuart Orr (Freshwater Manager, WWF- International) provided an overview of the current draft of the guide, including its objectives, timeline, key concepts and principles, a brief summary of an operational framework for engagement, and potential pitfalls of and barriers to engagement. They also described the business case for engagement, introducing the concept of shared risk. The two noted that the structure of the Guide has been changed significantly from the annotated outline to improve the flow and readability of the document.

Contextualizing Water Policy Engagement (Session 2 & 3)

The following two sessions provided an opportunity for panelists from endorsing companies and consultancies to present their respective approaches and activities related to policy engagement and reflect on the implications of their experiences on engagement specifically for water and sanitation. Both sessions were concluded with discussion sessions that allowed the audience ask questions and express their own views. Discussions indicated substantial opportunity exists to improve companies' understanding of policy engagement processes and their implications, signaling a strong need for tools and guidance to support and assure responsible engagement.

Some of the key comments on the current state of corporate engagement with public policy were:

- Companies generally do not have established policies or protocols for engagement,
- The growing interconnectivity among sustainability issues (e.g., water, carbon, energy, etc.) poses challenges from a policy perspective; messaging these issues in a coherent fashion is difficult.
- Corporate engagement can be quite effective at facilitating communities' and civil society's ability to influence responsible public policy.
- Many governments may be skeptical of private companies and not welcome engagement efforts; signaling the need to invest in developing trust-based relationships as crucial to effective and responsible engagement.
- Engagement often occurs through trade associations and other membership organizations over which individual companies have limited influence; companies may well be held responsible for their individual actions as well as those of the organizations of which they are members.
- There is great potential for companies to advance sustainable water management through supporting the financing of good infrastructure projects.
- Corruption is one of the biggest barriers to engagement. Determining how to enact change in the absence of political will is crucial.

³ To read the draft in full, see:

http://www.unglobalcompact.org/Issues/Environment/CEO_Water_Mandate/public_comment_water_policy.html

⁴ For more details on the *Guide*, see Morrison's and Orr's slides here:

http://www.unglobalcompact.org/docs/issues_doc/Environment/ceo_water_mandate/5th_Working_Conference_NYC_2010/Morrison_Orr.pdf.

Engaging with Governments and Other Stakeholders on Issues Relating to Community Access/ Human Right to Water (Session 4)

This session, featuring panelists from leading civil society organizations on human rights, explored why companies have a stake in the human right to water and how they can contribute to meaningful solutions through engagement. Comments firmly established that fulfilling the human right to water is the responsibility of governments and indicated that companies are responsible for proactively ensuring that they do not infringe upon this right. Panelists, however, also indicated that this does not preclude companies from adopting measures that support governments' efforts to fulfill the human right to water.

Many participants asserted that there is no “one size fits all” solution to supporting the human right to water. Strategies vary substantially depending on social, economic, environmental, and political context, even as local stakeholder engagement was identified as a universal component of human rights engagement and impact assessment. Discussion further indicated that engagement efforts must also invariably consider whether they are empowering or disempowering vulnerable communities and whether they are making companies more or less accountable for their impacts.

The human right to water was discussed further on day two. A summary of this conversation can be found on pages 10-11.

Reflections on the Draft Policy Engagement Guide (Sessions 3 & 5, Facilitated Discussion)

The final panel session of the day featured stakeholders from civil society, intergovernmental organizations, and the public sector sharing their impressions of the Guide, followed by a facilitated discussion. Panelists shared their thoughts on the Guide's applicability to industrialized and developing nations alike, the usefulness and appropriateness of the principles, and the potential for engagement to lead to undesired and inequitable outcomes, among other topics. Comments suggested a general comfort with the direction of the *Guide*, and that it represents a positive “paradigm shift” in how companies envision their role in water sustainability. Many believed, however, that the draft could be improved by further elaborating on how to operationalize principles and concepts and assess performance.

Throughout the first day, endorser and stakeholder panelists had many suggestions for how the *Guide* could be improved, including the following.

- The Guide could provide more clarity on exactly what appropriate public and private roles are with respect to water management and how companies can respect these roles.
- Further guidance is needed on how companies can engage proactively; companies must know how to identify, consider, and address problems before they become crises.
- The operational framework/practical guidance for engagement must be more explicitly linked to the principles of responsible engagement and sustainable water management.
- The Guide could include a framework or metrics through which to monitor and assess performance as a way to foster continuous improvement.
- “Sustainable water management” is an often ambiguous and undefined concept.
- Case studies exploring how engagement concepts and practices play out on the ground could make the Guide more user-friendly.
- More specific tools and mechanisms with which companies can operationalize engagement principles and concepts would help make the Guide more practical.
- Guidance on how to communicate and message engagement activities is needed to facilitate internal alignment and external support.
- It is not clear whether the Guide is – or is intended to be - useful for situations when companies are already experiencing a water crisis and fighting for survival and/or operate in a combative water management context.
- The business case for engagement must be more strongly articulated.
- The current focus on risk avoidance could be better balanced with opportunity acquisition.

- More emphasis needs to be added to the role of the agriculture sector.

Day One Closing Remarks

Power and Morrison concluded the day by thanking participants for their active participation and insightful feedback. Morrison noted an underlying tension in the comments heard between the desire to include guidance that is detailed and able to be implemented on the ground and to make the Guide succinct and readable. He suggested that perhaps the Mandate can build on the Guide in the future with stand-alone tools and further guidance. He also expressed support for the many calls to ground the Guide with case studies and to include guidance for communication engagement.

Second Day Sessions

The second day of the working conference focused on the Mandate's other two workstreams: 1) corporate water disclosure, and 2) water and humans rights. The discussion on disclosure explored emerging tools and initiatives that inform the expectations of companies with respect to disclosure, as well as the metrics and methods they use to report. It also used an analysis of Mandate endorser's *Communication on Progress: Water* reports to better understand current and emerging practice in this field. The last session focused on the potential for corporate policies and public commitments on the human right to water and how such policies might be applied on the ground.

Assessing Current and Emerging Practice in Corporate Water Reporting (Sessions 6 & 8)

Much of the first half of the day was spent reviewing recent studies from Ceres and the Pacific Institute/CEO Water Mandate that analyze current and emerging practice in corporate water reporting. These studies illustrated marked progress in the sophistication and depth of reporting practices, but also illustrated that there is still much need for improvement. Study findings suggested room for improvement in several broad areas, especially qualitative reporting on issues such as risk, stakeholder engagement, policy engagement, supplier performance; and materiality assessment.

Some of the common threads and key comments in these sessions were as follows.

- Water reporting is most effective when water data are assessed at the regional level and in the context of the environmental, social, and political realities of those regions.
- Reporting on supplier water use and discharge is essential to a meaningful assessment of risk, yet is currently quite limited for most companies.
- Engaging with stakeholders from various sectors and contexts is necessary for companies to understand material issues and make sure that their reporting is meaningful and effective to a broad audience including investors, civil society, and affected communities.
- An explanation of how water risks are assessed, addressed by key policies, and integrated into governance and management systems throughout the company hierarchy is important for stakeholders' assessment of companies.
- When discussing process-oriented actions (e.g., community projects, policy engagement), companies can be more explicit about their role, financial commitments, and outcomes.

The discussion indicated a broad sentiment that these practices are quickly transitioning from being aspirational goals to a baseline expectation of companies by investors and civil society alike.

Launch of Carbon Disclosure Project's Water Information Request (Session 7)

The next session provided an overview of the Carbon Disclosure Project's (CDP) recent draft of its "Water Information Request" – an attempt to facilitate meaningful reporting through defining standard measures and performance benchmarks for corporate water use. CDP believes improved harmonization of metrics will allow investors, companies, and governments to assess risks and impacts, and ultimately improve their decision-making. The CDP Water Information Request is divided into three primary components: 1)



water management and governance, 2) risks and opportunities, and 3) water accounting. This framework expands upon current practice by explicitly requesting not only water data, but also qualitative information on how companies assess related risk and implement response actions. The information request is also notable in its emphasis on putting water data in a regional context, particularly into water stress and political conditions, and for data collection and risk assessment throughout the supply chain.

The first version of the CDP Water Information Request was released in April 2010. Companies have until July 31, 2010 to submit their disclosure to CDP. The initial draft will be refined and expanded every year. There will be no scoring or ranking of responses until 2010; the first three years are designed as an opportunity for companies to demonstrate leadership, share best practice, and build capacity.

Update on the Operational Framework Being Developed by the UN Special Representative on Business and Human Rights (Session 9)

Next, Michael Wright - Legal Advisor to the UN Special Representative for Business and Human Rights – provided an update on John Ruggie’s efforts to elucidate expectations and processes for the private sector with respect to human rights. Wright focused specifically on Ruggie’s recent work to define an operational framework for how to implement key values and principles on the ground, particularly the corporate duty to “respect”. He stressed that “respecting” human rights does not imply actively fulfilling or protecting them, but rather ensuring that a company does not infringe upon human rights by means of a proactive due diligence process. Wright identified four key components in this process:

1. Formulating a corporate human rights policy to state commitments and response strategies,
2. Assessing actual and potential impacts on human rights,
3. Integrating response strategies throughout the company, and
4. Tracking and reporting performance.

Wright concluded his remarks by encouraging companies to adopt formal corporate policies on human rights as a way to signal to key stakeholders their intent to follow the Ruggie Framework. At the same time, he cautioned that detailed policies make companies accountable for their future actions on this issue, so that creating a robust and actionable commitment is crucial.

The Merits, Pitfalls, and Realities of a Formal Company Policy on the Human Right to Water / Facilitated Discussion (Session 10)

The final session of the multi-stakeholder working conference explored formal company policies on the human right to water. This discussion included thoughts on advantages and disadvantages of such policies from the perspective of several panelists from companies, civil society, and the investment community. Following this panel was a facilitated discussion among all participants on how the Mandate can move forward with its operational guidance relating to water and human rights.

Though the discussion suggested general comfort with the broad ideals associated with the Ruggie Framework and respecting the human right to water, many endorsers expressed an uncertainty about how to implement this on the ground and therefore expressed hesitation relative to making a formal policy. They also noted a resistance from their company’s legal departments to create corporate policies/ commitments on this due to the possibility of litigation. In contrast, some of the NGO stakeholders noted that there have been no cases of litigation based on companies’ lack of alignment with their human rights policies. Participants also discussed the relationship between a rights-based approach and a corporate policy. While some considered a rights-based approach as an alternative to a formal corporate policy, others thought them both to be inextricably linked to effectively respecting a human right to water.

The panelists and facilitated discussion revealed many merits and pitfalls to articulating a formal company policy on the human right to water, such as the following.

Merits / Advantages:

- Raising global awareness
- Facilitating internal alignment on values and approaches
- Influencing other companies to act
- Promoting accountability
- Enhancing reputation among affected communities, NGOs, and consumers
- Encouraging stakeholder feedback on process for respecting human rights
- Operational framework is undefined; lack of clarity on the nature of commitment
- Difficult to translate principles into actionable practices
- Limited process for demonstrating adherence to policy and/or mitigating adverse impacts
- Once commitment is made, there is no turning back

Pitfalls:

Meeting participants expressed a wide range of views with respect to how the Mandate should pursue its workstream on human rights. Comments suggested a widespread support for the Mandate developing guidance on the principles and operational framework of a rights-based approach to water consistent with the Ruggie Framework. Many comments, however, suggested a need for further discussion on whether and how the Mandate should take a position on the human right to water. Some advocated for the Mandate itself to collectively acknowledge the human right to water and call other companies to action. Others believed that too little is known about the operational implications of such an acknowledgement to be able to act at the moment.

Day Two Closing Remarks

Gavin Power concluded the two-day multi-stakeholder working conference by thanking all participants for the lively and informative discussion, as well as their ongoing support of the Mandate. He also once again thanked Baosteel, PepsiCo, Syngenta, The Coca-Cola Company, and Unilever for sponsoring the event. He noted that this was the best-attended of all of the Mandate's conferences. Finally, Power suggested that despite the initiative's great progress, it still has much work to do, particularly in taking the ideas and practices explored in these meetings and implementing them into companies' every day practices from upper management to their facilities and suppliers.

Endorser-only Meeting Proceedings

Objectives

- Digest proceedings from multi-stakeholder working conference
- Determine immediate next steps/action items/workstreams
- Decide future governance matters and funding of the initiative
- Determine the date/location/subject of the initiative's next convening

Summary

For the last meeting of the three day event, representatives from endorsing companies convened to digest prior discussions and come to some conclusions about ways forward on the three workstreams, next steps for the initiative, and governance issues. Endorser comments suggested the working conference was quite helpful in providing a forum for discussion and debate on emerging issues, and as a way to learn about new concepts and business practices.

Responsible Business Engagement with Water Policy

While endorsers noted that reception of the draft *Guide* was overwhelmingly positive, it will be a great challenge to determine which comments to implement and how. Furthermore, endorsers noted a need to address the tension between a desire for a comprehensive and actionable guidance document and one that is easily readable and palatable for all audiences. In order to ensure that both these needs are met, it was agreed that the *Guide* should be broken into two outputs:

- 1) A short "Framework" (5-10 pages) that outlines the business case, key concepts, and principles to be completed in advance of the UN Global Compact Leaders Summit in June 2010, and
- 2) The full length *Guide* (~50 pages) where the framework is explained in greater detail.

To be completed before the Mandate's next working conference (Q4 2010), the full-length document will incorporate many of the "practical how to" suggestions heard during the New York meetings and add a number of case studies to illustrate the concepts and best practice highlighted in the *Guide*.

Though Mandate endorsers have agreed to the two version format in order to provide more time to develop the full *Guide*, there is still a limit to how much can be realistically incorporated into the longer document due to concerns of readability and length. For this reason, the Mandate Secretariat will work with the Policy Engagement Working Group (PEWG) in the coming weeks to determine which suggestions to address and how. Any and all endorsers are welcome to participate in the PEWG meetings held by teleconference.

Water and Human Rights

Acknowledging that endorser understanding of their responsibilities with respect to the human right to water is evolving and remains unclear, the Mandate agreed to develop a white paper to help distill core issues and contextualize the Mandate's work on this topic. The Mandate's recent survey of endorser practice on water and human rights will be used as one of the paper's key data sources. Specifically, this analysis will:

- Describe the nature of the challenges and the contours of the debate regarding businesses acknowledging/respecting the human right to water;
- Summarize the state-of-play with regard to endorser practice and illustrate examples of existing corporate policy and approaches on the topic;
- Provide an overview of related public policies and emerging frameworks and guidance that establish expectations of companies on this issue; and
- Identify options for how the Mandate can advance this workstream.



Ultimately, the goal of this white paper is to provide background information that will inform both how individual companies as well as the Mandate itself can address this issue going forward.

Corporate Water Disclosure

Discussion at this meeting demonstrated that there are a number of emerging initiatives that have relevance/bearing for companies' water-related disclosure. Mandate endorsers acknowledged the value of these initiatives, but also identified the breadth and diversity of reporting requirements to be a potential problem. For this reason, the Mandate agreed to form a Water Disclosure Working Group (WDWG) comprised of Mandate endorsers to determine how the Mandate can facilitate the development of effective and user-friendly water-related reporting, as well as encourage harmonized and complementary disclosure frameworks and approaches in the field. As a first step, the Mandate Secretariat will draft a Terms of Reference for the WDWG and solicit endorser participation in the group. The draft Terms of Reference will be the subject of discussion/finalization at the WDWG's first meeting.

Governance

The Mandate agreed to expand Steering Committee terms to two years and stagger them so that only half of the Steering Committee is replaced every year. In order to make these changes, the two Steering Committee representatives from each geographic region will decide amongst themselves which of the two will stay for a second year and which will step down at the end of this first year. If both wish to stay on for a second year, it will be decided by a simple coin toss. The five new Steering Committee members will be nominated as per usual.

Some Mandate endorsers noted that several endorsers have failed to fulfill their *Communication on Progress: Water* requirements and are therefore at risk of delisting. In response, the Steering Committee will draft a letter to these endorsers, co-signed by any interested Mandate endorsers, encouraging them to fulfill their requirements and become more actively engaged with the initiative.

Next Conference

The Mandate also agreed to hold the next multi-stakeholder working conference in South Africa in Q4 2010. The tentative themes for this conference are "Community Engagement" and "Watershed Management", two of the six commitment areas for the CEO Water Mandate. The Mandate will also hold a half-day public informational session at World Water Week 2010 in Stockholm the morning of September 9th.



Appendix A: List of Working Conference Participants

| Affiliation | Name | Title |
|--|----------------------|--|
| Endorsing Companies and Prospective Endorsers | | |
| Baosteel Group | Zou Kuan | Director, Environmental Protection and Resource Utilization |
| Calvert Group | Bennett Freeman | Senior Vice-President of Sustainability Research and Policy |
| Calvert Group | Julie Frieder | Environment Analyst |
| The Coca-Cola Company | Denise Knight | Global Water Initiative Manager |
| The Coca-Cola Company | Greg Koch | Director - Global Water Stewardship |
| The Coca-Cola Company | Lisa Manley | Group Director – Sustainability Communications |
| Coca-Cola Enterprises | Lucinda Hensman | CSR Manager |
| Coca-Cola Enterprises | Maury Zimring | Manager, Corporate Responsibility & Sustainability |
| Dow Chemical Company | Lisa Schroeter | Director – International Policy |
| DSM | Robert Claasen | Director Corporate Manufacturing |
| DuPont | Dawn Rittenhouse | Director of Sustainable Development |
| Firmenich | David Shipman | Group Vice-President Corporate Compliance |
| Firmenich | Johan Firmenich | Project Manager Sustainability |
| GlaxoSmithKline | Robert Hannah | Project Director |
| H&M | Henrik Lampa | Environmental Supply Chain Manager |
| Hindustan Construction Company Limited | Mangesh Gupte | Deputy General Manager – Corporate Social Responsibility |
| Intel | Todd Brady | Corporate Environment Manager |
| Intel | Michael Jacobsen | Director of Corporate Responsibility |
| Levi Strauss & Co. | Michael Kobori | Vice President, Supply Chain Social and Environmental Sustainability |
| Molson Coors Brewing Co. | Michael Glade | Director, Water Resources and Real Estate |
| Monsanto | Brian Lowry | Deputy General Counsel |
| Nalco | Mike Bushman | Division Vice President, Communication & Investor Relations |
| Nestlé S.A. | Christian Frutiger | Public Affairs Manager |
| Netafim | Naty Barak | Director of Global Corporate Responsibility |
| Netafim Irrigation | Michael Dowgert | AG Marketing Manager |
| Nike | John Frazier | Director of Considered Chemistry |
| PepsiCo, Inc. | Dan Bena | Director of Sustainability, Health, Safety, and Environment |
| PepsiCo, Inc. | Liese Dallbauman | Senior Manager - Water Stewardship |
| Pfizer | Elizabeth Auda | EHS Stakeholder Relations |
| PricewaterhouseCoopers | Jon Williams | Partner |
| Reed Elsevier | Terry Martin | Manager, Socially Responsible Supplier Program |
| Sasol | Martin Ginster | Environmental Advisor |
| Siemens Water Technologies | David LoPiccolo | Director of Food & Beverage Sustainability |
| Stora Enso | Johan Holm | Vice-President, Environment |
| Syngenta | Juan Gonzalez-Valero | Head of Corporate Responsibility |



| Unilever | John Temple | Environmental Sustainability Director |
|---|--------------------------|---|
| Affiliation | Name | Title |
| Unilever Water Research Unit | Helen Fox | Water Expertise Group |
| Veolia Water | Sandy Sullivan | Vice-President Government and Industry Relations |
| Veolia Water | Pierre Victoria | Head of International Institutional Relations |
| Westpac Banking Corporation | Manuela Adl | Senior Vice-President & Chief Operating Officer |
| | | |
| UN Agencies and Government Officials | | |
| GTZ | Ulrike Pokorski da Cunha | Advisor – International Water & Infrastructure |
| Spartanburg Water | Rebecca West | Deputy General Manager |
| UN Development Programme | Andrew Hudson | Cluster Leader, Water Governance Programme |
| UN Development Programme | Juerg Staudenmann | Water Governance Advisor for Europe/CIS |
| UN Environment Programme | Guido Sonnemann | Programme Officer for Innovation and Life Cycle Management, Sustainable Consumption and Production Branch |
| UNICEF | Andrew Parker | Senior Adviser, Water Sanitation and Hygiene WASH (Emergencies) |
| UN Principles for Responsible Investment | Christina Zimmerman | Manager |
| UN-Water | Frederik Pischke | Advisor |
| US AID | Sharon Murray | Freshwater Programme Manager |
| US State Department | Hugh Dugan | United States Delegate to the United Nations |
| | | |
| Civil Society | | |
| Ceres | Brooke Barton | Manager |
| Conservation International | Marielle Canter Weikel | Center for Environmental Leadership and Business |
| Environmental Defense Fund | Laura Harnish | Regional Director |
| Institute for Human Rights and Business | John Morrison | Director |
| The Nature Conservancy | Jonathan Kaledin | Blue Water Certification Program Director |
| The Nature Conservancy | Karin Krchnak | Senior Advisor, International Water Policy |
| The Nature Conservancy | Brian Richter | Co-Leader Global Freshwater Team |
| Oxfam America | Chris Jochnick | Director, Private Sector Team |
| Transparency International | Donal O'Leary | Senior Advisor; Board Member, Water Integrity Network |
| WASH United | Virginia Roaf | Senior Researcher |
| Water Advocates | John Oldfield | Executive Vice President |
| WaterAid | Duncan Wilbur | Private Sector Engagement Advisor |
| Water Witness International | Nick Hepworth | Senior Consultant |
| Wessanorth | Garth Barnes | Environmental Coordinator – Northern Areas |
| World Resources Institute | Piet Klop | Senior Fellow, Markets & Enterprise Program |
| WWF International | Stuart Orr | Freshwater Manager |
| WWF International | Diederik Vismans | |
| WWF – China | Chaode Ma | Head of China Freshwater |
| WWF – US | Nicole Tanner | Program Officer – Market Transformation |
| WWF – US | Andrew Murphy | Director of Enterprise Planning |
| | | |



| Affiliation | Name | Title |
|--|-----------------------|--|
| Other | | |
| Alliance for Water Stewardship | Matthew Wenban-Smith | Co-Secretary |
| Business for Social Responsibility | Linda Hwang | Manager of Environmental Research and Innovation |
| Columbia University | Upmanu Lall | Director, Columbia Water Center |
| Columbia University | Daniel Stellar | Assistant Director – Columbia Water Center |
| Future 500 | Bill Shireman | President and CEO |
| Future 500 | Matt Turner | Director, Global Stakeholder Initiative |
| Harvard University (Kennedy School of Public Policy) | Christine Bader | Advisor to the UN Special Representative for Business and Human Rights |
| International Water Association | Kristina Kohler | Director – North America Office |
| Irbaris LLP | Will Lynn | Senior Consultant |
| LimnoTech | Greg Peterson | Vice-President |
| | Nicky Black | Independent Corporate Citizenship Research Consultant |
| Pegasys Strategy and Development, Ltd | Guy Pegram | Managing Director |
| PricewaterhouseCoopers | Nick Shufro | Manager, Sustainability and Climate Change |
| Quantis | Jon Dettling | Director, US |
| Quantis | Sébastien Humbert | Project Leader, ISO Working Group on Water Footprinting |
| Stockholm International Water Institute | Andreas Lindstrom | Project Officer |
| Stockholm International Water Institute | Johanna Sjodin | Coordinator for Issues re Water & Corp Responsibility |
| University of Arkansas | Marty Matlock | Area Director, Center for Agricultural and Rural Sustainability |
| University of Twente | Maite Martinez Aldaya | Researcher on Multidisciplinary Water Management |
| Water Environment Federation | Matthew Ries | Managing Director, Technical & Educational Services |
| Water Stewardship Initiative | Michael Spencer | Co-Director |
| | | |
| Financial Sector | | |
| Carbon Disclosure Project | Marcus Norton | Head of CDP Water Disclosure |
| Interfaith Center on Corporate Responsibility | Leslie Lowe | Energy & Environment Program Director |
| Interfaith Center on Corporate Responsibility | David Schilling | Program Director, Global Corporate Accountability |
| Robeco | Lara Yacob | Senior Engagement Specialist |
| Sustainable Asset Management | Marc-Oliver Buffle | Equity Analyst |
| | | |
| Event Organizers | | |
| UN Global Compact | Gavin Power | Head, CEO Water Mandate |
| UN Global Compact | Haeryong (Sony) Nahm | Office Management, Environment |
| Ross and Associates | Robert Greenwood | Vice President and Principal |
| Pacific Institute | Jason Morrison | Globalization Program Director |
| Pacific Institute | Peter Schulte | Research Analyst |



Appendix B: Meeting Ground Rules

This CEO Water Mandate event offers a unique opportunity for endorsing companies and other key stakeholders to share approaches and emerging practices, build relationships and explore partnership opportunities, and generate enthusiasm and consider near-term strategies for this new public-private initiatives.

The day and a half-long Working Conference offers a mix of panel presentations and discussion opportunities intended to foster in-depth deliberations. Rob Greenwood, as facilitator, is a neutral third party with no stake in the outcome of discussions. Although under contract to the Pacific Institute, he works for the process and treats all meeting participants as equal “clients.” The organizing team puts forward the following streamlined ground rules for all meeting participants to guide conference deliberations:

- *Active, focused participation:* The conference is structured to encourage an active exchange of idea among participants. Voicing these perspectives is essential to enable meaningful dialogue. To that end, we encourage attendees to actively participate in the discussion and fold in their perspectives throughout the day.
- *Constructive input:* Meeting participants are encouraged to frame observations in terms of needs and interests, not in terms of positions; opportunities for finding solutions increase dramatically when discussion focuses on needs and interests.
- *Respectful interaction:* Conference participants are encouraged to respect each other’s values and legitimacy of interests. We further ask that you strive to be open-minded and integrate participants’ ideas, perspectives and interests.
- *Focused comments:* Our 1.5 day-long agenda is ambitious, with many topics to cover and numerous perspectives to fold in. Given the limited time, we ask that participants keep their comments as succinct and focused as possible and help ensure that all participants have an opportunity to contribute their thoughts to the dialogue.
- *Chatham House Rule:* To encourage free discussion, workshop participants are welcome to share discussion points with other non-attendees, but comments are not to be attributed directly to particular speakers or entities (Chatham House Rule).
- *Other:* To keep the meeting as effective as possible, we ask that you honor the following meeting management aspects:
 - Keep cell phones off
 - Use scheduled breaks, as possible
 - Wait to be recognized before speaking
 - Avoid side-discussions

We look forward to a productive dialogue and thank you for your participation.