



GENEVA CENTRE FOR HUMAN RIGHTS  
ADVANCEMENT AND GLOBAL DIALOGUE

## UNITED NATIONS HUMAN RIGHTS COUNCIL

### Interactive Dialogue with the Working Group on the Issue of Human Rights and Transnational Corporations and Other Business Enterprises

#HRC59 • 19 June 2025



#### PRESENTATION OF THE THEMATIC REPORT

**Ms. Lyra JAKULEVIČIENĖ, Chair of the Working Group on the Issue of Human Rights and Transnational Corporations and Other Business Enterprises**

The Chair of the Working Group (WG) introduces the thematic report on the **procurement and deployment of artificial intelligence systems in accordance with the guidance principles on business and human rights**. This report underscores the very urgent need for states and businesses to ensure human rights protection in use of artificial intelligence systems to address regulatory gaps and accountability challenges.

The WG has recognised the vital role of technologies in the past. At the same time, the use of technologies by states and by businesses can have an adverse impact on virtually all internationally recognised human rights, including **data protection, security, privacy, non-discrimination, right to clean, healthy, and sustainable environment, and freedom of expression**, among others.



The Working Group's stocktaking reveals that states increasingly are shifting from voluntary guidance to mandatory legislation on artificial intelligence and human rights. However, this **regulatory landscape is still fragmented**. It lacks universal standards that would have clearly established red lines. It insufficiently integrates the perspective of the Global South, provides for very broad exceptions, and the involvement of civil society was also insufficient.

**Artificial intelligence** technologies are increasingly integrated in the critical public and private sector functions, from law enforcement to social protection, finance, surveillance, and other areas. However, what we observed that states, many states and businesses procure and deploy artificial intelligence systems **without adequate human rights safeguards**. Therefore, the Working Group urges states to ensure that AI and related regulations align with international human rights law by implementing mandatory human rights due diligence, establishing oversight mechanisms, and ensuring transparency and ethical procurement frameworks.

Furthermore, the WG observes that many businesses are quite in early stages of identifying their human rights impacts, risking adverse impacts such as bias, decision-making, exploitative working surveillance, or manipulation of consumer behaviour. Therefore, the WG also calls upon **businesses to conduct robust human rights due diligence**, disclose the use of artificial intelligence, disclose the risks of artificial intelligence use, as well as establish grievance mechanisms, collaborate across sectors to increase the leverage, and very importantly, empower the SMEs. Access to remedy in this area remains insufficient, with affected individuals facing **opaque complaint mechanisms**, legal barriers, limited corporate accountability. Strengthening the enforcement mechanisms, shifting the burden of proof to AI providers is very essential to ensuring effective redress.

The report also highlights **emerging good practises**, for example, by states introducing safeguards for AI deployment, standardised public procurement policies, algorithm registers, or mandatory impact assessments. In the private sector, for instance, development of AI ethical frameworks, evaluation of AI projects, stakeholder engagement when deploying new AI systems, or cross-sectoral collaboration.

In conclusion, the implementation of the guiding principles in AI procurement and deployment is critical in order to ensure that AI is procured and deployed to fulfil human rights rather than erode them. Collaborative efforts among states, businesses, civil society are very essential to achieve that rights respecting AI procurement and deployment happens.

## PRESENTATION OF THE COUNTRY VISIT REPORT

The Chair reports on the country visits to Colombia, which took place from 29 July to 9 August of 2024. The Working Group (WG) expresses its gratitude to the Government of Colombia for its support and for its openness in engaging in constructive dialogue. The WG also expresses its appreciation to businesses, civil society representatives, human rights and environmental defenders, trade unions, and many, many other stakeholders who generously shared their experiences and insights.

The country-visit report acknowledges **Colombia's leadership in the region**, including its early adoption of the National Action Plan, the ratification of the Escazú Agreement last year. The WG commends the Government's commitment to adhere and advance the guiding principles and



recognises the progress that was made in the constitutional protections and environmental legislation. At the same time, the WG remains concerned about persistent structural challenges, including the enduring presence of non-state armed groups, widespread violence, insecurity, and the lack of adequate protection for human rights defenders.

The report highlights the **disproportionate impact of irresponsible business practises** on Indigenous peoples, Afro-descendant communities, and peasants. The WG also noted the room for improvement as concerns corporate accountability and lack of meaningful consultation with affected communities. So there is an urgent need for heightened human rights due diligence and for businesses to engage in true reconciliation and reparation process.

The report further identifies the **critical gaps in regard to access to remedy** and calls for stronger enforcement of court decisions, improved coordination among institutions, and the establishment of effective grievance mechanisms. Advancing the implementation of the guiding principles in Colombia is essential not only for addressing historical injustices and preventing future harms, but also for fostering inclusive development, environmental sustainability, and lasting peace.

## PRESENTATION OF THE FORUM REPORT

The **2024 Forum on Business and Human Rights**, which was titled Realising the Smart Mix of Measures to Protect Human Rights in the Context of Business Activities, was successfully conducted from 25th to 27th of November of last year, drawing nearly 4,000 participants from 156 countries. Discussions focused on the implementation of voluntary and mandatory measures to uphold the human rights, particularly in light of emerging global challenges such as the climate change, technological advancements, and increased inequality. The Forum emphasised the need for stronger regulatory frameworks, enhanced access to remedy, and inclusive stakeholder engagement. Key themes including, among others, the role of mandatory human rights due diligence, the protection of human rights defenders, and integration of indigenous rights and environmental concerns into business practise.

## REPLIES AND CONCLUDING REMARKS

Reflecting on **states not participating in the development of AI**, the Chair of the Working Group explains that the thematic report does not address the development of AI, but only the deployment and procurement. However, these issues are very much connected, and the WG is of the opinion that the human rights considerations have to be integrated in the entire life cycle of AI. With regard to the possibilities that states have, the Chair mentions first global cooperation frameworks to agree on certain **definitions which are still not agreed**, including the definition of AI itself, ethics, and other definitions; to map the AI systems that are already being used; to include the requirements in the procurement tenders for the private sector when AI is procured, even if there is no participation in the development. The **capacity issue** that was also mentioned is a very important one, because the officials that are responsible for procurement have to have very broad and very transdisciplinary knowledge, so capacity-building can also be done here.

When any legislation that is related to use of AI is developed, any policies that are developed at the national level, it is very important to integrate this human rights approach. This will ensure that once AI systems are used in the country, that they will be used with the human rights



considerations in mind. With regard to **procurement**, countries could **develop guidelines**. There are already some good practises from some of the countries touching upon capacity-building, integrating the human rights considerations and tenders, using some of the already existent at the regional level model clauses for procurement of AI and considering the human rights considerations.

With regard to **use of AI in conflict situations**, the WG acknowledges the importance of this issue and considers this as a very important topic for future considerations. However, due to the limited scope of the report that was chosen, the WG could not address this issue in this present report.

With regard to **transparency**, the Chair highlights very positive examples of practises where states are disclosing the use of AI in the public sector. The WG encourages the private sector to disclose the use of AI and to require as much as possible the consent of the rights holders to the use of AI. There are some good practises in establishing, for example, the public registers of use of AI that would also ensure the transparency.

On how to **enhance international cooperation**, the WG in its report identified more than 1,000 various standards already existing on AI. So if there is cooperation with all those organisations that are developing those standards to include the human rights considerations, already we will be much ahead.

With regard to **mandatory requirements** - be them at the national level, regional level, or possibly also at international level, and not only directly related to AI, but also in a variety of other fields which touch bases with the use of technologies – it is important to create the **consent on the definitions**, on red lines, and also ensure the policy consistency.

On the importance to **seek transparency**, the Chair points out that transparency is required in the disclosure of the use of AI, both by states and by businesses. Without transparency, we cannot have effective access to remedy, considering the opaqueness of use of AI, and other challenges. It is also very important to encourage the businesses to **disclose the use of AI**, as well as establish the oversight mechanisms.

In this regard, it is also important how to **integrate all stakeholders**. There are a number of stakeholders that are from civil society, from academia, that are working on these issues, that are following the developments, that are reporting and recording various allegations and violations. It is very important to give voice for these organisations in those forums where decisions are made on development and use of AI.

The Chair also stresses the importance of **working together with businesses**, not only by encouraging businesses to integrate human rights considerations in the use and procurement of AI, but also include directly the requirements for procurement when it is being procured from businesses, including also mandatory regulations on human rights due diligence, that would cover not only the company itself, but also its entire value chain.

One should also look into the **liability requirements**, both at national, but also consistently at the regional level, as well as provide guidance to businesses in procurement, in deployment, and work at the sectorial level in order to enable small and medium enterprises also to benefit from these developments.



## VIEWS EXPRESSED BY COLOMBIA AS CONCERNED COUNTRY

The delegation of the **Colombia** states that during the country visit, the Working Group could see can see the country's commitment to human rights, transparency, and multilateral dialogue, as well as its openness to international scrutiny and faith in international cooperation. Appreciating that its own views were taken into account, Colombia welcomes the constructive approach and the recommendations made, which are a significant contribution to strengthen its public policies and legal framework and institutions.

The WG is a key tool for promoting human rights in a corporate context, which is a priority in Colombia's development plan for 2022-2026. In keeping with this, Colombia was the **first country of Latin America** to adopt a national action plan on this issue in 2015. This was followed by a second action plan in 2020. Currently, Colombia is working on a baseline and the formulation of a legal tool which would have the force of a decree and would be accompanied by action plans aimed at ensuring differentiated approaches by territory with a comprehensive public policy.

Colombia reaffirms its commitments and acknowledge the progress made by certain actors in the corporate sector regarding the guiding principles on businesses and human rights, especially those relating to due diligence. Each time, we are is seeing an increasing number of companies that focus on human rights in the context of their activities. Therefore, Colombia invites the WG to continue making concrete recommendations aimed at the business sector and assist those companies that have provided sustained commitment and have been proactive in this area.

Colombia actively takes part in multilateral fora which are promoting a **legally binding instrument on businesses and human rights**. With this purpose, it is essential to foster dynamic and inclusive dialogue with all relevant stakeholders, both at the national level and the international level. Colombia acknowledges and welcomes the emphasis placed by the report on the various ethnic communities and their human rights and the environment.

In Colombia, **Indigenous communities and the Afro-descendant communities** and others face disproportionate challenges regarding business contexts which are also exacerbated by other situations of vulnerability. The right to free, prior and informed consent which was supported by Inter-American Court of Human Rights extends to people of African descent and peasant communities which are suffering from the structural impacts of agro-industrial projects or other business enterprises. Prior consultation is a **constitutionally recognised right** and it has been fleshed out by the constitutional court.

Regarding **human rights defenders and the environment**, Colombia has taken administrative and legal measures to ensure their protection. The National Protection Agency carried out protective measures for more than 400 activists. Colombia has a robust framework for ensuring access to justice, including protection for fundamental rights. Colombia has a system for peace which has highlighted the economic consequences of the armed conflict and it has highlighted the need for the **corporate sector to take part in transitional justice mechanisms**. Colombia supports the social reintegration of ex-combatants as well as training on human rights and reparation mechanisms that are effective. Colombia is further promoting constitutional changes at the level of its national police. Reiterating its commitment to human rights in the business sector, Colombia will build on the report in order to foster greater peace and human rights.



## INTERACTIVE DIALOGUE

### Views Expressed by State Delegations

**Algeria** underscores that the widespread use of technologies requires concerted efforts in order to serve humanity, to serve science, instead of threatening rights and freedoms. Aware that the human rights system should promote tools in order to face the challenges by digital technologies, we need to ensure a balance between the opportunities linked to these technologies, especially right to education and employment, and on the other side, tackling violations of human rights when using these digital technologies, especially when it comes to hate speech, right to privacy and illegal surveillance. Algeria has progressed a lot in terms of digital transformation, AI-comprising institutions, companies, in order to face challenges when it comes to sustainable development. Algeria supported SMEs, emerging technology companies, and the creation of employment for youth.

**Armenia** shares the concern of the WG that AI presents significant challenges in terms of data protection, security, privacy, discrimination and exclusion. As we navigate this evolving technological landscape, Armenia is mindful of concerns and remains dedicated to protecting privacy and human dignity while fostering innovation in a responsible and ethical manner. In this context, Armenia is piloting the use of AI to strengthen tax compliance, risk management and fraud detection supported by the World Bank. To mitigate the associated human rights risks, our strategy is grounded in four key pillars – explainability, transparency, strong cybersecurity and stakeholder engagement. Furthermore, Armenia agrees with the WG that integrated access to remedy processes with adequate enforcement mechanisms that involve considerations around data protection, the right to privacy are key in effectively addressing adverse AI-related human rights impacts. While personal data law was adopted in Armenia in 2015, the country continues its efforts in adapting regulations and strengthening legal protections in line with international human rights standards to further address newly emerging challenges. Armenia is specifically proud of piloting AI education in schools, a public-private partnership initiative that has already registered impressive results. As we advance digital transformation, Armenia stands ready to work with all stakeholders to ensure that AI is used to empower, not undermine human rights.

**Bangladesh** shares the concern that while AI can really offer widened opportunities for innovation and development, it can also exacerbate the existing digital divides posing serious challenges to the protection of human rights. As the report rightly reflected, the rapid advancement and almost unregulated expansion of AI while offering transformative potential also presents unprecedented risks. It is therefore imperative that the development, procurement and the deployment of AI systems be undertaken in a rights-respecting manner, with robust safeguards in place to prevent adverse human rights impacts. Bangladesh reiterates the WG's focus on the responsibility of states to respect human rights in public procurement and service provision in the context of AI. It is essential that all AI-related initiatives be grounded in principles of transparency, accountability, privacy, equity and inclusive stakeholder engagement. Similarly, it will be important to reflect the priorities and realities of the global South fully into the broader landscape of global AI governance.

**Belgium** emphasizes that the report provides valuable guidance on how AI-related decisions can align with the UN Guiding Principles on Business and Human Rights. Belgium shares the WG's



concerns that inadequately regulated AI deployment can result in algorithmic discrimination, mass surveillance and misuse in policing or migration control. In this regard, Belgium recalls UNHRC Resolution 58/23 urging states to foster a safe and enabling environment for human rights defenders and to prevent the misuse of digital tools to suppress dissent or target defenders. AI-powered surveillance technologies are the instruments of oppression.

**Bolivia** believes it is important to look at existing regulatory framework and look at how states can continue to strengthen human rights protection in the regulation and acquisition and implementation of AI systems. It is also relevant to look into potential reparation mechanisms for rights holders. There is a need to address the imbalance in the development of AI systems. It is major corporations, technological corporations, which not only accumulate data, but also resources and control over the development of AI. As the report states, there is an imbalance between theoretical knowledge and practical knowledge within states and the private sector regarding AI, that is to say, how it functions and what the results of AI are. Bolivia believes it is relevant to develop legally binding initiatives, and voluntary guidelines as a complementary means, which would help address any human rights violations or abuses in connection with AI.

**Brazil** notes with appreciation the report's positive reference to Brazil's multi-stakeholder approach and the use of social dialogue in shaping the discussions of the Artificial Intelligence Bill currently before Congress. The Brazilian draft law on official intelligence was approved by the Federal Senate in 2024 and is currently under consideration in the House of Deputies. In addition to promoting responsible innovation and competitiveness and ensuring the development of safe and reliable systems, the bill also aims to safeguard fundamental rights and uphold our democratic institutions. For Brazil, human rights principles must be integrated into the design, development, deployment and use of AI. Furthermore, Brazil believes that AI governance should be addressed within multilateral forums in order to align regulatory frameworks with our commitments under international human rights law.

**Cambodia** notes that as AI technologies evolve, so too do the risks of discrimination, marginalisation and the erosion of fundamental freedoms, often hidden behind opaque algorithms and unchecked digital power. Cambodia opposes the report concerning AI when procured without certification or deployed without scrutiny, a risk in strengthening inequality rather than addressing it. States must not outsource the responsibility we as human rights are concerned. Procurement is not a technical exercise. It is a matter of accountability. Cambodia calls for greater transparency across AI supply chains, enhanced due diligence in public-private partnerships and a binding adherence to the guiding principles on business and human rights. Furthermore, Cambodia stresses the urgent need for capacity-building in developing countries that they are not passive recipients of AI systems but active, informed participants in shaping inclusive rights-based digital futures. The promise of AI must not be reserved for the powerful, whilst it always falls on one level. Cambodia reaffirms its commitment to a digital transformation that is inclusive, transparent and rooted in human dignity. Its core innovation must not be an afterthought. It must be the foundation from which we begin.

**Cameroon**, as a developing country, sets great store by attracting foreign direct investment in order to bolster its growth and promote the SDGs. Cameroon recognises the great advantages offered by these investments for job creation, technology transfer, improvement of infrastructure, and also integration into global value chains. That said, President, we do believe it is essential

that companies that operate in our national territory, including the subsidiaries of multinationals, scrupulously respect human rights in a spirit of social responsibility, transparency, and sustainability. This implies effective due diligence regarding the deployment of AI and it has to be integrated into the investment policies from the very first stages of planning. Cameroon supports the efforts aimed at strengthening national and regional frameworks and call for greater technical support so as to enable states to better manage economic activities and ensure the participation of local communities and ensure effective access to reparation mechanisms. In closing, Cameroon reaffirms its commitment to the development of an international legal framework that would guarantee both legal certainty for investment and the primacy of fundamental rights.

**Chile** notes that the report clearly identifies the asymmetries faced by the countries of the Global South when trying to weigh in on AI governance. Chile agrees that such exclusion can widen existing inequalities and limit the equitable access to technological benefits. Chile underscores the importance for states to ensure effective due diligence processes at the corporate level including the analysis of the acquisition of technologies as used by third parties. The delegation further welcomes the emphasis placed by the report on the various legal frameworks under development which can ensure that synergies are developed so as to ensure human rights focus. Chile reiterates commitment to the process aimed at establishing a legally binding instrument that would regulate in keeping with international human rights law the activities by transnational corporations and other businesses.

**China** is opposed to the WG's report's deliberate comments on the development of facial recognition technology in China. The use of modern technologies, such as facial recognition, to improve the level of social governance and ensure public safety is common practise. China has established the security management measures on the application of facial recognition technology so as to standardise the application of technology and ensure an oversight and management system and protect the personal data and privacy rights of a broad public. China believes in the concept of AI development geared towards the well-being of its citizens and aimed at promoting our people's well-being and serving economic and social development while at the same time avoiding any abuse or malicious uses of AI technologies. China advocates stronger evaluation and risk prevention in connection with AI development so as to show that AI is safe, reliable and controllable while also establishing an adequate legal and regulatory and ethical framework to foster the healthy development of AI. China published the Global Initiative on AI Governance and launched the creation of a group of friends for international cooperation on capacity-building in AI within the United Nations. In closing, China hopes to work with all stakeholders to ensure that AI technology benefits humanity.

**Cote d'Ivoire** recognises the numerous benefits of AI, notably in healthcare, agriculture and financial services. These technologies offer genuine opportunities for achieving sustainable development. However, the accelerated and unregulated evolution of AI could bring negative impacts on basic rights, for example, the right to private life, the right to security and freedom. To conclude, Cote d'Ivoire calls for greater involvement by states in governing AI as well as higher levels of responsibility amongst investors to ensure that human rights are respected in companies where it is used.

**Cuba** stresses that states play a key role in the development and implementation of laws, regulations, and standards for ensuring that transnational corporations and other businesses



meet international obligations in the field of human rights. Cuba agrees with the report by the WG on the obligations and duties of states and corporations to ensure that AI systems are installed and function in a way that is respectful of human rights and that appropriate safeguards are established in order to prevent any harmful impacts. There is a need to ensure universal access and the inclusive, ethical, and fair development of AI and new technologies, especially in developing countries. It would be contrary to international law to impose barriers that would limit access to these technologies, as is the case by the coercive unilateral measures. AI should be used responsibly and aimed at helping us achieve the SDGs without replicating xenophobic or discriminatory patterns. In closing, Cuba reiterates its support for a legally binding instrument regulating the activities of transnational corporations and other transnational enterprises.

**Ecuador** thanks the working group for their report, which reflects that despite certain advances in regulation, acquisition and implementation of AI systems, there is still little knowledge in the states and in the companies about their own use and its possible negative effects on human rights. Regarding this, Ecuador agrees with the recommendations of the states to establish solid legal frameworks, to establish due diligence, to strengthen capacities, to guarantee independent supervision, to establish specific limits and safeguards for high-risk sectors, in addition to the requirement of accountability to companies and reparation mechanisms, not just claims. Ecuador, as a subscriber of the UNESCO recommendation on the ethics of AI, is currently developing a national action plan with emphasis on the protection of personal data, non-discrimination and the prevention of algorithmic bias. Additionally, there is a debate on a bill to promote the development of AI that seeks to promote technological innovation and human talent, to strengthen education in emerging technologies, to promote an ethical and responsible AI and to promote public-private alliances for technological development.

**Egypt** concurs on the need to assess these programmes in a regular manner by companies and states in order to respect the guiding principles and refraining from using them in a way that violates human rights, as well as establishing common standards on the responsible use of AI and efficient remedy. Egypt reiterates support to the WG. Despite the importance of the UNGPs, the sustained progress of the impact of transnational companies in the world requires the voluntary implementation of the principles in order to protect human rights and to find solutions to negative impacts.

**Estonia on behalf of the Nordic-Baltic countries** notes that the rapid uptake of artificial intelligence by both public and private sectors is a major challenge. This is particularly relevant in procurement processes that lack sufficient safeguards. Ethical, legal, labour, social, and environmental challenges raised by new technologies must be addressed. With innovation comes responsibility. Human rights-based approach must be at the core of our digital governance model. Human rights risks are among the key concerns we identify in public AI deployments. The Nordic-Baltic countries fully support the anchorage of business responsibilities in the UNGPs and other important guidelines on reasonable business conduct, such as the USCD guidelines. We call on both states and enterprises to uphold due diligence, transparency, and accountability in AI deployment and use and take appropriate measures to detect and mitigate risks.

**Ethiopia** recognises the transformative potential of AI to accelerate sustainable development, enhance agricultural productivity, improve public health, and expand access to education and



services. At the same time, we share concerns about the risks posed by unregulated AI use, particularly to privacy, equality, and democratic participation. Ethiopia underscores the importance of aligning AI procurement and deployment with the guiding principles on business and human rights. Ethiopia has made significant progress in establishing legal and institutional frameworks to support rights respecting digital transformation. Its National Digital Transformation Strategy, Digital Ethiopia 2025, centres on ethical and inclusive innovation. Ethiopia has enacted a personal data protection proclamation, is advancing cyber security legislation, and has established the Ethiopian Artificial Intelligence Institute to guide responsible AI development and capacity building. Ethiopia is committed to embedding human rights due diligence in all AI-related policy and procurement processes. In closing, Ethiopia supports international efforts to promote transparency, interoperability, and to prohibit AI applications incompatible with human rights.

**Ghana** acknowledges the recommendations of states to establish robust legal, regulatory, and policy frameworks that are aligned with international human rights laws. The growing use of AI across sectors bring both opportunities and challenges, making it crucial to ensure its procurement and deployment align with international human rights standards and national legal frameworks. Ghana's 1992 constitution guarantees private sector business operations including foreign investment in Ghana's economy. Nevertheless, to ensure responsible deployment of AI, particularly the protection of fundamental human rights and freedoms, the Data Protection Act of 2012 and the National Action Plan on Business and Human Rights developed by the Commission on Human Rights and Administrative Justice are being implemented in support of ongoing digital governance reforms.

**Ghana on behalf of the African group** welcomes this year's focus on the critical role of investors in respecting the promoting human rights, particularly in the context of climate transition and the increasing volumes of investment in infrastructure, natural resources and renewable energy. This context creates both opportunities and increased risk for local communities. The African group concurs that investors, whether public or private, national or foreign, must not only refrain from causing or contributing to human rights violations, but also take proactive due diligence measures in line with international standards to ensure responsible conduct throughout their value chains. The African group further takes note of the core address to financial institutions, relevant banks and asset management to fully integrate human rights considerations into their investment policies. This evolution is essential to ensure coherence and global commitment, particularly in the implementation of the 2030 Agenda. In this regard, the group emphasises the importance of sound regulatory framework, state capacity-building and technical assistance adapted to the realities of developing countries. Effective implementation of the guiding principles also requires the meaningful participation of local communities, including Indigenous people, women and youth.

**Honduras** recognises the value of AI for ensuring inclusive processes periodic evaluations and meaningful participation of affected communities. It also underscores the importance of looking at the differentiated effect that these systems can have on women and girls. As the report points out, the lack of representative data can broaden gender inequality. Regarding migration, Honduras shares the concern that it is essential to ensure transparency mechanisms and accountability mechanisms that avoid discriminatory or disproportionate practises. Finally,



Honduras highlights the need of assessing the environmental impact of AI technologies. AI cannot be divorced from the fight against climate change, especially when its environmental footprint worsens vulnerabilities that already exist. Honduras reaffirms its commitment to digital governance and to a people-centred development.

**India** agrees with the report's assessment that the UNGPs should be embedded in evolving global AI practises. India believes in open-source AI systems that enhance trust and transparency, support quality data sets free from biases, and focusses on democratisation and people-centric applications. Addressing cyber security, disinformation and deep fakes is vital, as is routing technology in local ecosystems. India's Digital Personal Data Protection Act 2023 upholds individual data rights while supporting innovation. India's Business Responsibility and Sustainability Reporting framework is considered one of the most comprehensive regimes globally. Therefore, it is surprising that rather than examining India's pilot initiatives on AI, the report makes an unverified claim attributing to a source that AI is deployed to red-flag human rights defenders in India. The delegation clarifies that India's constitutional frameworks and prevailing laws, including a data protection law, provides robust protections and judicial recourse for privacy breaches. India urges the WG to incorporate only evidence-based comments in future assessments. India remains committed to inclusive, accessible AI for sustainable development.

**Indonesia** fully acknowledges the dual nature of artificial intelligence as implied in the working group's report. It shares the view that states and businesses have duty and responsibility to protect and mitigate adverse impacts of AI on human rights. To this end, Indonesia has adopted the National Strategy on AI 2020-2045, which provides strategic direction for all stakeholders, including the private sector, to develop and utilise AI responsibly, anchored in the principles of accessibility, transparency, inclusivity and non-discrimination. The 2022 Personal Data Protection Law, along with other regulations, have also been promulgated to foster protection against human rights abuses that occur through the use of digital and AI technologies. Malaysia is committed to further reinforcing our legal and policy frameworks to ensure alignment with international human rights standards. It further underscores the urgency of enhancing global governance on AI, particularly to address its cross-border implications and ensure protection for people, including in the Global South. In this regard, we reiterate our continued support for the establishment of a robust international LBI on TNCs and other business enterprises of transnational character, including ensuring accountability for their business activities relating to the use of AI.

**Iran** stresses that a comprehensive approach must also acknowledge the ongoing military aggression against Iran. On 13 June 2025, the Israeli regime committed the blatant act of aggression against Iranian territory. Such aggression exacerbates vulnerabilities that affect corporate accountability and human rights protections. Iran urges the WG to document the Israeli regime's use of AI in targeting civilians and call for accountability of companies enabling such actions. It further calls on the WG to consider these broader implications and to support efforts for accountability and protection of economic and social rights in conflict situations. Iran remains committed to cooperation based on respect, impartiality and international law.

**Iraq** fully supports international efforts to put in place an international framework to sustain human rights during the purchase and deployment of AI by companies. Iraq sees in AI opportunities for comprehensive development and social justice, but it must be leaning on



principles of accountability, privacy, and equity. The delegation insists on the importance of national capacity-building, technological transfer, and enabling the Global South countries to be able to utilise these technologies. Iraq also calls for international cooperation to ensure that modern technologies are not turned into tools for marginalisation, but rather tools for elevating human rights and human dignity.

**Ireland** agrees with the report's observations highlighting the need for ethical AI governance guided by transparency, accountability and human rights frameworks, such as the UN guiding principles. A human rights-based and ethical approach to AI governance must also foster inclusive participation across all sectors. It is important that all businesses are supported to ensure respect for human rights in the procurement and deployment of digital technologies, including AI. In this regard, Ireland has had a national AI strategy in place since 2021, with the overall goal of leveraging AI for economic and societal good. Ireland is also currently developing our second national plan on business and human rights, which will reaffirm our strong commitment to the implementation of the UN guiding principles.

**Japan** is committed to taking a leadership role in the responsible development and use of AI. As the G7 Chair in 2023, Japan initiated the Hiroshima AI process, culminating in the comprehensive policy framework aligned with the UN Guiding Principles. This demonstrates our commitment to shaping international norms for generative AI. Domestically, Japan has developed AI guidelines for business, prioritising a human-centric approach as one of the common guiding principles to prevent human rights violations in the development, provision, and use of AI systems and services. Furthermore, from 2022 to 2025, Japan has collaborated with UNESCO on several projects that support Africa and small island developing states to benefit from AI technologies while addressing great ethical risks. Japan is currently revising its national action plan and remains steadfast in its commitment to promoting respect for human rights based on UNGPs. Japan will continue to work collaboratively with businesses, civil society, and other stakeholders to achieve this goal.

**Malawi** commends the WG for examining the gaps, opportunities and emerging positive examples of applying human rights considerations. It stresses the importance of mapping emerging practises and clarify the responsibilities of businesses to incorporate a human rights-based approach into the guiding principles of business and human rights. Malawi particularly appreciates the spotlight on the challenges faced by states in their duty to protect individuals and communities from human rights abuses by third parties, including businesses along value chains. Malawi support the call for a legally binding instrument on business and human rights. Such a framework is crucial to ensuring accountability and access to justice for those impacted by corporate human rights abuses, especially in developing countries such as Malawi.

**Malaysia** shares the concern that opaque AI systems can undermine transparency, accountability and access to remedy. In response to this, Malaysia established the National AI Office in 2024 as a central body to guide ethical, inclusive and rights-respecting AI development. Its approach combines sectoral coordination with multi-stakeholders working groups in order to ensure public participation and alignment with national values and international human rights standards. Malaysia is also developing the AI governance and ethics guidelines to help embed accountability and fairness into AI deployment, particularly when involving private sector solutions in public functions. Malaysia is also investing in public awareness, media literacy and



risk mitigation frameworks to strengthen safeguards against misinformation, bias and algorithmic harm. We further believe international collaboration is essential to address transboundary risks, build trust and promote responsible innovation.

**Pakistan** agrees that understanding of the human rights implications of the deployment of AI systems across businesses remains at an early stage. Notwithstanding talk of life cycles of AI deployments, there is at the moment an incomplete understanding of how quickly these systems could evolve or how long-lasting their cumulative human rights impacts could eventually be. Pakistan echoes the WG's assertion that certain AI systems and their deployment entail grave risks to human rights and the absence of red lines for prohibited uses of AI systems multiplies these risks. In this context, transparency in data collection and usage remains integral and also recommended by the WG. However, transparency alone will not be enough to address concerns around data poisoning, data biases or algorithmic biases. The digital divide within and across countries further exacerbates the risks posed by opaque AI deployments, particularly within global supply chains, where algorithmic decision-making may escape effective oversight. Pakistan further welcomes the WG's insights on how to strengthen capacity-building initiatives while leveraging developing countries' wealth of data to offset these risks.

The **Russian Federation** stands ready to cooperate with all interested parties in this area. However, it considers that the development of AI technology which all of humanity will be required to come together to overcome. Universal rules for AI are something that must be discussed under the appropriate mandate and in the appropriate forum. With all respect for the UNHRC, with respect to continuing to work on a document on transnational corporations and other business enterprises from the viewpoint of human rights, Russia believes that the scope should be reduced to realising human rights when implementing artificial intelligence as per relevant resolution.

The **State of Palestine** cannot speak about AI and corporate responsibility without addressing its weaponization in the context of the illegally occupied Palestine. The deployment of AI by Israel alongside corporations that have long participated in efforts to erase the Palestinian people now serves to sustain an economy of genocide. Many corporations have reoriented their operations to actively support the mass extermination and destruction of the Palestinian people, embedding their technologies and services in systems of annihilation. Among the most egregious examples is Israel's use of AI-powered drones to systematically and deliberately target and kill Palestinians in Gaza, demonstrating how automated warfare is being used to commit mass atrocities and genocide. Technology firms and arms manufacturers have directly profited from these AI systems despite the clear and documented risks of contributing to war crimes, crimes against humanity, and genocide. This digital apartheid, which treats Palestinians' lives as algorithmic variables to be tracked, surveyed, and eliminated, reflects a broader reality that corporations continue to profit from oppression, death, and destruction, often with the complicity of states that still claim they are committed to human rights. Palestine urges the WG to address the situation in occupied Palestine. The genocide in Gaza is not separate from the greed of corporations and the relentless exploitation of human suffering for profit. The future of AI must not be built on systems of oppression.

**Switzerland** stresses that this thematic report comes at a crucial time where the impact of AI on human rights is growing ever more complex. The report meets its goals. It analyses existing



frameworks, clarifies responsibilities, suggests possible remedies and guides states and corporations on the implementation of UN's guiding principles in the context of AI. Switzerland welcomes the call for greater transparency and the need to document bias and ensure effective access to remedy. The recommendations that have been made offer a concrete roadmap for a human rights-based governance and they also factor in all stakeholders - states, corporations, civil society, investors and academia. The report also highlights in a bold and much-needed way the fact that some AI systems are fundamentally incompatible with human rights. It calls for the establishment of red lines for prohibited usages such as real-time facial recognition, mass surveillance and social rating.

**Togo**, aware of the human rights requirements for digital and technological development of AI, has taken measures, including legislative measures, so as to strengthen protection for human dignity and ensure access to legal remedies. The Adoption 2019 of a law on the collection, handling, transmission, storage, and use of personal data, as well as that of the Cinema and Animation Code in 2021, are part of these efforts and they apply both to public and private corporations. Regarding prospects, Togo has started the process of developing a national AI strategy. This follows an integrated approach and its adoption and implementation will help strengthen human rights in relation to AI across our country.

The **United Kingdom** notes that the use of AI presents significant opportunities for human rights as well as risks. The UK advocates for human rights considerations to be incorporated into the design, development and use of AI, and expects all businesses to carry out human rights due diligence in line with UN guiding principles to this effect. Recognising the need for transparency raised in the report, the UK has introduced an algorithmic transparency recording standard which requires public sector organisations to publish clear information on how and why they are using algorithmic tools delivering meaningful transparency through a tiered approach. This is mandatory for central government when such tools have a significant influence on decision-making processes which affect the public. The UK further recognises that international cooperation through multilateral fora is vital to safeguard and mitigate against human rights risks associated with AI. These principles are being implemented through public procurement practises and national regulatory mechanisms. Viet Nam supports the WG's call for meaningful multi-stakeholder engagement and underscore the need for strengthened international cooperation to address regulatory gaps and ensure equitable access to the benefits of AI.

**Venezuela** welcomes the recommendations, particularly those which highlight the need for legal, regulatory, and political frameworks that are aligned with human rights standards. In November 2024, Venezuela's legislative approved during a first round of discussions a bill on AI, the purpose being to protect and promote the development of AI, ensuring compliance with fundamental principles which guide our country's development. On a different note, Venezuela asks the WG to help ensure the liberation of the 250 Venezuelan migrants detained in El Salvador.

**Viet Nam**, as a country advancing digital transformation, views AI as a strategic pillar of national development. At the same time, Viet Nam remains committed to ensuring that technological progress proceeds in alignment with the protection and promotion of fundamental human rights. To this end, Vietnam has taken steps toward establishing an ethical framework for AI. The Ministry of Science and Technology's guidelines on responsible AI development outline nine core principles, including transparency, safety, privacy, accountability, and respect for human dignity.



### Views Expressed by Intergovernmental Organizations and UN Entities

The **Council of Europe (CoE)** states that its benchmarking instrument, the European Convention on Human Rights, sets minimum standards relevant in many aspects of business and human rights, starting from the protection of private property, prohibition of discrimination, right to a fair trial and many more. The European Court of Human Rights generated an abundant body of case law relevant both for the operation of businesses and the status of employees. In addition, European Social Charter sets standards which should also be taken into account by companies and member states regarding health protection at work, equal pay and other rights. The CoE also elaborated a number of soft law rules and other international conventions which may be applicable in the business and human rights area, such as the Framework Convention on Artificial Intelligence or conventions dealing with environmental issues. The CoE is currently preparing a study aiming to show the link between the corporate compliance with human rights standards and its economic impact. It believes that better application of human rights and rule of law standards will result in social and economic progress and benefit society as a whole.

The **European Union** and its member states consistently emphasise their support for human rights-based approach to the whole life cycle of new and emerging technologies, including AI systems. The EU aims to ensure transparency, fairness and accountability in AI deployment through various frameworks, including the public procurement directives and the general data protection regulation. The AI Act regulates AI specifically and proposes classifying AI systems based on risk. It sets out obligations for providers and the users of high-risk AI systems regarding transparency, accountability and oversight. A currently ongoing public consultation on high-risk AI systems aims to collect practical examples and clarify issues relating to such systems. The EU also recalls the 2019 Ethic Guidelines for Trustworthy AI, which emphasise principles like human oversight, technical robustness, privacy and non-discrimination.

**UNDP** congratulates the WG on their report on AI procurement and deployment and welcomes the recommendations for UN support in aligning AI-related policies and regulations with international human rights standards. Business can play a pivotal role in fostering the responsible use of AI by prioritising human rights-based procurement and deployment. By emphasising accountability in vendor partnerships and actively mitigating biases in deployment systems, business can harness AI's potential to drive equitable and sustainable development outcomes. Through its Business and Human Rights Initiative, UNDP assists governments in establishing robust legal and policy frameworks, such as for public sector procurement and responsible business incentives. UNDP's new human rights-based approach toolkit empowers practitioners to deliver legal advice to national counterparts. UNDP also trains business to conduct human rights diligence, preventing and addressing adverse impacts in their operations, including those linked to AI procurement and deployment. UNDP stands firmly behind the Global Digital Compact and supports governments in assessing their digital rights landscapes with key insights available in our digital rights dashboard.

**UNICEF** particularly commends the report's recognition of groups at heightened risk of being adversely affected by AI systems, including children. As highlighted in UNICEF and OHCHR's contribution to the BTEC project, digital technologies can significantly impact children's rights, including the rights to privacy, education, protection from exploitation and participation. Risks related to AI that are also faced by adults can be magnified for children, and innovation may



outpace the development of adequate safeguards. UNICEF urges states and businesses to adopt a child rights-based approach to AI governance. This includes ensuring that policies and practises are in line with the Convention on the Rights of the Child and General Comment No. 25. States must ensure that regulatory frameworks and procurement practises reflect the specific needs and vulnerability of children in the digital space. Companies must embed respect for children's rights into their core operations, proactively identifying, preventing and mitigating risks. The UNGPs on children's rights and business principles provide a clear framework for action. UNICEF calls on all stakeholders to ensure that AI systems are developed, procured, and deployed in ways that respect children's rights. Only through sustained cross-sectoral collaboration can we ensure that digital innovation serves the best interest of every child.

The **University for Peace (UPeace)**, an institution established more than 40 years ago with approval by the UNGA, welcomes this dialogue and uses this opportunity to emphasise the importance of integrating a peace-centred approach in the governance of AI and emerging technologies. AI carries social, political consequences that directly impact peaceful coexistence. It has the potential to support sustainable development and economic growth, but also to undermine social cohesion and the well-being of civil society when regulatory frameworks fail to prioritise equity, participation and transparency. Through its Global Centre for Peace Innovation, UPeace explores intersections between innovation and peace in the fields of health, migration and information and communication technologies. It advocates for human-centred decision-making processes that are based on human rights and informed by the lived realities of the communities that will be impacted by the use of social technologies. This also means the involvement of impacted community members as critical stakeholders at all stages of decision-making around the integration and adoption of AI and other emerging technologies. UPeace calls on states and companies alike to embed peace and human rights in the design, deployment and regulation of AI systems. UPeace stands ready to support member states and the working group through policy-orientated research, capacity-building and education that foster ethical innovation in the service of peace.

#### **Views Expressed by Non-Governmental Organizations**

The **Global Alliance of International Human Rights Institutions (GANHRI)** expresses particular concern about the potential human rights violations arising from the misuse of personal data, surveillance technologies, and inadequate cybersecurity in the deployment of AI systems. GANHRI emphasises that the development and deployment of AI technologies must fully respect human rights standards in line with the UN guiding principles. Moreover, businesses developing or using AI must conduct robust human rights due diligence to prevent gender discrimination, eliminate bias in algorithms, and ensure safe and equitable working conditions. As independent institutions, NHRIs play a key role in ensuring that the UNGPs are effectively implemented and translated into reality on the ground. They can monitor, advise, and actively contribute to the development and implementation of public policies related to AI that are grounded in accountability, transparency, and in full compliance with international human rights standards. GANHRI, its members, and regional networks will continue to support and work closely with the Working Group on these important issues.

The **Colombian Commission of Jurists** welcomes the WG's report on its visit to Colombia, and highlights the urgent need for both the state and the corporations to effectively implement the



WG's recommendations. The Commission agrees with the concern expressed in the report about the persistent impunity in cases where businesses have been linked to serious human rights violations, such as the financing of armed groups, land dispossession, or the hounding of human rights offenders. Cases such as the German Union or the Hacienda Bellacruz, which were marked by systematic delays and judicial manoeuvring which, for decades, delayed legal processes, highlight the ineffectiveness of the judiciary when investigating and punishing the perpetrators of these crimes. Moreover, as the WG stated, despite efforts that have been made, reparation measures proposed by the transitional justice system are insufficient in the face of the scale of the challenge involved in shedding light on the crimes and providing reparation to the victims of the corporate participation in the armed conflict. Regarding cases such as the German Trade Union, the Commission has found that the reparations that have been proposed are not commensurate with the harm caused to victims, especially regarding the right to assembly and association. Corporate actors cannot continue to act on the margin of accountability, whereas victims continue to wait for truth, justice, and reparation. Due diligence is not sufficient.

The **Centre du Commerce International pour le Développement (CECIDE)** welcomes progress towards a legally binding instrument for transnational corporations and other businesses on human rights. Given the scale of the current challenges, the Centre is of the view that we must invest in political convergences so as to agree on a robust and ambitious and victim-centred treaty. Local communities, indigenous peoples, and workers, in particular women and migrants, continue to suffer on a daily basis serious human rights violations in connection with the activities of transnational corporations. Therefore, CECIDE calls for implementation of the some priorities. Effective access to justice - The instrument must guarantee binding mechanisms that enable victims to access legal remedy, including beyond their own borders. Extraterritorial accountability. - States should provide a legal framework for the activities of their corporations, including when these have operations abroad, in accordance with the guiding principles. Ensuring that AI and digital technologies are properly managed. - The treaty should anticipate the risks posed by AI when it is unregulated, such as discrimination, surveillance, abuses of freedoms, thereby ensuring that digital governance is based on human rights.

The **International Centre Against Censorship** welcomes the strong report of the Working Group, which rightly affirms the need to conduct human rights impact assessments and due diligence throughout the entire life cycle of AI systems, and importantly calls for red lines on those technologies that are fundamentally incompatible with international human rights law. The Centre has long warned of the potential race to the bottom in the competition to embrace AI, where the promotion and protection of human rights are sidelined in the name of innovation. It has also documented the pervasive threat of AI-enabled surveillance, including through facial recognition on the right of freedom of expression and media freedom. It creates a climate of fear and self-censorship among journalists and media workers. Awareness of potential monitoring deters journalists from covering sensitive topics, engaging in investigative reporting, and communicating with vulnerable sources. This chilling effect undermines the diversity, independence, and long-term viability of the media sector. The Centre calls on all governments to fully implement the recommendations of the report, including prohibiting the procurement and deployment of AI systems that cannot comply with international human rights standards. The Centre further calls on states to embed a multi-stakeholder, human rights-based approach in the functioning of both the independent International Scientific Panel on AI and the Global Dialogue



on AI Governance. It also calls on businesses to carry out and require robust human rights impact assessments and due diligence processes throughout the whole life cycle of AI systems, with specific measures to ensure the protection of journalists, human rights defenders, and other civil society actors.

**Peace Brigades International** explains that in Colombia, ethnic communities and campesino communities continue to be exposed to the violence of armed groups in connection with both legal and illegal markets. Displacement, sexual violence, and stigmatisation affect them both in rural areas and urban areas, like in Buenaventura and El Catatumbo, amongst other places. In this context, it is urgent to clarify the links with political and economic elites, both international and national ones. A legally binding framework is needed to punish corporations that violate human rights, and the protection and collective prevention for those who defend their rights in the face of economic interests needs to be strengthened. The present reserve zones, such as the Cotomachaco Amazonian area and the biodiversity regions that are protected, are key for building peace and ensuring sustainability. The visit to Colombia's reports calls for contracts with corporations to be suspended when there are signs of violations. In Colombia, since 2018, the WG's concern about the link between the Frontera Energy Company and the Colombian Army and the Public Prosecutor's Office remains unaddressed. There were many protests about environmental damage in connection with this case.

The **Centre for International Environmental Law (CIEL)** thanks the WG for addressing the issue of Investor-State Dispute Settlement (ISDS), in the reports on their visit to Colombia. As the WG highlighted, ISDS undermines human rights due to the exorbitant compensation claims from foreign investors against states that attempt to expand the protection of human rights and the environment. It also has a chilling effect on more progressive policies due to the looming threat of potential lawsuits from investors. It is worth noting that the majority of claims are brought forward by fossil fuel investors. In the case of Colombia, the state is at the forefront of a global shift to reform a decades-old investment treaty system that has undermined its sovereignty. This demonstrates efforts towards increasing corporate accountability and ensuring that foreign investment supports, rather than hinders, sustainable development and the country's historic peace process. Many Special Procedures, including this WG, have looked at the human rights implication of ISDS mechanisms, and CIEL encourages the UNHRC to explicitly address this issue in the most appropriate manner.

**Juventum** commends the comprehensive coverage and the bird's-eye view of the issue of the ethical use of AI in the report. Juventum agrees with the conclusions and hopes all the recommendations will be implemented. Wishing this issue would be continuously followed up by the WG, Juventum would like to mark some points for future discussion. Robust international standards for the ethical use of AI should be established as a treaty. Transnational corporations should not be allowed to take advantage of the different levels of regulations by claiming certain AI operations take place in their favourable states. All available digitised information on AI and human rights should be stored in a searchable database and constantly updated. This type of library search mechanism is possible with the currently available information and discussions. AI should be able to help evaluate if certain business activities meet the human rights criteria. The regulations should be periodically updated by discussions involving all necessary stakeholders.



**Sikh Human Rights Group (SHRG)** commends the report by the WG and the recognition it contains of urgent challenges linked to human rights and AI. However, a key loophole must be filled, that is, the lack of direct obligations for transnational corporations. Although the report does recognise the responsibility of corporations, it relies mainly on state regulation without introducing binding obligations for corporations. This is insufficient as an approach for AI systems, such as those used by transnational corporations, systematically violate human rights. The lack of binding obligations means that transnational corporations can act in all impunity, whereas research shows that AI training rests largely on the exploitation of workers from the Global South. Yet despite this evidence, those practises are ignored by the current regulation systems. AI systems often strengthen bias on the basis of the data on which they are trained, which expands discrimination and exclusion, especially for marginalised communities. This is clear in facial recognition and surveillance technologies, which have a disproportionate impact on those groups, and also in algorithmic bias regarding hiring, loans, and healthcare, which again broadens social inequality. Without binding obligations for corporations and effective oversight of the development and training of AI, we risk integrating these human rights violations into our digital future. SHRG urges the WG to bridge these gaps and to ensure that TNCs are held directly responsible.

the **Iraqi Development Organizations** draws the Council's attention to a recent industrial disaster in Bahrain that highlights systematic failures in occupational safety, corporate accountability, and workers' rights. On 2 May 2025, a toxic gas leak at the Bapco Refining complex killed three employees. Authorities announced an internal investigation and the appointment of an independent investigator but have yet to disclose his identity or qualifications. This lack of transparency has raised serious doubts about the independence and credibility of the process. This is not the first industrial accident at the Bapco facility. The recurrence of such incidents raises grave concerns about the adequacy of safety standards, the effectiveness of oversight, and the extent to which negligence may have contributed to preventable death. The company's past safety record and the OPAC investigation process cast further doubt on whether victims' rights and the right to life are being adequately protected. The Organization asks the WG, what measures can be taken to ensure accountability and transparency in corporate-linked human rights violations, particularly when national investigations fail to meet international standards?

Commending the WG's essential efforts over the last several years to create frameworks to ensure accountability for transnational corporations, **Just Atonement Inc.** calls attention to the devastating role transnational corporations have played in furthering the climate crisis and disrupting the global climate system. Transnational corporations can and must be held liable for their contributions to the climate crisis, including where applicable, their knowledge of the use of fossil fuels would radically disrupt the climate system. Just Atonement urges the WG to consider the intergenerational consequences of transnational corporate conduct and to focus its efforts on addressing climate change damages that could last for tens of thousands of years. Just Atonement asks the WG to consider the oftentimes close nexus between corporate and state conduct and align its work with the International Law Commission's Articles on Responsibility of States for Internationally Wrongful Acts, specifically Articles 5 and 8 relating to conduct of private actors that can be imputed to the state. Just Atonement also requests that the WG considers liability for members of corporate boards, aligning itself with Nuremberg-era principles on holding



directors accountable for actions on the board, such as in the IG Farben case. Just Atonement urges the WG to connect its work to these related international legal frameworks.

The **Institute for NGO Research** states that the WG's report consists of a careful analysis of AI and how business and government can improve its benefits while ensuring human rights protections. As the WG notes in its report, UNGPs are one of these important tools, providing a compelling starting point. Unfortunately, other Special Procedures mandate holders, however, are using their platforms to distort the UNGPs and weaponize them for destructive political campaigns and agendas. Notably, some mandate holders who will be presenting later in this UNHRC session are misrepresenting the UNGPs as a punitive framework to be used for threatening, boycotting, and sanctioning companies based on demands from radical political actors. In contrast to this misuse, the WG rightly notes that the UNGPs are a positive instrument in enshrining multi-stakeholder collaboration and social dialogue. The UNGPs are not, as misrepresented by some mandate holders, a mandatory cudgel to bludgeon companies. The Institute believes the WG should ensure that the UNGPs are protected and utilised for their intended purpose as a positive, pluralistic, collaborative, and multi-stakeholder process. The Institute urges it to speak out against those that seek to exploit the UNGPs for their narrow and discriminatory interests, which not only degrade the UNGPs, but could ultimately relegate this carefully designed framework into obsolescence.

## FACTS & FIGURES ON ID PARTICIPATION

**35** State Delegations

**5** Inter-Governmental Organizations

**11** Non-Governmental Organizations