

## **Minutes, ICoC Working Group #1 Meeting: 22 August 2011 via teleconference**

### **Attending :**

- Mark DeWitt, Triple Canopy
- Jason Pielemeier, U.S. Department of State
- Andy Orsmond, Human Rights First
- Chris Mayer, U.S. Department of Defense
- Glynne Evans, SCEG (Security in Complex Environments Group-ADS)
- Anne-Marie Buzatu, DCAF
- Thomas Haueter, DCAF

### **BEGIN 9:00 DC / 14:00 UK / 15:00 GENEVA**

- At the beginning of the meeting the different ways how comments could and should be added to the report were discussed. The possibility of a one page paper with diverging issues of a consistency was mentioned in order to not question the report as a whole.
- It was agreed that the cover paper will include the areas of agreement and outline the areas of differing views.
- It was mentioned that more work should be done to maximize the areas of consensus; however, the time was too short for that.
  
- It was brought up that the report should highlight clearly that there were two processes: a system/policy and impact.
- There was discussion about national standards. The distinction between the international standards that ANSI will develop and the national implementation guide should be noted. The IGOM should review those standards and implementation guides and take a view once those processes are completed.
- A monitoring process / review process should be focus on performance, rather a quality assessment than a certification on the system and policy side.
- It was brought up that the monitoring and evaluation of impact companies have will face significant resource questions: there are significant costs related with in-field monitoring. Remote monitoring / information collection is cheaper. As an alternative proposal to all company monitoring, a targeted in-field monitoring was mentioned: one that looks at the context and risk level of activities.
- Multiple statements were made that the concept of monitoring will be costly and that there probably will be more work involved in resolving the in-field monitoring issue. Regarding the issue of possible conflict of interest, Working Group 3 was mentioned that looks at the institutional side of the IGOM: much will depend on whether the IGOM board consistent of independent experts or stakeholder representative.
- It was mentioned that the monitoring should be proportionate to the size of the industry and that the TSC should look at the proposals as a complete package
- It was brought up that the IGOM should have the authority to review its standards. Going forward will be a learning process. It is not bound by other processes; it should retain its authority to make adjustment to its own certification.
- The question was raised what should be done until national standards such as ANSI will be operational. Maybe the IGOM can accredit ad interim its own companies that will be able to certify companies. It was mentioned that the UK will start working on national implementation guidelines. The IGOM should do something of the same kind.

- It was mentioned that the scope of certification needs to be determined: on headquarters, on in-country level? Is certification needed in all the countries they are active? Again, the issue of the proportionality to the industry size was discussed.
- It was mentioned that some legal difficulties such as the EU data protection act should be added to the report. The EU data protection directive might also lead to some contract not being disclosed.
- The concern was raised that a draft Charter by the TSC is not an optimal instrument for consultation: some parts of industry will not be able to comment since a Charter will be very complex. An interim paper with the issues at stake could be more useful and understandable for the industry consultation.

**END 10:30 DC / 15:30 UK / 16:30 GENEVA**