

Report on the Ways to Take the Opportunity of "Business and Human Rights" Requirements in Contemporary Sustainable Society

CSR Committee, Business Policy Forum, Japan

March 2022

Executive Summary

<Index>

Introduction

Chapter 1: General Trends of Business and Human Rights (BHR)

- (1) "Guiding Principles on Business and Human Rights" of the United Nations (the UNGPs)**
- (2) General Trends of BHR**

Chapter 2: Current Situation of Legal Regulations and Court Cases, Rule Making Processes and Behaviors of Institutional Investors Regarding Business and Human Rights (BHR) Issues

- (1) Current Situation of Legal Regulations and Court Cases**
- (2) Current Situation of Processes to Establish Legal Regulation in EU**
- (3) Current Situation of Behaviors of Institutional Investors**

Chapter 3: Current Situation of Corporate Actions for Business and Human Rights (BHR) Issues

- (1) Current Situation of Actions of Japanese Corporations for BHR Issues**
- (2) Corporate Actions from Interviews and Open Articles for BHR Issues**

Chapter 4: Evaluation and Suggestion to Upgrade Related Actions for Business and Human Rights (BHR) of Japanese Companies

- (1) Framework in Evaluating the Level of "Maturity" on Related Actions for BHR**
- (2) Suggestions**

Member of CSR committee of Business Policy Forum, Japan

Introduction

✓ **10 Years since Guiding Principles:**

- 10 years have passed since the "Guiding Principles on Business and Human Rights (the UNGPs)" were endorsed at the Human Rights Council (HRC) of the United Nations in 2011 to present the framework of challenges for governments and companies. Since then, the UNGPs have become widespread as the international standard. Many governments have established National Action Plans (NAP) and introduced legal regulations. A large number of global companies have established their own human rights policies and innovated their due diligence processes.
- In these circumstances, practical topics, such as appropriate ways to perform the UNGPs, or to clear the discrepancies between the policies and the real implementation by both governments and companies, have become the subject of wide attention.

✓ **Overall Trends of Business and Human Rights (BHR):**

- Social circumstances concerning Business and Human Rights (BHR) have now been elevated to a more serious situation. The kind of negative impacts from worsening environmental issues including climate change, or from new technologies like artificial intelligence are now broadly acknowledged. Furthermore, a conflicting social structure was revealed in the period of reduced stability by dictatorial and violent politics, a populism type movement, and expanded disparity in wealth, concurrently with the outbreak of the COVID-19 pandemic, where human rights of those vulnerable were not fully respected.
- In this period of time, the Japanese government launched its "National Action Plan on Business and Human Rights (2020-2025)" and revised the "Corporate Governance Code" to specify the responsibility of the board of directors to respect human rights. In addition, the introduction of guidelines of due diligence for human rights is now under discussion.

✓ **Background and Targets of this Report:**

- The main objective of this report is to summarize major challenges and measures of companies through research on on-going actions of progressive corporations in order to suggest all companies to upgrade and advance the actions regarding BHR.

- This report is intended to be read by top managers, board members and leaders related to BHR issues of all companies, and it can be referred to by companies of all fields and all scales in Japan.

Chapter 1: General Trends of Business and Human Rights (BHR)

(1) "Guiding Principles on Business and Human Rights" of the United Nations (the UNGPs)

- The UNGPs were established to control the governance gaps, or difference in capacity, among societies to properly manage the adverse consequences of human rights brought by multi-national corporations that grew in the globalized economy.
- The UNGPs are composed of 3 pillars, which are, (a) the state duty to protect human rights, (b) the corporate responsibility to respect human rights, and (c) access to remedies. The most important indication of the UNGPs is that government and corporations have different but complementary roles in settling human rights infringements. This concept provides a common global framework for various stakeholders to work together for BHR.
- In this framework, companies are asked to establish and pledge to abide by their own policies to respect human rights, and to move to practice the due diligence programs in which they identify, evaluate, prevent and reduce and account for adverse human rights impacts.
- The phases of human right impacts caused by companies are classified into three stages. These are, (a) to cause adverse impacts, (b) to contribute to adverse effects through its own activities, or (c) the situation that their operations, products or services are directly linked to the adverse effects through their business relationships. Adverse impacts should be addressed depending on the actual stage of the situation.
- Proper grievance mechanisms should be established to have appropriate measures according to the states, companies and society as a whole so those who were adversely impacted can be protected appropriately.

(2) General Trends of BHR

- ✓ **Enlarged Scope of Business and Human Rights Issues:**

- The scope of human rights now is no longer limited to traditional human rights such as harassment, discrimination and forced or child labor, but has expanded to include human rights issues caused by new technologies like artificial intelligence (AI), and environment issues including climate change.
- ✓ **Expanded Disparity Brought during the COVID-19 Pandemic:**
 - The COVID-19 pandemic has brought intense impacts on those vulnerable, especially females, children, disabled and the poor. This situation is now influencing companies and investors to accept the perception that dealing with human rights and social justice will lead to constructing a more resilient society, together with the spread of the "Black Lives Matter" movement that occurred in the USA during the same period.
- ✓ **Development of New Technology and Human Rights:**
 - The way to construct appropriate regulations for new technologies is under intense discussion since both development and introduction in the society of new technologies including AI has progressed thus far. One of the major topics of discussion is the accountability-gap, or lack of sufficient explanations.
 - Companies are urged to be accountable for their own actions while being sensitive to the potential infringement of human rights when using AI technology, and furthermore, are advised to take part in rule-making processes from either the supply side or demand side of new technologies.
- ✓ **Geopolitical Risk and Human Rights:**
 - In recent years, higher risk cases have been observed when the action of a state to contribute to adverse human rights impacts does induce creation of real adverse human right impacts by a closely related company.
 - In order to prevent and mitigate adverse human right impacts, companies should enhance their due diligence programs and take appropriate action to mitigate detected effects. In a case where a company is not able to prevent or mitigate adverse impacts sufficiently, ending the operation, temporarily or permanently, taking account of credible assessments of the potential impacts of doing so, is an important option to have.
 - In addition, it is important for companies to develop joint works with other companies, or to engage in discussions and collective actions with stakeholders, such as NGOs, states and others, as well as to disclose their processes and outcomes in a transparent manner. Internal decisions of a

company for those actions that should affect its business results greatly should directly be made by the top executives, which must be extremely difficult for only the directors in charge.

Chapter 2: Current Situation of Legal Regulations and Court Cases, Rule Making Processes and Behaviors of Institutional Investors Regarding Business and Human Rights (BHR) Issues

(1) Current Situation of Legal Regulations and Court Cases

- ✓ **Effects on Japanese Businesses of Legal Regulations or Soft Laws of Foreign States Regarding Human Rights**
 - Applying domestic rules to business activities performed outside of the jurisdiction are challenged by some foreign states through various methods, including extraterritorial application of domestic regulations, rules to require companies to oversee activities of customers in the supply and related chains, economic sanction and trade restrictions, or conditioned deregulation. This situation has started to have real effects on Japanese companies.
 - In addition, de facto rules are set up by various stakeholders beyond state regulations. These actual rules may also have a potential influence on business activities, together with state regulations.

- ✓ **Situation of Court Cases and Judgements or Non-Judicial Remedies Regarding Human Rights**
 - Traditionally, the judicial system did not allow for dealing with issues that occurred outside of its legal jurisdiction. However, recently some court decisions of several states ruled that a parent corporation based in the country of the court had responsibility to ensure its affiliated companies do not cause adverse human right effects, even though those adverse effects occurred in other countries.
 - There is another current tendency regarding the standard of non-judicial remedies, in which whether sufficient human rights due diligence is carried out or not plays a major role in evaluating the responsibility of a parent corporation, concerning adverse human right effects caused by subsidiary corporations or related companies in the supply chains in foreign countries.

(2) Current Situation of Processes to Establish Legal Regulation in EU

- In February of 2022, a proposal for an EU Directive on "Corporate Sustainability Due Diligence" was made public. The proposal prescribes that all corporations over a certain magnitude are required to perform due diligence regarding themselves, affiliated companies and other companies they have strong business relations with. This rule may require Japanese businesses, if enacted, to take corresponding actions through the lines of supply chains or value chains.
- Regarding EU rules for sustainable finance, the "Sustainable Finance Disclosure Regulation (SFDR)," which stipulates the framework on information disclosure to end-investors by asset management firms and institutional investors, became effective in February of 2022, and the detailed enforcement regulations will be put into operation in the near future. The regulation will ask financial investors to disclose activities for human rights protection performed by companies they invested in.
- Another related regulation in EU is the "Corporate Sustainability Reporting Directive (CSRD)," which requires non-financial companies to disclose their information on sustainability, and is scheduled to be put into enforcement in 2023.

(3) Current Situation of Behaviors of Institutional Investors

- An international group of institutional investors, "Principles for Responsible Investment (PRI)," which has more than 3800 signatories, has chosen climate change and human rights as its focus themes of the annual meetings for the past 5 years consecutively.
- Other benchmark frameworks are also established through joint works with NGOs, such as "Know the Chain," that evaluate corporate activities to deal with the potential risk of forced labor, or the "Corporate Human Rights Benchmark (CHRB)," that assesses total activities for human rights of a company with a specific focus on industry sectors that have higher risks in human right infringement. Some institutional investors overseas have come to utilize these benchmarks as a standard in executing voting rights.
- Foreign investors, in general, tend to place higher emphasis on social matters than Japanese investors. Research by Japan's Government Pension Investment Fund (GPIF) on materiality among its entrusted institutions says that passive-style investors, both domestic and foreign, values the

importance of climate change, diversity and the supply-chain the highest. It showed, at the same time, that domestic active-style investors place their main priority on governance issues, but foreign investors of this style set their top priority on the climate change issue, followed by health and safety, human rights and local community issues.

Chapter 3: Current Situation of Corporate Actions for Business and Human Rights (BHR) Issues

(1) Current Situation of Actions of Japanese Corporations for BHR Issues

The result of joint research carried out by the Ministry of Economy, Trade and Industry and Ministry of Foreign Affairs was made public in November of 2021 that surveyed listed enterprises in the 1st and 2nd section of the Tokyo Stock Exchange and similar scale companies (total number of respondents: 760). The CSR Committee had previously carried out similar research in 2018 for almost the same magnitude of enterprises (total number of respondents: 373). The current situation of the activities for BHR of Japanese corporations is evaluated as follows, from the comparison of the research.

✓ Level of Familiarity for Human Rights Issues

- The levels of familiarity on both UNGPs and Due Diligence for Human Rights showed an increase from the 2018 research result. This suggests that corporate recognition for human rights issues has advanced steadily in the period of extended concern for BHR.

✓ Establishing Own Policies for Human Rights

- The numbers of corporations that established their own policies for human rights has increased in the past 3 years. The 2018 research showed that a large number of corporations had revised their own policies during the preceding 2 years to place more emphasis on human rights reflecting the expansion of ESG investments. This move is thought to be continuing.

✓ Implementing Due Diligence Processes

- The number of respondents for the government research in 2021 was much larger than that of the 2018 research. Considering that the level of actual

processes of due diligence varies depending on the corporation, further detailed research is expected concerning the real steps to evaluate adverse effects, actual methods to prevent or mitigate adverse effects, to follow-up on the found cases, and to disclose related information.

- Corporations which had not taken steps of due diligence in the research replied stating that they were lacking sufficient knowledge, experienced staff or funds to deal with it.

✓ **Organizing Grievance mechanism**

- Half of the respondents for the 2021 research answered that they have launched their own guidelines or procedures to protect sufferers and address business-related human rights infringement, whereas only 30% of the respondents for the 2018 research stated that their remedy processes covered their suppliers that were considered to have higher risks on human right issues. More detailed studies on the targets of complaint or grievance systems and on the results of implementation would be appreciated in future research.

✓ **Disclosure of Information**

- The 2021 research showed that more than half of the respondents said they disclosed related information, but detailed contents of the answers were not made public. The 2018 research result showed that under 10% of the corporations disclosed their distinct human right topics or performances based on Key Performance indicators.

✓ **Proposals from Corporations in the 2021 Research**

- The group of corporations that engaged in human right tasks in a positive manner raised proposals in the 2021 research about international unification of related regulations and institutions, further support for acquiring information on overseas systems, and building up more familiarity among domestic society and companies. Among other groups of corporations which had not promoted related programs that much, almost half of them stated that they have little information on how to deal with the issues, and many of them expected to be provided with more information regarding actual cases of due diligence activities of other corporations.

(2) Corporate Actions from Interviews and Open Articles for BHR Issues

The CSR committee interviewed 10 Japanese corporations in 2021 together with 5 foreign corporations through open articles.

A) Establishing and Committing to Own Policies (related to UNGPs #16)

- Typical practices of each interviewee corporation were to establish and make its own policies on human rights public based on the core requirements of UNGPs after sufficient discussion among top management, related divisions and outside experts.
- Some examples of the actions were as follows;
 - to update their own policies considering both the situations of extended social perception on BHR and the stage of progress of their internal programs,
 - to re-organize the policies to integrate them with total and multifaceted corporate visions, or to explain the relation between corporate visions or purposes and human rights values,
 - to put together new programs to deal with specific tasks, or
 - to publish a message when a new socially distinctive event occurs.
- It is their own policies for human rights that work as practical criteria to decide appropriate responses when a risk event happens. Policies of superficial words are not useful for real actions and they are not effective for promoting internal shared understanding. Periodical improvement of their own policies for operating procedures and reinforcing a team structure is highly advised for assuming fair responsibility to prevent and mitigate human rights infringement.

B) Organizing Internal Structure and Education (related to UNGPs #16)

- Each interviewee corporation designated a board member and a division in charge during the process of establishing its own policies, and organized its internal structure regarding both the regular processes of the whole company and on specific actions for each risk event. In many cases the division of CSR or Sustainability was in charge of the management of the total internal processes in cooperation with related divisions.
- Major responses in the interviews underlined the importance of facilitating further understanding of human rights and encouraging employees to consider the corporate risks from BHR as their own tasks, when they would share and disseminate their own policies among the whole corporation. One

company stated that its experience in another country coping with more advanced local regulations accelerated momentum to promote this throughout the whole company.

- These answers suggest the important values in re-organizing internal processes to be more effective in minimizing human right risks. The following steps should be vital in tackling those challenges;
 - to coordinate general processes of the whole company and case-by-case reactions for specific events,
 - to share related tasks between the headquarters and its branches abroad with appropriate coordination,
 - to set up a roadmap or indexes to track performances of the procedures periodically, and
 - to review and re-organize, if needed, related processes or institutions based on the possible transition of social circumstances.

C) Collecting Information and Assessing Adverse Human Right Effects (related to UNGPs #18)

- When evaluating adverse human right effects, it is important to look widely over the whole business value chain without prejudice for the kind of possible risks, and to start tackling issues one by one based on priorities from risk levels examined according to the characteristics of the business style and sectors.
- Many interviewee corporations set their priorities in the area of supply-chains, and thus, made a questionnaire survey in the form of the self-assessed questionnaire (SAQ) method over their direct suppliers, and made periodical inspections including site visits to the operations of the areas or suppliers that were found to have higher risks in human rights. In a case where a company deals with diverse and varied goods and services, the company made several limited extraction surveys over its direct suppliers, considering that setting a priority on higher risk factors was not practical.
- Concerning indirect suppliers, some companies whose risk factors were specified, implemented intensive surveys over their specific indirect suppliers of the risk area. At the same time, most of the interviewee corporations had not started their surveys with indirect suppliers.
- Regarding the downstream-side of the value-chain, or customers, it seems that most companies had not started sufficient actions.
- For how to gather necessary information to select risk sectors or areas, the

following methods were mentioned by many corporations;

- implementing employee interviews and questionnaire surveys in the company,
 - collecting information of general research or other companies,
 - engaging in discussions with stakeholders, or
 - utilizing an outside database to get objective criteria to select target sectors and areas.
- These results show the need for Japanese corporations to arrange and disclose the situation of the business operations in the whole supply chain step by step, starting from direct suppliers and widening it to suppliers of different stages. It is also recommended to develop grievance mechanisms to be used by any party concerned in the supply chains, especially with raw material sources.

D) Preventing and Mitigating Adverse Impacts and Tracking the Effectiveness of Remedies (related to UNGPs #19 & 20)

- All of the interviewee companies introduced some measures to prevent and mitigate possible adverse effects. Many of them said they asked their suppliers and customers to improve the situation, and that they made it a rule to monitor the actions taken afterwards when they found something that needed to be improved in a survey carried out by SAQ or others.
- The approaches to improve and reform the situation are different depending on the kind of detected risks of BHR. An example of measures to deal with risks concerning raw materials in the manufacturing sector were to cooperate with NGOs especially in understanding and disclosing the situation of supply chains, and in settling problems of local society related to production processes in factories. Another example of solutions regarding the employment conditions for foreign workers and technical trainees, which is recognized as one of Japan's risks, was to grasp the situation by conducting interviews with the persons concerned and devising appropriate measures to improve the situation.
- In general, major corporations are expected to influence their customers and suppliers properly to prevent and mitigate the adverse effects that might happen during a series of operations. In the last few years, the scope of the expectation among societies has expanded to the suppliers of primary raw materials. Many of the problems are rooted in the social structure and it is not easy for a single corporation to settle the issues. This is why collective

actions are in definite need in order to solve the structural problems.

E) Disclosure of Related Information (related to UNGPs #21)

- Most of the interviewee companies disclosed their procedures and systems regarding their own policies, internal operation systems, processes of due diligence for human rights, typical examples of employee education and arrangements of grievance services, while only a small number made their detailed results public on how these measures actually worked.
- Several Japanese corporations have now made their special report solely on human right issues public. Some of the interviewee companies also disclosed detailed information on supplier lists or supply-chain trees, results of their surveys for direct suppliers, and outcomes and reactions in their grievance mechanism. Many stated that they elaborately responded to inquiries from NGOs, with additional surveys about the real situation, if necessary, and that they share the results among related divisions for the next surveys.
- It is recommended for the sake of providing effective information to institutional investors that corporations disclose their results of the PDCA management operations, especially about the scope, methods, findings, reactions and implications for future operations regarding their due diligence programs, in addition to information of the regular check-box format for ESG index evaluation.

F) Establishing Grievance Mechanisms (related to UNGPs #22, 29-31)

- All interviewee companies set up a contact center for their own employees, however the percentage of interviewees which have established contact centers for all the employees of their affiliated group companies both in Japan and abroad is limited. Examples of the cases include cases in which a lot of work had taken place to disseminate the information of the contact center among their employees, and that a new PC application that can be operated in multiple languages was introduced for foreign workers.
- Some companies stated that they set up contact centers for specific lines of supply-chains. The grievance mechanism framework of collective actions among NGOs, business associations and governments is now under consideration and preparation in Japan as well as in other countries, considering that it has a lot of merits in cost, management load, efficiency

and accessibility for users.

- The critical objectives of the grievance mechanism are, first of all, to monitor and analyze the general patterns of grievance contacts, and secondly, to identify the basic causes of possible adverse human right effects, and to prevent and mitigate them in early stages. These steps are, in other words, running a PDCA cycle. It is highly advised that the mechanism be improved so that a wider range of potential users can be reached more easily and smoothly.

Chapter 4: Evaluation and Suggestion to Update Related Actions for Business and Human Rights (BHR) of Japanese Companies

(1) Framework in Evaluating the Level of "Maturity" on Related Actions for BHR

- ✓ The possibility for companies to cause adverse effects cannot be fully eliminated, but the potential risk and the degree of severity would be reduced through developing maturity of their related actions. The development might also provide clues to find brand new approaches for value creation in the businesses.
- ✓ The practical approaches are not uniform in general, however. A single concrete picture of necessary and sufficient actions cannot be provided easily. Some essential ways to develop their actions are to evaluate their own potential risks regarding human rights according to their business field, scale and style, and to take actions starting from issues of higher priority. It is also critical to hold engagements and discussions with stakeholders to monitor the needs of parties concerned and society, as well as to check outcomes of their actions.
- ✓ The framework of the following three levels of maturities for related approaches are proposed to serve companies to evaluate their own position and performances and to deliberate further projects for BHR issues.

[TABLE]

A) Level 1

- This is the level that is required for all companies to proceed with in a short period of time, including small and medium sized enterprises. Concrete requirements are, first of all, local legal regulations, while other rules may be entailed on through actual demand from business partners, even if they do not operate directly in foreign areas. When a company has transactions with a global corporation that is covered by the scope of related EU regulations, the company is asked to follow the regulations with a higher sense of urgency and at the corresponding level.
- The major goal is to organize an internal institution to continuously check their actions with PDCA processes, through understanding the contents of BHR issues that are required under international standards, and establishing their own human right policies, managing due diligence procedures, and improving the grievance mechanism based on UNGPs.
- The first essential step of all the effective actions is for the top management to comprehend the significance of BHR issues.

B) Level 2

- This is the level listed corporations in Japan are expected to reach immediately. The actual contents of this level are to sufficiently prepare for the new rules, promoted mainly in EU, and to develop the procedures and their own related institutions further to prepare for specific risks of the industry sector or of its business model.
- The major goal is to continue and upgrade actions for BHR issues, and to integrate them into management and business operations. Keeping track of cyclical check processes of due diligence may make it possible to generate a higher reputation from customers or increased job motivation among employees.
- The most important task of a corporation in promoting actions of this level is to adopt its own policies as the global standard of the whole company, and to organize an internal system to implement the policies in order to cope with the difference between the international standards and local rules.

C) Level 3

- This is the level that a global corporation that leads and influences the world market is expected to reach. Progressive global corporations in the U.S. and Europe are working with strategic minds to create innovative markets from

the viewpoint of human rights, and to formulate updated business rules or new frameworks to lead to innovative values. Japanese corporations of similar business fields are also expected to perform at this level.

- It should be noted that at this level the area a single corporation can manage by itself decreases comparatively because the remaining human right risks depend largely on structural factors, and that collective actions organized by cooperative works with multi-stakeholders have greater potential.
- The major goal is to construct a framework to grasp impacts for BHR by maintaining total due diligence programs that cover direct suppliers, in-direct suppliers and all the suppliers up to the raw materials in the supply chains, by establishing a grievance mechanism in collective ways, and by holding engagements with rights holders.
- This approach needs a series of trials of collective challenges with the industry sector or with other stakeholders in the viewpoint of long-term corporate management.

(2) Suggestions

- ✓ The move of making rules in leading regions has had a steady impact on Japanese corporations through global supply chains, which seems to have urged movement to study new rules in Japan. A substantial decrease of human right risks in a supply chain should be accompanied by the situation in which the decrease is achieved in all businesses in the supply chain.
- ✓ In particular, corporations that operate their businesses globally are advised to watch and follow the steady and enhanced world trends, initiated mainly in Europe, that place a lot of value on BHR issues. It may take a considerable amount of time to cope and to be skilled with new legal regulations and international standards. This is why companies are asked to proceed with their studies and corresponding actions as soon as possible.

A) Suggestions to All Companies:

- **Starting from the conviction of the top management to regard BHR issues as the primary task in operating businesses, all companies are asked to initiate and promote related actions for BHR, through establishing practical policies according to their maturity levels, and implementing PDCA processes in cooperation with other Japanese businesses and**

society.

- ✓ Due diligence programs for human rights should be integrated into business operations as a routine rule, which may not be accomplished in a short time. Any company that has a business within any supply chain system is asked to promote BHR processes, regardless of its company size.
- ✓ Top management is strongly asked to regard BHR issues as the primary task in operating businesses. All Japanese companies are advised to start their actions for BHR, and upgrade the level of maturity in cooperation with other Japanese companies and society.

B) Suggestions to Corporations that Operate Globally:

- **Corporations that operate their businesses globally, as well as companies that have transactions with global supply chains or investment chains, are asked to integrate their actions for BHR into their businesses and management operations as soon as possible, through upgrading the maturity level by accelerating their programs.**
 - ✓ Some corporations are now requested to perform specific actions with global companies or institutional investors that are directly covered by the scope of regulations for BHR. They are, first of all, strongly expected to arrange and maintain the level 1 actions immediately, and secondly, to upgrade their programs to higher level 2.
 - ✓ In some cases, urgent decisions are actually required regarding due diligence processes. In other cases, critical and urgent decisions by the management board became necessary to suspend or to withdraw from specific businesses. It is, therefore, reasonable to arrange internal arrangements beforehand to prepare for that kind of risk incident to not be left behind in the future.

C) Suggestions to Large Corporations that Lead the Global Market:

- **Large corporations that lead the global market are expected to construct impacts to resolve structural conflicts.**
 - ✓ Large corporations that lead the global market are expected to construct impacts for society through relevant contributions to resolve complicated conflicts. This can be performed, at first, by decreasing human right risks in their own operations in the supply chains, and by, in higher steps, challenging structural conflicts in a positive manner to develop business values through transforming business playing fields strategically.

- ✓ It is essential in the latter processes to work jointly with outside stakeholders including NGOs, governments and business associations. Large corporations are expected, in particular, to play a major role in promoting collective actions for preventing and mitigating adverse effects in the supply chains, or for constructing group grievance mechanisms.

D) Suggestions to Business Associations:

- **Business associations are expected to promote establishing standards of related corporate activities, and to lead to resolve structural conflicts.**
 - ✓ Business associations are expected to handle the following;
 - to promote establishing standards in each business sector.
 - to develop specific remedy methods based on particular risks or circumstances in the sector, or to disseminate them.
 - to enhance collective actions to deal with specific structural conflicts.
 - to arrange group grievance mechanisms in the sector.

E) Suggestions to the Japanese Government:

- **The Japanese government is expected to improve institutional framework as the main coordinator, and to encourage Japanese companies to upgrade their action levels.**
 - ✓ The Japanese government is expected to make steady progress on the programs shown in the released "National Action Plan," as well as to enhance each program much further.
 - ✓ The following points are especially welcomed among Japanese companies;
 - to arrange international rules to respect human rights including adjustment among each national or regional standard and providing support for adapting to foreign regulations, or to reinforce and rationalize domestic rules and regulations set by the government.
 - to construct related infrastructure and promote programs to help expand effective and efficient actions for BHR by companies.
 - to advocate understanding and interests among Japanese society, including more measures to disseminate positive perception and interests.

Member of CSR committee of Business Policy Forum, Japan

(the chair)

Tetsuyuki Kagaya

Professor, Graduate School of Business Administration, Hitotsubashi University

(the committee)

Youzou Nakao

Sustainability Group, Sustainability Development Department, Global Corporate Division, Ajinomoto Co., Inc.

Chikako Miyata

Senior Vice President, Legal & Insurance, General Administration, Corporate Sustainability and Director of Corporate Sustainability, ANA HOLDINGS, INC.

Akihiro Inatsugi

Director, Corporate, Sustainability Division, Bridgestone Corporation

Nobuhide Aoyama

Senior Director, Sustainability Unit, FUJITSU LIMITED

Haruo Hatanaka

ESG Strategy, ESG Division, Kao Corporation

Tomoko Hasegawa

Managing Director, Keidanern (Japan Business Federation)

Yohko Sekizaki

General Manager, Sustainability Department, MARUI GROUP CO. ,LTD.

Hiroki Shinno

Manager, CSR Section, CSR &Citizenship Office, Corporate Strategy and Technology Sector, Panasonic Corporation

Kei Kanai

Manager, Sustainability Department, Sompo Japan Insurance Inc.

Mitsu Shippee
Senior General Manager, Sustainability Department, Sony Group Corporation

Shigeki Matsui
General Manager, CSR Operation Dept., Toray industries, Inc.

(Observer)
Shozo Maeda
Director for Industrial Policy, Ministry of Economy, Trade and Industry

Miki Nogami
Assistant Director, Corporate Accounting, Disclosure and CSR Policy Office, Ministry of Economy, Trade and Industry

Hidemi Tomita
Managing Director, Lloyd Register Japan kk

(Secretariat)
Kenyu Adachi
Chairman of the board of Directors, Business Policy Forum, Japan

Tetsu Fukuoka
Director general, Business Policy Forum, Japan

Akira Kitabatake
General manager, Planning & research div., Business Policy Forum, Japan

Hiroaki Konishi
Senior researcher, Planning & research div., Business Policy Forum, Japan

Takeshi Nozawa
Researcher, Lloyd's Register Japan KK

Nao Okayama
Researcher, Lloyd's Register Japan KK

/END/