Expert Consultation on the practical application of the UNGPs to the activities of technology companies, including activities relating to artificial intelligence

Concept Note and Agenda

28 November, 10h-13h and 15h-18h CET, conference room XXIII, Palais des Nations (in person only)
Registration Link
29 November, 9h30-13.15h CET, conference room XXII, Palais des Nations and online
Registration Link

Background

The steady advancement of technological innovation has been at the centre of global governance discussions throughout 2024 and will be a priority for the decade ahead. Digital technologies, such as artificial intelligence (AI) - and more specifically generative AI – promise great potential to contribute to economic growth and sustainable development. At the same time, they need to be safeguarded against negative impacts on vulnerable groups and affected stakeholders more broadly.

A plethora of initiatives and approaches looking to govern AI responsibly are emerging, such as the G7 Hiroshima Process, the OECD AI Group of Experts as well as Net Mundial in Brazil, the AI Summit Seoul and the forthcoming AI Action Summit in France. The Global Digital Compact calls on States to root all approaches to digital governance in human rights and calls upon digital technology companies and developers to respect international human rights and principles, including through the application of human rights due diligence and impact assessments throughout the technology life cycle. The Global Digital Compact commits Member States "to respect, protect and promote human rights in the digital space" and to "uphold international human rights law throughout the life cycle of digital and emerging technologies so that users can safely benefit from digital technologies and are protected from violations, abuses and all forms of discrimination". It also recognizes "the responsibilities of all stakeholders in this endeavor" and calls on the private sector to apply the United Nations Guiding Principles on Business and Human Rights (UNGPs). Specifically, the Global Digital Compact requires "digital technology companies, developers and social media platforms to respect human rights online, be accountable for and take measures to mitigate and prevent abuses, and to provide access to effective remedy in line with the United Nations Guiding Principles on Business and Human Rights". The United Nations Secretary-General's High-level Advisory Body on AI's Final Report, "Governing AI for Humanity", has also been released and includes key recommendations to ensure that AI governance frameworks respects and promote human rights principles More broadly, the Human Rights Council, OHCHR and UN human rights mechanisms have highlighted that the promise of

digital technologies for transformational change to the benefit of humanity can only be realized when effectively guarding against the risk of harm to people.

Government responses need to be grounded in the existing frameworks and standards that provide principled and rights-based responses. For their part, and in relation to the responsibility to respect human rights, technology companies have called for more clarity and guidance on the practical application of the UNGPs to the activities of technology companies, including activities relating to AI. The authoritative global standard for preventing and addressing human rights harms connected to business activity, including in the tech sector, is the **UN Guiding Principles on Business and Human Rights (UNGPs)**, endorsed by the Human Rights Council in its resolution 17/4 of 16 June 2011.

Since its launch in 2019, the UN Human Rights B-Tech Project has sought to respond to the human rights challenges relating to the technology sector. Using the lens of the UNGPs, the B-Tech Project provides further clarity and guidance on the respective roles and responsibilities of States and technology companies to ensure respect for human rights in the development, deployment, and use of digital technologies. B-Tech has focused on Generative AI and its implications for the application of the UNGPs and has released guidance documents in November 2023, that set out key recommendations for a more effective understanding, mitigations and governance of the risks of Generative AI.

The Working Group on Business and Human Rights, taking stock of the first decade of implementation of the UNGPs, has stressed that "the UNGPs provide a compelling starting point for companies and States seeking to address the potential harms of digital technologies by effectively managing associated risks to people, as they precisely seek to manage the gap between rapid change (in this case technological change) and the capacity of society to manage its consequences".

Aims

Mandated by resolution 53/29 on "New and emerging digital technologies and human rights" and underpinned by the work of the B-Tech Project, OHCHR will convene a one and a half-day expert consultation to discuss challenges, good practices and lessons learnt in applying the UNGPs to the activities of technology companies, including activities relating to AI. Technology companies in the context of this consultation are defined as companies designing, developing and deploying AI. The consultation will also address key considerations about platform governance. The consultation's sessions will provide an introductory overview of the expectations of the UNGPs and focus on increasing both States and companies designing, developing and deploying AI in applying these expectations to digital technologies and business operations. The consultation aims to hear from diverse stakeholders on how States and companies designing, developing and deploying AI can apply the UNGPs to enhance the protection and respect for human rights in the context of digital technologies, and in particular AI. These discussions will feed into a report on the subject matter to be presented at the 59th session of the Human Rights Council in June 2025.

Format

The consultation will take place in room XXIII at the Palais des Nations. On 28 November, the consultation will be held in person only from 10-13h and 15-18h CET and on 29 November, the consultation will be held with hybrid modalities from 9.30 to 13h15.

For each session, there will be an opening panel of pre-identified speakers to help introduce the key issues and different stakeholder perspectives, followed by a period for open discussion.

Overview of Consultation Sessions

Session 1: UNGPs Pillar 1 State Duty to Protect human rights with regard to adverse impacts stemming from or being linked to new and emerging technologies, including AI and corporate activities

The framework for State action is set out in the UNGPs' Pillar I under the heading *The State Duty to Protect Human Rights* which affirms that States should adopt appropriate measures to prevent and address human rights abuses involving business, including companies designing, developing and deploying AI. This duty is anchored in State' existing human rights obligations and Pillar I elaborates on the legal, policy, and other measures States should adopt to protect people from harm.

The session will outline how the UNGPs conceptualize the State duty to protect human rights and how this duty applies to the governance of digital technologies, including AI, so that human rights are at the heart of State action to protect against the individual and societal risks posed by these technologies, while allowing the enormous potential for positive impact from innovative technologies to be realized.

The session will address the following key aspects of the State's duty to protect:

1. The foundations of the State duty to Protect as part of the UNGPs, including the concept of smart mix of regulatory and policy measures
2. Implications for policy coherence to address the complexity, scale, and fast evolving nature of the AI ecosystem and resulting human rights issues
3. Current trends towards regulatory efforts on AI as they relate to responsible business conduct, including but not limited to mandatory human rights due diligence and opportunities created by such trends which would apply to companies designing, developing and deploying AI.

Guiding questions:

1. How does the State duty to protect human rights apply with regard to the governance of AI?
2. What is the meaning of a "smart-mix" of measures in the context of digital technologies, and specifically AI?

3. Which policy measures and mandatory requirements are suitable to address the complexity, scale, and fast evolving nature of AI?

Background documents:

- "Bridging Governance Gaps in the Age of Technology – Key Characteristics of the State Duty to Protect", A B-Tech Foundational Paper
- Report of the Human Rights Council on the practical application of the UNGPs to the activities of technology companies (A/HRC/50/56)

Session 2: UNGPs Pillar 2: Corporate Responsibility to respect human rights in the context of activities of technology companies, including activities relating to AI

The responsibility to respect human rights (Pillar II) requires business enterprises to have in place policies and processes appropriate to their size and circumstances, including:

- Making a publicly available policy commitment at the most senior level and embedding responsibility to respect human rights throughout operational policies and procedures;
- Carrying out human rights due diligence processes, which entails:
  - Conducting human rights impact assessments to identify and assess any actual or potentially adverse human rights impacts; such human rights impact assessment needs to be part of a wider human rights due diligence approach
  - Integrating those assessments and taking appropriate action to prevent and mitigate adverse human rights impacts that have been identified;
  - Tracking the effectiveness of their efforts;
  - Reporting formally on how they have addressed their human rights impacts.
- Providing remediation or cooperating in remediation of abuse where the company identifies adverse impacts that it has caused or to which it has contributed.

The requirement for companies to undertake human rights due diligence across their activities and business relationships to identify, prevent, mitigate and account for how they address the actual and potential human rights harms stemming from or being linked to digital technologies is a central element to their corporate responsibility. The corporate responsibility to respect human rights applies to all business enterprises, regardless of their size, sector, location, ownership, or structure.

The human rights due diligence requirement extends to a company's products and services, beyond its sites, factories, supply chains, or corporate offices. This is highly relevant when considering the impacts of digital technologies, and AI in particular, as it is mostly in their use that human rights harms will manifest.

The session will provide an overview of how companies designing, developing and deploying digital technologies as well as civil society have begun to apply the key expectations of the Corporate Responsibility to Respect in their work, and what are distinct core expectations towards corporate human rights due diligence and challenges with regard to AI.

Guiding questions:

1. What progress and challenges exist with regard to companies implementing the following key features of corporate respect for human rights with regard to AI?
    a. Policy commitment, and Governance
    b. Building internal competence and skills to address human rights risks
    c. Identifying and acting on the most significant risks to people associated with the design, development and use of technology products and services
    d. Engaging users and non-user rights holders in human rights due diligence
    e. Delivering or enabling remedy for human rights harms
2. What is the status of corporate reporting and transparency about how companies designing, developing and deploying AI identify and address potential and actual human rights impacts?
3. What are investors, civil society, academia and collective action initiatives doing to advance respect for human rights by companies designing, developing and deploying AI?

Background documents:

- Key Characteristics of Business Respect for Human Rights
- Identifying Human Rights Risks Related to End-Use
- Taking Action to Address Human Rights Risks Related to End-Use
- Advancing Responsible Development and Deployment of Generative AI. A UN B-Tech foundational paper
- Taxonomy of Generative AI Human Rights Harms, a B-Tech Gen AI Project supplement
- A/HRC/50/56 on the practical application of the UNGPs to the activities of technology companies

Session 3: Pillar 3: Accountability and remedy for the human rights harms resulting from the use of technologies, and in particular AI

Beside the positive effects brought by digital technologies and AI specifically, their use by companies, State agencies, consumers and the wider public can also change people's lives for the worse, sometimes in severe and irreparable ways. Through Pillar III, the UNGPs offer States, companies designing, developing and deploying AI as well as investors, and advocacy organizations a robust and credible framework for remedying human rights harms resulting from the use of technologies. The framework is grounded in the right to an effective remedy, which is enshrined in international human rights law.

Depending on the nature of a particular case or situation, victims of adverse human rights impacts from digital technologies should be able to obtain remedy through effective judicial or non-judicial State-based grievance mechanisms. Indeed, the UNGPs divide mechanisms for seeking and delivering remedies for business-related human rights harms into three main types:

- judicial mechanisms,
- State-based non-judicial mechanisms, such as mechanisms connected with the State which may have the potential to deliver remedies in some shape or form, such as regulators, ombudspersons, inspectorates, public complaints handling bodies, National Contact Points

under the OECD Guidelines for Multinational Enterprises and national human rights institutions; and
- non-State-based grievance mechanisms (i.e. remediation mechanisms that are developed and administered by private entities such as companies or, in some cases, industry associations or multi-stakeholder groups).

The session will refer to the three categories of grievance mechanisms for accountability and remedy in cases of business-related human rights abuse related to digital technologies, including AI: Judicial mechanisms; State-based non-judicial mechanisms; and non-State-based grievance mechanisms, with a view to discuss how each fit within the broader remedy ecosystem. Drawing from the findings of phase III of the OHCHR Accountability and Remedy Project, the role of company-based grievance mechanisms in this complex, fast-moving and dynamic sector, as well as the challenges that may be encountered in responding to specific types of AI-related harm (e.g. adverse impacts resulting from decisions based on algorithms) will be discussed. The various ways that States can drive and support the development of a well-functioning system of remedies for technology-related harms that properly responds to the needs of rights-holders will also be explored.

Guiding questions:

1. What are the challenges related to the ability of State-based judicial and non-judicial grievance mechanisms to provide for accountability and remedy in case of human rights abuses relating to AI? And what are potential solutions to address and/or overcome such challenges?
2. Which types of company-based grievance mechanisms are companies designing, developing and deploying AI providing and what kinds of adverse human rights impacts are most commonly addressed by them?
3. What are good practices for remedial responses?

Background documents:

- Access to remedy and the technology sector: basic concepts and principles;
- Access to remedy and the technology sector: a "remedy ecosystem" approach;
- Designing and implementing effective company-based grievance mechanisms; and
- Access to remedy and the technology sector: understanding the perspectives and needs of affected people and groups
- A/HRC/50/56 on the practical application of the UNGPs to the activities of technology companies
- The Accountability and Remedy Project (ARP) aimed at strengthening the implementation of the Access to Remedy pillar of the UNGPs, has produced recommendations for enhancing the effectiveness of the three different categories of grievance mechanisms referred to in Pillar III (background on ARP).

- **Session 4: Human Rights Due Diligence for AI across diverse geographies with a view to integrating diverse stakeholders/affected communities and people**

The UNGPs emphasize stakeholder engagement as a key element of the Human Rights Due Diligence (HRDD) process; under UNGP 18, companies should seek to understand the concerns of potentially affected stakeholders by consulting them directly in a manner that takes into account language and other potential barriers to effective engagement. Companies' requirements for a successful stakeholder engagement necessitate identification, first, of the rightsholders that may be potentially affected by companies' decisions and actions. In the area of digital technology, this encompasses users and customers of products and services, and given the vast scope of the sector, the scale of these affected stakeholders may vary widely. The UNGPs focus on three types of stakeholders who have a strong understanding of the complexity of business decisions and processes, and related human rights impacts:

- Affected stakeholders; any individual or group whose human rights have been affected by an enterprises' operations, products, or services;
- Credible proxies; individuals or groups who are recognized as legitimate representatives of affected stakeholders; and
- Expert stakeholders; individuals or groups with expert knowledge about the impacts of business on people's human rights.

AI as a technology which enables the execution of additional products and services encompasses a broad and diverse set of relevant stakeholders. In order to gauge what the human rights risks are and to assess what their impact is, it is important to involve potentially affected groups and other stakeholders in this process. Additionally, a significant component of the HRDD process involves the communication of the identification and mitigation of risks by a company; the speed at which AI-augmented tools and services are developed in the present day suggests that many developers, in order to hasten the HRDD process, omit or truncate the communication piece, which is problematic and adversely impacts stakeholders who may have been consulted in the development process, but who are subsequently not informed of related decisions related to design, development, or rollout of a technology.

This session will explore roles and responsibilities of companies designing, developing and deployment AI to carry out meaningfully stakeholder engagement, and discuss expectations from affected stakeholders about how doing so in a rights-respecting manner.

Guiding questions:

1. How can stakeholders be meaningfully engaged as part of human rights due diligence throughout the lifecycle of AI-supported technologies?
2. How can AI developers ensure that red teaming exercises are representative of affected stakeholders, in addition to expert stakeholders?
3. What are existing gaps in company practice with regard to stakeholder engagement in relation to AI and how could these be addressed?

Background documents:

- Five Practices to Improve Stakeholder Engagement in Tech Company Due Diligence (B-Tech)

- Key Characteristics of Business Respect for Human Rights (B-Tech Foundational Paper)

- **Session 5: Gender, AI and the role of business**

While there is great potential for new technologies, including AI, to contribute to the empowerment of women and gender equality in, inter alia, education, employment and communication, there are also very well documented severe risks to women and girls stemming from their use. The term "women" and "women and girls" refers to women and girls in all their diversity, including their diversity in sexuality, gender identity and sex characteristics. Examples of such negative impacts include the gender digital divide regarding access to the internet and digital technologies, as well as the lack of women's equal participation and representation in innovation and development of digital technologies; digital technologies used to incite online violence against women, as well as abuse and harassment; surveillance, censorship and threats to privacy rights, particularly regarding women's bodily autonomy and intimate lives. Digital technologies have also been reported to amplify and perpetuate gender biases and stereotypes, and leading to algorithmic discrimination – for example, in the context of employment advertising and recruitment tools. These negative impacts all have an intersectional dimension, as women and girls face multiple and intersecting forms of discrimination based on a variety of factors, such as race, class, literacy, and social, cultural, and economic norms, resulting in both compounded barriers to technology use, and compounded negative impacts.

While these risks vary and are context-specific, a key aspect is that tech companies developing and deploying these digital technologies are expected to effectively identify, prevent, and mitigate these risks. In that regard, the UNGPs set clear expectations about the respective roles and responsibilities of States and the private sector. Applying the UNGPs framework in relation to the impact of technologies on women and girls can help devise meaningful strategies to tackle them and deliver on the implementation of the Global Digital Compact.

The session will discuss the key considerations relevant to understanding the implications of the UNGPs for the State duty to protect women's and girls' rights, the company responsibility to respect these rights, and the shared responsibility of States and companies to provide remedies.

The State's duty to protect human rights includes the protection of women' and children' rights from abuse by third parties, such as businesses. To ensure adequate protection, States should consider a comprehensive array of preventative and remedial measures, such as legislation, regulations, policies, and adjudication.

Equally, the corporate responsibility for respecting human rights encompasses the rights of women and girls. The UNGPs General Principles highlight that the UNGPs should be implemented in a non-discriminatory manner, with particular attention to the rights and needs of, as well as the challenges faced by, individuals from groups or populations that may be at heightened risk of becoming vulnerable or marginalized, and with due regard to the different risks that may be faced by women and men. The commentary on UNGP 18 stipulates that business enterprises should respect the human rights of all rights holders, paying *"special attention to any particular human rights impacts on individuals from groups or populations that may be at heightened risk of*

vulnerability or marginalisation." Under UNGP 3, it is noted that this includes women and children.

In terms of proactively addressing gender-based impacts, the UNGPs expect that businesses, including companies designing, developing and deploying AI, have:

- A policy commitment to meet their responsibility to respect human rights;
- A human rights due diligence process to identify, prevent, mitigate and account for how they address their impacts on human rights;
- Processes to enable the remediation of any adverse human rights impacts they cause or to which they contribute.

UNGPs Pillar III stipulate the duties and responsibilities of states and business respectively to provide access to effective remedy for human rights harm by business. States not only have the obligations to ensure accountability and remedy for human rights violations committed by state actors - they must also take appropriate steps to ensure that women and girls victims of adverse human rights impacts from digital technologies, including AI, have access to effective remedy. Depending on the nature of a particular case or situation, victims of adverse human rights impacts from digital technologies should be able to achieve remedy through effective judicial or non-judicial state-based grievance mechanisms.

Guiding questions:

- How does the state's duty to protect the human rights of women and girls apply in the technology sector, including providing appropriate guidance to businesses, or specific regulatory action, by recognizing the challenges that may be faced by women and girls?
- How does companies designing, developing and deploying AI' responsibility towards women and girls apply regarding impacts stemming from, or being linked to, digital technologies, and how can a gender lens be integrated into human rights due diligence?
- What are the gender-related challenges to the ability of State-based judicial and non-judicial grievance mechanisms to provide for accountability and remedy in case of human rights abuses relating to companies designing, developing and deploying AI? What are potential solutions to address and/or overcome such challenges? How can companies designing, developing and deploying AI make a more positive and proactive contribution to providing remedy addressing technology-related harms, from a gender perspective?

Background document:

- Report by the Working Group on business and Human rights on gender lens to the Guiding Principles on Business and Human Rights (A/HRC/41/43)

- **Session 6: The investment ecosystem and its role in incentivizing corporate respect for human rights in the technology sector, in particular AI**

Investors enjoy unique influence over companies designing, developing and deploying AI' governance and decision-making. In different ways, public equity and private capital investors have access to levers of influence that allow them to encourage companies designing, developing and deploying AI to move their business models in more rights-respecting directions. Indeed, investors using their leverage to encourage portfolio companies to conduct human rights due diligence and adequately address human rights risks and impacts is a key element of investors' own responsibility to respect human rights.

In the technology sector, a growing number of investors demonstrate a willingness to more vocally advocate for portfolio companies to make changes to business models to prevent or mitigate serious adverse human rights impacts. Some investors also maintain human rights or sustainability-based exclusion criteria that prevent them from making investments that carry high levels of human rights risk in the first place.

Within this global push for responsible digital governance spurred by the Global Digital Compact (GDC), multilateral development banks (MDBs) and development finance institutions (DFIs), play an important role in realizing a rights-respecting digital transformation. MDBs are funding an ever-increasing range of digital projects and initiatives, bringing the benefits of digitalization to millions across the globe. At the same time, such investments can also have profound and pervasive adverse human rights impacts. If DFIs make decisions and provide finance in a rights-respecting manner, development finance can act as a powerful driver of responsible digitalization. Technology design and development, and consequential risk management actions today may have impacts for generations to come.

Going forward, it is crucial that more technology investors incorporate these strategies into their decision-making. Applying a human rights lens to pre-investment due diligence, assessing the adequacy of portfolio companies' own human rights due diligence processes, encouraging improvements to these processes where necessary, advocating for portfolio companies to make specific business model changes where necessary to address serious human rights risks—all of these strategies, when implemented by investors, tangibly reduce the level and scope of human rights risks connected to the development, deployment, and use of digital technologies, including AI.

Progress has been made toward normalizing these practices among investors. However, effective protection against technology-related human rights abuses requires that these practices continue to be mainstreamed, including among the large institutional investors that own the majority of public equities around the world and the venture capital investors who finance the cutting-edge startups responsible for some of the most influential technologies we interact with every day.

This is especially true amid the ongoing proliferation of AI technology. While AI can facilitate many positive impacts on the lives of humans, it can also erode individual freedoms, undercut livelihoods, reinforce inequalities, and undermine norms and institutions designed to uphold democratic values and protect human rights. Technology investors have a key role to play in

ensuring that the development, deployment, and use of AI do not negatively impact human rights. In particular, it is key that these investors advocate strongly for AI developing companies to incorporate robust forms of human rights due diligence early in AI software development cycles, so that potential adverse human rights impacts can be identified early and mitigated appropriately.

This session will explore the importance of investors as actors influencing companies toward respect of human rights; the key elements of investors' own responsibilities to respect human rights; the extent to which technology investors today are carrying out human rights due diligence; and possible strategies going forward for the human rights community to continue influencing investors toward respect for human rights.

Guiding questions:

1. What are the responsibilities of investors with regard to encouraging rights-respecting company conduct in the AI ecosystem
2. Which guidance exists to depict measures that investors can adopt to contribute to responsible business conduct of companies designing, developing, and deploying AI?
3. Which strategies could be used by the human rights community to continue influencing investors toward respect for human rights?

Background documents:

- Rights-Respecting Investment in Technology Companies
- B-Tech Institutional Investor Business Models Tool
- Venture Capital, Technology Startups, and Human Rights: a Primer for General Partners and Limited Partners
- Human Rights Toolkit for Venture Capital General Partners
- Human Rights Toolkit for Venture Capital Limited Partners

Consultation agenda

Day 1	**Thematic topic**
10.00-10.30 CET	Opening remarks Peggy Hicks, Director TESPRRD, OHCHR Introduction to the consultation Lene Wendland, Senior Advisor, Business and tech, OHCHR
10.30-13.00 CET	UNGPs Pillar 1: State Duty to Protect human rights with regard to adverse impacts stemming from or being linked to the activities of technology companies ("the smart mix" of voluntary and mandatory measures), including activities relating to AI • Anna Walch, Permanent Mission of Austria

	• Youngmin Kwon, Permanent Mission of the Republic of Korea • Marie Humeau, Permanent Mission of the Netherlands in their capacity as the Freedom Online Coalition Chair • Olivier Alais, ITU • Rashad Abelson, OECD • Frederike Kaltheuner, AI Now • Heloisa Massaro, Internet Lab • Jan Gerlach, Wikimedia • Peter Micek, Access Now Moderator: Isabel Ebert, OHCHR, B-tech Project
13.00-15.00 CET	*Break*
15.00-16.30 CET	UNGPs Pillar 2: Corporate Responsibility to respect human rights in the context of activities of technology companies, including activities relating to AI • Radka Sibille, EU Delegation to the UN in Geneva • Jin Wha, Kakao, Kakao Group • Ncumisa Willie, Vodacom • Sani Suleiman Sani, Paradigm Initiative • Wahyudi Djafar, ELSAM • Taysir Mathlouthi, 7amleh Moderator: Tim Engelhardt, OHCHR
16.30-18.00 CET	UNGPs Pillar 3: Accountability and remedy for the human rights harms resulting from the use of technologies, and in particular AI • Atnike Nova Sigiro, National Commission on Human Rights, Indonesia • Pooja Larvin, Oversight Board • Prasanth Sugathan, SFLC • Isedua Oribhabor, Access Now Moderator: Nathalie Stadelmann, OHCHR, B-Tech Project
Day 2	
9.30-11.00 CET	Human Rights Due Diligence for AI across diverse geographies with a view to integrating diverse stakeholders/affected communities and people • Myoungshin Kim, LG AI Research • Matthias Thorns, Samsung • Maria Paz, Global Partners Digital • Mahsa Alimardani, Article 19

	Moderator: Isabel Ebert, OHCHR, B-Tech Project
11.00-12.00 CET	Gender, AI and the role of business • Kameni Chaddha, Permanent Mission of the United Kingdom • Ashutosh Chadha, Microsoft • Mona Thaya, Digital Action (virtual) • Caitlin Kraft-Buchman, Women at the Table • Paloma Lara Castro, Derechos Digitales Moderator: Nathalie Stadelmann, OHCHR, B-Tech Project
12.00-13.00 CET	The investment ecosystem and its role in incentivizing corporate respect for human rights in the technology sector, in particular AI • Anna Warberg, Council on Ethics, Swedish National Pension Funds (virtual) • Stephan Sonnenberg, Seoul National University (virtual) • Benjamin Chekroun, Candriam (virtual) • Mac Darrow, OHCHR • Josianne Galea Baron, UNICEF Moderator: Isabel Ebert , OHCHR, B-Tech Project
13.00 – 13.15 CET	*Next steps and closing*