

CONTENTS

Foreword	9
----------------	---

I. Introduction	11
-----------------------	----

II. Key concepts	21
------------------------	----

III. Foundational principle on access to remedy	28
---	----

PRINCIPLE 25: As part of their duty to protect against business-related human rights abuse, States must take appropriate steps to ensure, through judicial, administrative, legislative or other appropriate means, that when such abuses occur within their territory and/or jurisdiction those affected have access to effective remedy	28
--	----

Question 1. Why does this matter?	28
---	----

Question 2. Is ensuring access to effective remedy a legal requirement of States?	28
---	----

Box 1: International standards on substantive remedy	29
--	----

Question 3. How is ensuring access to effective remedy relevant to the State duty to protect under the Guiding Principles?	31
--	----

Question 4. How does a State ensure access to effective remedies through judicial means?	31
--	----

Question 5. How does a State ensure access to effective remedies through administrative means?	32
--	----

Question 6. How does a State ensure access to effective remedies through legislative means?	33
---	----

Question 7. What other appropriate means could be relevant for ensuring access to effective remedies?	34
---	----

Question 8. What is the difference between "territory" and "jurisdiction"?	35
--	----

Question 9. What have international bodies said about ensuring access to remedy in cross-border cases?	36
--	----

Box 2: Comments by human rights treaty bodies on the geographic scope of States' duty to protect against business-related human rights abuse	36
Question 10. What does it mean to have "access" to an effective remedy?	38
Question 11. Is "access to remedy" the same as "access to justice"?	39
Question 12. Is "access to remedy" the same as "accountability" for business-related human rights harm?	40

IV. State-based judicial mechanisms 41

PRINCIPLE 26: States should take appropriate steps to ensure the effectiveness of domestic judicial mechanisms when addressing business-related human rights abuses, including considering ways to reduce legal, practical and other relevant barriers that could lead to a denial of access to remedy	41
Question 13. Why does this matter?	41
Question 14. What are domestic judicial mechanisms?	42
Question 15. What is an "effective" judicial mechanism?	42
Question 16. What kinds of appropriate steps can States take to ensure the effectiveness of domestic judicial mechanisms?	43
Question 17. What kinds of remedies are potentially available through judicial mechanisms?	43
Question 18. Are there any kinds of remedy that are accessible only through judicial mechanisms?	45
Question 19. What is a denial of access to remedy in the context of judicial mechanisms?	45
Question 20. What kinds of legal barriers do affected stakeholders encounter with judicial mechanisms?	46
Question 21. How can legal barriers be addressed?	47

Question 22. What kinds of practical barriers do affected stakeholders encounter with judicial mechanisms?	47
Question 23. How can practical barriers be addressed?	48
Question 24. What other relevant barriers do affected stakeholders encounter with judicial mechanisms?	49
Question 25. How can other barriers be addressed?	50

V. State-based non-judicial grievance mechanisms 51

PRINCIPLE 27: States should provide effective and appropriate non-judicial grievance mechanisms, alongside judicial mechanisms, as part of a comprehensive State-based system for the remedy of business-related human rights abuse	51
Question 26. Why does this matter?	51
Question 27. What are State-based non-judicial grievance mechanisms?	52
Box 3: What role can national human rights institutions play in relation to access to remedy?	53
Box 4: What role can OECD national contact points for responsible business conduct play in relation to access to remedy?	54
Question 28. What is an "effective and appropriate" State-based non-judicial grievance mechanism?	56
Question 29. What does it mean for States to "provide" effective and appropriate non-judicial grievance mechanisms?	56
Question 30. What kinds of remedies are potentially available through State-based non-judicial grievance mechanisms?	57
Question 31. What techniques are used by these mechanisms to help resolve business and human rights grievances?	58
Question 32. Can State-based non-judicial grievance mechanisms deliver effective remedies on their own?	58
Question 33. What does a comprehensive State-based system for the remedy of business-related human rights abuse entail?	59

VI. Non-State-based grievance mechanisms 61

PRINCIPLE 28: States should consider ways to facilitate access to effective non-State-based grievance mechanisms dealing with business-related human rights harms 61

Question 34. Why does this matter? 61

Question 35. What are non-State-based grievance mechanisms? 61

Box 5: Multilateral development banks and independent accountability mechanisms 63

Question 36. What is an "effective" non-State-based grievance mechanism? 64

Question 37. What does it mean for States to "facilitate access" to effective non-State-based grievance mechanisms? 64

Box 6: How can non-State-based grievance mechanisms contribute to a well-functioning "remedy ecosystem"? 65

Question 38. Can non-State-based grievance mechanisms deliver effective remedies on their own? 66

Box 7: Parallel proceedings 67

Question 39. Are regional and international human rights bodies "judicial" or "non-judicial" grievance mechanisms? 68

Box 8: Contribution of regional human rights bodies to access to remedy for business-related human rights harms 69

PRINCIPLE 29: To make it possible for grievances to be addressed early and remediated directly, business enterprises should establish or participate in effective operational-level grievance mechanisms for individuals and communities who may be adversely impacted 72

Question 40. Why does this matter? 72

Question 41. Is it not up to the State to redress human rights abuse? 73

Question 42. What are operational-level grievance mechanisms? ... 74

Box 9: Are whistle-blower reporting channels operational-level grievance mechanisms? 75

Question 43. To whom should operational-level grievance mechanisms be available? 76

Question 44. What issues should operational-level grievance mechanisms be able to address? 77

Question 45. When might an enterprise “participate in” an operational-level grievance mechanism?	78
Box 10: Participating in operational-level grievance mechanisms: questions to ask	80
Question 46. What kinds of remedies are potentially available through operational-level grievance mechanisms?	81
Question 47. How might the kinds of remedies available through operational-level grievance mechanisms differ from the remedies available through other types of mechanisms mentioned in the Guiding Principles?	82
Question 48. How should the work of trade unions and other workers organizations be taken into account in the development and operation of operational-level grievance mechanisms?	83
Question 49. How do operational-level grievance mechanisms relate to human rights due diligence?	83
Box 11: What is human rights due diligence?	84
Question 50. How can operational-level grievance mechanisms work in combination with other kinds of mechanisms?	86
Box 12: The use of legal waivers in the context of operational-level grievance mechanisms	87
PRINCIPLE 30: Industry, multi-stakeholder and other collaborative initiatives that are based on respect for human rights-related standards should ensure that effective grievance mechanisms are available	89
Question 51. Why does this matter?	89
Question 52. What are industry, multi-stakeholder and other collaborative initiatives that are based on respect for human rights-related standards?	89
Question 53. What does it mean to ensure that effective grievance mechanisms are available?	90
Question 54. What issues should such grievance mechanisms be able to address?	91
Question 55. What kinds of remedies are potentially available through such grievance mechanisms?	91
Question 56. How do these grievance mechanisms relate to human rights due diligence?	92

VII. Effectiveness criteria for non-judicial grievance mechanisms 93

PRINCIPLE 31: In order to ensure their effectiveness, non-judicial grievance mechanisms, both State-based and non-State-based, should be legitimate, accessible, predictable, equitable, transparent, rights-compatible, and a source of continuous learning. Operational-level mechanisms should also be based on engagement and dialogue	93
Question 57. Why does this matter?	93
Question 58. Which mechanisms do these criteria apply to?	94
Question 59. Why these criteria?	94
Question 60. Does a mechanism need to meet each criterion to be considered effective?	95
Question 61. How should a grievance mechanism's effectiveness be assessed?	95
Question 62. What does it mean for a grievance mechanism to be considered legitimate?	96
Box 13: Adopting a gender-sensitive approach	97
Question 63. What does it mean for a grievance mechanism to be considered accessible?	100
Box 14: Protecting people from the risk of retaliation	102
Question 64. What does it mean for a grievance mechanism to be considered predictable?	103
Question 65. What does it mean for a grievance mechanism to be considered equitable?	103
Question 66. What does it mean for a grievance mechanism to be considered transparent?	104
Question 67. What does it mean for a grievance mechanism to be considered rights-compatible?	106
Question 68. What does it mean for a grievance mechanism to be considered a source of continuous learning?	107
Question 69. What does it mean for an operational-level grievance mechanism to be based on engagement and dialogue?	108
Box 15: What is "meaningful stakeholder engagement" in this context?	110
Box 16: Additional resources	111