

**Safeguard People and the Planet,  
Not Corporate Profit and Human Rights Abuses**  
*Why We Reject the Draft World Bank's Safeguards Framework and Demand a  
Rigorous Revision*

The undersigned peoples' networks and civil society organizations issue this public statement in response to the 2014 draft of the Environmental and Social Safeguards Framework of the World Bank. We completely reject the draft World Bank Environmental and Social Safeguards Framework.

For over 50 years, the World Bank has promoted a development model that is friendly to markets and capital, but destructive to people, communities and the environment. Through direct financing, technical support, policy conditionalities, and knowledge manipulation, the World Bank has colluded with private financiers, corporations and governments to undermine laws and regulations that uphold the rights of peoples and protect nature. By virtue of its foundational charter, the World Bank remains above all national laws and completely unaccountable for its actions. The current framework is a clear indicator that despite the many struggles and efforts of people all over the world to make the World Bank accountable for its decisions, the Bank continues to arrogate to itself and its actions legal immunity.

Notwithstanding World Bank President Kim's public promise that safeguards would not be compromised, and despite the good faith engagement of global civil society in the first phase of consultation, the draft safeguards framework attacks the fundamental and universally accepted environmental and human rights standards, and various Principles securing environmental and social justice.

The draft is a clear testament to the fact that the World Bank has no intent to end its legacy of promoting policies, programs and investments that have resulted in huge development debacles and injustices. It is widely documented that it evolved without accountability and transparency, and consultations were held sparingly and ritualistically. Keeping this in mind we reject the process by which the safeguards framework was evolved and also the draft. If the World Bank wishes to consult with people, it must take our issues seriously.

The draft is woefully inadequate when compared with international human rights standards and best practices, and is so drafted as to remove fundamental protections of human rights and the environment and absolve the Bank of any accountability for its actions. The Bank, in evolving this framework, has even failed to meet moral obligation that respect human rights and its own mandate to alleviate poverty. This policy jeopardizes the survival of local communities and natural ecosystems. The World Bank clearly intends to not only continue business as usual, but also prioritizes economic growth-led development model to regain its relevance in international development finance at the irreplaceable cost of human rights and

irreversible damage to the environment. In addition, the draft fails to recognize the links between environment and poverty, and the emerging climate crisis.

The draft safeguards also demonstrates the stand of the Bank that it is more than willing to retrogress instead of taking accountability for its actions. The draft clearly positions a schema for offloading Bank responsibilities to Borrowers and Financial Intermediaries. It also allows the World Bank to escape even the basic human rights standards and environmental obligations applicable to Borrower countries. The draft sets a dangerous precedent and will be an architect of a race to the bottom as IFIs, the national governments and new lending institutions will in all likelihood follow the same model. At present, safeguards are the only policies that the World Bank has that address its stated mandate of poverty reduction, and they must not to be seen as a hindrance to human progress. Strong safeguards firmly aligned with international human rights standards are essential to any institution to demonstrate its integrity with the stated mandate of benefiting all, especially the poor.

We believe that respecting human rights entails ensuring the rights of vulnerable and marginalized groups, especially women, sexual minorities, children, persons with disabilities, workers, climate refugees, internally displaced population, people in armed conflict, and human rights defenders. The framework allows too much flexibility for the borrower to use country systems, which are generally weak while also providing for the devolution of Bank obligations and accountability to the Borrower. The draft also puts the primacy of corporate powers over the protection of people and the environment. Without adequate assessment of equivalency and capacity, use of country systems will be detrimental and will nullify any protections provided by the safeguards.

Key dilutions we have detected in the draft safeguards include, but are not limited to: due diligence of Bank decisions, financial exposure and project level functions are done internally and not through a third party review mechanism – in effect the Bank conducting its own due diligence; an overly narrow scope of coverage of issues; the inadequate treatment of the climate crisis and the rights of workers; the commodification of natural resources leading to the destruction of life supporting environmental systems; the invisibility and suppression of voice of vulnerable groups to hold the Bank accountable; the failure to include broad free, prior and informed consent for all affected peoples; and the evisceration of minimum protections, all of which will result in loss of accountability for World Bank projects.

Furthermore, the draft undermines the rights of Indigenous People by allowing borrowers to “opt out” of implementing the proposed IP standards, which would directly undermine their successive and hard fought battles from local to international levels for self-determination and collective ownership of lands, territories and resources. Moreover, the draft undermines protections to women from the adverse impacts and risks of the Bank’s operations whilst providing no measures to safeguard the rights of women to access, participate and challenge the decision-making process. The draft fails to assess gaps in the existing safeguard

policies under review and how to address them. On the contrary, the draft leaves women completely out from measures to protect and empower them in the decision making process. In effect, the Bank draft will only widen gender disparities and inequalities across its entire operations.

We demand a recall of the draft. No new round of consultations must occur without a new draft that rectifies these massive failures. The Bank must guarantee the non-dilution of all binding provisions of the World Bank safeguards policy as prior to this review process, and adherence to binding provisions that are compliant to international human rights standards. Safeguards must also be applicable to all projects directly or indirectly financed by the Bank and its instrumentalities. The redraft must include a robust and meaningful consultation process, and be accompanied by a consultation plan, which includes translations into all member country languages, including regional languages. These consultations must include the full and effective participation of all affected peoples, especially vulnerable groups. If the World Bank is serious about doing good, it should take immediate action on our key demands.

### **Environment**

The new Biodiversity policy is a clear dilution of the protection for natural ecosystems and resource-dependent communities provided by the existing policies on Forests and Natural Habitats. The policy's new and limited emphasis on biodiversity and primary production demonstrates a clear perspective of commodification of nature overlooking all other natural values. The proposed Biodiversity policy drastically narrows the definition of critical habitats to exclude government-recognized protected areas and "areas initially recognized as protected by traditional local communities." The policy permits the conversion and degradation of any natural area—including but not limited to critical habitats—if biodiversity offsets are used as a mitigation mechanism. Biodiversity offset is a blind destruction of nature that we vehemently oppose. The Bank must remove this provision in the policy.

We emphasize that any safeguard policy must provide robust protections for the full range of terrestrial and marine ecosystems, whether they are officially protected or not, taking into account the important links between natural ecosystems and food security. The draft leaves no areas truly off the table for destructive development, and fails to adequately ensure the consent of local communities for projects that impact their use of and access to natural resources. The Draft Safeguards do not at all address the critical importance of recognizing traditional knowledge associated with natural resources dependent peoples, and their intricate dependence on natural habitats.

It is indisputable that it is high time the World Bank safeguards are in compliance with international and multilateral standards on human rights and the environment. These safeguards must also avoid and minimize harmful impacts to the environment, such as relying on biodiversity offsets to mitigate destructive interventions.

Conversion or degradation of critical habitats must not be allowed, and the subset of environments considered “critical” must be expanded to include protected areas and ecologically sensitive areas, among other environmentally and culturally important areas. Ensuring the consent of communities for projects impacting natural resources important to their traditional livelihoods must be a primary directive, as well as evaluation of direct and indirect impacts, and short-term and long-term impacts. Additionally, the broadening of environmental and social impact assessment frameworks and adoption of climate change impact assessments must be prioritized. Project-level evaluation of impacts are not sufficient, but rather impacts must be evaluated cumulatively and at the regional level, in accordance to the Principle of Inter-generational Equity, Precautionary Principle, Public Trust Doctrine, Principle of Free, Prior and Informed Consent, and related international norms.

The Bank must acknowledge women as rights holders and stakeholders. The acknowledgement requires gender impact and risk assessment of Bank projects, and an assessment of the changing environments that affect the livelihoods of women, their sexual and reproductive health and safety. In the draft, the Bank must consider gender dimensions of the environmental impacts and risks and develop specific measures to mitigate the environmental impacts and risks to women. It must also promote women’s equal participation in decision making and address gaps that are disadvantageous to women. The Bank must recognize gender as an essential determinant of social outcomes.

### **Climate Change Crisis**

We oppose the World Bank’s involvement in false climate solutions, given its historical mistakes and refusal to reform its continued financing of destructive projects. It is a non-negotiable demand that the World Bank stop funding fossil fuels by putting this funding on the exclusion list. It must take a cautious approach in financing so-called low carbon emission projects such as hydropower and geothermal as they have high social and environmental risks and impacts. We demand that any project or policy with climate change impacts must be scrutinized on the basis of whether they actually reduce GhG emissions or not, and come under the purview of full safeguards. Any funding, irrespective of borrower capacity, must take into account the climate impacts and their mitigation measures, including requirements to develop responses for the multiple impacts of extreme events, hydro-meteorological disasters caused by climate change. There must be measures to address the additional impacts on already occurring slow onset events such as impacts on agricultural yields, water availability and access, life, and livelihoods. Any shortfall in a project’s technical feasibility and economic viability to address climate change impacts must be met by the funding mechanism itself regardless of the system that applies in the country. We reject the financialization of nature promoted by the Bank’s so-called climate solutions, which undermine and manipulate the rights of indigenous peoples, other local communities, and women. This also undermines the traditional knowledge systems and practices in terms of community resilience. The proposal of projects that claim to be “climate solutions” must include assessment of the full range of differentiated impacts on land, water, displacement,

indigenous, marginalized and vulnerable populations, including women, which result in human rights and women's rights violations.

### **Labor**

The World Bank's draft labor safeguard entails that borrowers from the public-sector divisions of the Bank need not comply with all of the ILO core labor standards and that contract workers can be denied any protection under this safeguard. This brings the Bank's draft safeguard out of line with and several steps backwards from the labor standards requirements of multilateral development banks such as the African Development Bank and the European Bank for Reconstruction and Development, as well as the Bank's own private sector lending arm, the International Finance Corporation. Unlike the safeguards at these institutions, the Bank's proposed safeguard makes no mention of the ILO, its eight fundamental rights conventions or the core labor standards. In fact, the draft labor safeguard will protect freedom of association and collective bargaining rights only "where national law recognizes" such rights. Furthermore, the draft labor safeguard would only apply to people "employed or engaged directly by the Borrower." This means that contract workers, who are often the most vulnerable workers to exploitation and abuse, would be excluded from any protection through the draft labor safeguard.

The World Bank's labor safeguard should require compliance with all four ILO Core Labor Standards (covering freedom of association, collective bargaining rights, the absence of forced labor or child labor, and non-discrimination in the workplace) and properly adapted requirements for other basic working conditions (including provision of documented terms of employment to employees, occupational safety and health, retrenchment procedures, access to grievance mechanisms, and supply chain standards) regardless of the laws/policies in borrower countries. It should be developed through communication with trade unions and the International Labor Organization. Given the increasing and large-scale casualization and 'informalization' of labor in many countries and in many sectors, every part of the labor safeguard must apply to all workers, including migrant workers regardless of immigration status and workers in the informal sector. Furthermore, this safeguard should apply to all employees of contractors or subcontractors of institutions that receive loans either directly from the Bank or from its financial intermediaries. We demand clear obligations regarding the rights of workers with disabilities, sexual minorities, and high risk and vulnerable populations.

### **Land Rights and Involuntary Resettlement**

The draft eviscerates the rights of communities subjected to forced eviction. It does not provide adequate protection for vulnerable populations such as people without legal identity, internally displaced people and land occupants without formal land title who are most exposed to evictions without reparation and subjected to discriminatory practices in many countries. The draft allows the Bank to finance projects that entail the physical and economic displacement of communities without first ensuring that there is a plan and budget available to ensure their adequate compensation, resettlement and rehabilitation.

The Bank must not weaken, impede or restrict local peoples' tenurial rights to land and housing, and access rights to natural resources in any manner, and/or violate human rights, including the right to adequate housing, the right to food, the right to non-discrimination, the right to equal protection of the law, and civil and political rights. It must avoid and minimize the risk of conflict over land and natural resources, and make every effort to address any/all conflicts that arise from Bank operations. It must support and strengthen recognition of the specific land tenure and resource rights of indigenous peoples, the legal protection of vulnerable and marginalized people, with particular attention to women, children and persons with disabilities, against forced eviction and illegitimate use by others of their land and natural resources. The Bank must account not only for economically tangible losses and damages but also for political persecution, cultural impacts and psychosocial trauma that evicted communities suffer.

The Bank must acknowledge women and the female-headed households, as among the marginalized and vulnerable groups as a result of development-induced evictions. Hence, the Bank must provide specific mitigation requirements to assist women and female-headed households in dealing with difficult situations triggered by eviction. The Bank policy must require an assessment of the impacts of eviction to the rights of women, which include, but are not limited to: specific women's needs for health, safety, livelihood and other protections as a result of eviction; a gender disaggregated baseline data to inform the compensation, livelihood improvement and other related assistance to women; and clear and meaningful process for their involvement in consultations and decision-making.

### **Indigenous Peoples**

We reject the overall weakening of the policy requirements for indigenous peoples as it poses very serious implications including outright denial of the existence and rights of indigenous peoples under international human rights laws. Not only are the standards for indigenous peoples (contained in ESS7) still below international human rights law; it also appears that even the standards in ESS7 will only apply to a minority of projects impacting on indigenous peoples and financed by the World Bank. It is simply unacceptable that the implementation of policy requirements for indigenous peoples could be subject for an 'opt-out', or that borrowers can use borrower system or national laws that are not aligned to the recognition of the rights of indigenous peoples under international human rights instruments.

We demand the immediate removal of the proposal that governments can simply 'opt-out' of applying the policy requirements intended to protect indigenous peoples. As part of protecting the land rights of the indigenous peoples, it is critical that requirements intended to ensure such rights are protected are clearly formulated in partnership with the peoples themselves, time-bound, designed against clear indicators and with sufficient budget allowances. The inclusion of a requirement for obtaining the free, prior and informed consent is welcomed but the requirement is inadequate. Agreements reached with communities described and verified by the

Bank together with independent experts and clear and accessible grievance mechanism in case of violation of the agreement are imperative as they are critical for the indigenous peoples to exercise their right to self-determination and as full partners in the development process.

Moreover, particular attention must be given to indigenous women. In dealing with the project benefits to and impacts to the rights of indigenous women, the Bank's safeguard policy must require a gender analysis on project impacts and risks to indigenous women. This analysis must be informed by gender-disaggregated baseline information that covers the demographic, social, cultural, and political characteristics of the affected Indigenous Peoples' communities, their land and territories. Moreover, the policy must require consultations with indigenous women and consider indigenous women's cultural identity and uniqueness in managing the resettlement action plan for Indigenous Peoples.

### **Gender and SOGIE**

The draft does not consider how persons who are vulnerable and marginalized due to identity, age, race, disability, gender and SOGIE (sexual orientation, gender identity and expression) may be differently affected by the implementation of World Bank funded-projects. Although the draft mentions prejudice and discrimination in a few instances, SOGIE persons and women are not specifically included. Women and SOGIE persons must be explicitly included in ESS1 of the draft as a vulnerable group, which requires consideration during environmental and social assessment and project implementation.

We demand that the Bank's revision of its safeguard policies rectifies problematic provisions that are a product of insufficient gender awareness and non-recognition of international women's human rights standards. The revision must result in a gender-sensitive and responsive safeguards framework that:

- Adheres to international agreements, conventions and declarations particularly CEDAW (Convention on Elimination of Discriminations against Women), UN-Covenant on Civil-Political Rights, UN Covenant on Economic, Social and Cultural Rights, UN Declaration on Rights of Indigenous Peoples and the UN Convention on the Rights of Persons with Disability;
- Protects women's rights and commits to preventing women from adverse impacts and risks of WB operations;
- Includes gender awareness attitude by acknowledging different experiences and needs of women and men in facing the adverse impacts and risks of WB operations;
- Segregates women and men from people or community to enable a cleared and more detailed assessment of and mitigation to the differential project impacts and risks to women; such support measures should be tailored to the specific needs, identities and uniqueness of women;
- Acknowledges women as rights holders and stakeholders in the community, which are an essential determinant of social outcomes;

- Acknowledges the gender dimensions in the social risk and mitigation framework; and
- Acknowledges women as heads of households and women's differential status, experiences, and needs within male-headed households

The Bank's safeguard policy must have gender sensitive and responsive policy requirements including: 1) gender impact and risk assessment of the changing environments that affect the livelihoods of women and their sexual and reproductive health and safety; 2) specific measures to involve women in any decision making relative to environmental assessment, mitigation, resettlement and other development plans; and 3) gender disaggregated baseline data and information on demographic, economic, social, cultural, and political status. Requirements must also include 4) specific and culturally appropriate measures to assist displaced local and indigenous women in dealing with difficult situation triggered by involuntary resettlement activities; 5) Gender sensitive and responsive grievance mechanism; and 6) specific measures to address the needs of female-headed households.

### **Children**

The draft does not at all address the specific needs and concerns of children and does not articulate how children, being among the most vulnerable groups, experience the negative impacts of World Bank-financed projects. The draft does not show how children are differently effected by World Bank projects when it uses child labor, resettles children and their families, thus depriving them of the possibility for school, and the lack of job opportunities for parents, resulting in a lack of access to basic services. These conditions bring about the potential for abuse, violence, exploitation, and trafficking of children. The draft does not include provisions that will guarantee equal social and economic benefits to children, as those received by other member of the community, let alone giving children priority over others in the access and delivery of basic services.

We demand that the borrower be required to systematically and regularly assess the impacts World Bank projects may have on children, including serious consequences for children, such as the impact on their physical and mental health, and the loss of their childhood (the possibility for play, and engaging in meaningful children's activities). To address the negative impacts of World Bank-financed projects on children, the policy must incorporate differentiated, child-sensitive language that ensure improvement in their quality of life, in the various cross-cutting issues that are included in the policy framework. This must be anchored in a Child Rights Framework with the four main pillars: 1) guaranteeing survival or the right to live, e.g. food security projects; 2) the right to full human development, which includes the right to identity, play, and education; 3) the right to participation in determination and decision-making that effects their lives, which includes participatory and consultative processes directly involving children themselves; and 4) the right to protection from abuse, violence, and exploitation.



## **Persons with Disabilities**

The very nature and character of the World Bank, which is in effect rejecting human rights principles has resulted in policies, including safeguards that do not effectively address poverty. Human rights determine the full equality of every individual, however and whatever status he is in. When an institution does not uphold human rights principles, it naturally inevitably creates discriminatory and harmful programs and projects. This is the very reason why we have citizens in the world we call vulnerable and marginalized, like that of Persons with Disabilities (PwD). The vulnerable and marginalized citizens are simply a creation of policies that are not human rights based. Human rights and socioeconomic development are inseparable, and they should not remain dichotomized as it is today at the World Bank.

The policy must incorporate the UN Convention on the Rights of Persons with Disabilities. As such, the policy must guarantee full inclusion, which means non-discrimination and the end of the invisibility of PwD. The policy must observe the four principles: 1) inclusion: the termination of the invisibility of PwD needs and interests in the general policy; 2) accessibility: to ensure that all infrastructure, built-in environment, transportation, information and communication technology (ICT), and related services are available and usable to PwD; 3) full participation: the acknowledgment that PwD are present in all basic sectors of all society—women, children, laborers, and other groups — and are consulted and involved; and 4) capacity building: the enablement of PwD to meaningfully participate by providing full access to education, information, and opportunity for development.

We reiterate our demand for a redraft as basis for a new round of consultations. The World Bank redraft must rectify serious policy deficiencies including dilution of some strong and binding safeguard provisions. We also demand expanding the scope of the safeguard policy's application that covers all lending instruments and trust funds. The redraft must include a robust and meaningful consultation process, and be accompanied by a consultation plan, which includes translations into all member country language. These consultations must include the full and effective participation of vulnerable groups. We urge the Bank to take immediate action on our key demands.

### **Signed by:**

Asia	Asian Labor Network on International Financial Institutions (ALNI)
Asia	NGO Forum on ADB
Asia	Diakonia Asia
Asia	Asian NGO Coalition for Agrarian Reform and Rural Development,
Burma	Association of Human Rights Defenders and Promoters
Burma	Karen Environmental and Social Action Network
Burma	Burma Environmental Working Group
Burma	Kachin Women's Association Thailand
Burma	Human Rights Foundation of Monland
Burma	Tavoyan Women's Union

Burma	Burma Partnership
Cambodia	NGO Forum on Cambodia
Cambodia	Equitable Cambodia
India	Beyond Copenhagen collective, India
India	Bharat Jan Vigyan Jatha (India People's Science Campaign)
India	Environmental Support Group – Trust
India	India HIV Alliance
India	South Asian Dialogues on Ecological Democracy
India	ToxicsWatch Alliance
India	Afadah Women Forum Foundation (FORWA)
India	Confederation of Indonesian Trade Union Prosperity (KSBSI)
India	Federation of Construction, Informal and General Workers (FKUI-KSBSI)
India	Federation of Financial, Information, Trade and Banking Trade Union (NIKEUBA-KSBSI)
India	Federation of Forestry Trade Union (FSP KAHUTINDO)
India	Federation of Forestry, general Industry, Wood, Agriculture and Peasants Trade Union (HUKATAN - KSBSI)
India	Federation of Garment, Crafting, Textile, Leather and Shoes Trade Union (GARTEKS – KSBSI)
India	Federation of Pharmaceutical, Health Workers – Reformation Trade Union (FARKES – KSPI)
India	Federation of Printing, Publication, Media and Information Trade Union (FSP PPMI – KSPI)
India	Health for All Foundation (YKS/HfA)
India	Indonesian Seafarers Trade Union (KPI)
India	Inter Islands Foundation (Lintas Nusa) 1
India	Migrant Care Indonesia
India	Migrant Workers Care Foundation
India	National Advocacy Network for Domestic Workers Rights (JALA-PRT)
India	National Industrial Workers Federation (FSPN)
India	Rumpun Tjoet Njak Dien Foundation
India	The All Indonesia Workers Organization (OPSI)
India	Trade Union Congress of the Philippines (TUCP – Affiliate of ITUC)
India	Federation of Free Workers (FFW)
Indonesia	Aksi! for gender, social and ecological justice
Indonesia	HuMA-Perkumpulan untuk Pembaharuan Hukum Berbasis Masyarakat dan Ekologis
Japan	Japan Center for Sustainable Environment and Society
Mongolia	OT Watch
Mongolia	Gobi Soil
Mongolia	Steps without Border
Mongolia	Centre for Human Rights and Development
Mongolia	Centre for Citizens Alliance
Mongolia	Rivers without Boundaries
Mozambique	JOINT- National Coalition of NGOs in Mozambique,

Nepal	Community Self-Reliance Center
Nepal	Jal Sarokar Manch-Nepal
Pakistan	Creed Alliance
Pakistan	National Peasants Coalition of Pakistan (NPCP)
Pakistan	Society for Conservation and Protection of Environment (SCOPE)
Philippines	<i>Alyansa Tigil Mina (Alliance Against Mining)</i>
Philippines	<i>Alyansa Laban sa Mina (ALAMIN)</i>
Philippines	<i>Aksyon Klima</i>
Philippines	Ancestral Land Domain Watch Network
Philippines	Bayay Sibuyanon
Philippines	Concerned Laleno Against Illegal Mining
Philippines	Dinarawan Indigenous Peoples' Organization (DIPO)
Philippines	Ecological Society of the Philippines
Philippines	Freedom from Debt Coalition
Philippines	Green Convergence
Philippines	Greenheart Hermitage
Philippines	Marinduque Council for Environmental Concerns
Philippines	Philippine Alliance of Human Rights Advocates
Philippines	Philippine Human Rights Information Center
Philippines	Philippine Movement for Climate Justice (PM CJ)
Philippines	Romblon Ecumenical Forum Against Mining (REFAM)
Philippines	Sibuyan ISLE, Inc.
Philippines	Social Action Network - Marbel
Philippines	SOCSARGEN Cares
Philippines	Task Force Detainees of the Philippines
Philippines	Vicarial Social Action Center - CarCanMadCarLanPar
South Africa	Free Burma Campaign (South Africa), South Africa
Thailand	Building and Woodworkers Industrial Council of Thailand
Thailand	Colour Motor Thailand Workers Union
Thailand	Confederation of Electronic, Electrical Appliances, Auto and Metal Workers
Thailand	Confederation of Industrial Labour of Thailand
Thailand	Food and Services Union Thailand (KFC)
Thailand	Ford & Mazda Thailand Workers' Union
Thailand	Freedom Group Worker's Union
Thailand	Karat Sanitary Workers Union
Thailand	Mitsubishi Electric Labour Union Thailand
Thailand	Myer Aluminium Workers Union
Thailand	Oil and Gas Wellhead Platform Thailand Labor Union
Thailand	Postal office Labour Union
Thailand	RPC Workers Union
Thailand	Saraburi and Nearby Labor Area Group
Thailand	State Enterprises Workers' Relations Confederation
Thailand	Summit Kurata Manufacturing Workers Union
Thailand	Thai Bridgestone Labour Union
Thailand	Thai Labour Solidarity Committee

Thailand	The Eastern Labour Union Group
Thailand	The Fujitsu General Workers Union
Thailand	The State Railway Worker Union Of Thailand
Thailand	Tostem Thai Workers Union
Thailand	Yamaha Workers Union
Thailand	YS Pund Workers Union
United Kingdom	Burma Campaign UK

**Other organizations represented in the Bangkok meeting (to confirm endorsement)**

Earthrights International Alliance, Asia and International  
DebtWATCH, Indonesia  
Philippine Coalition on the Convention on the Rights of Persons with Disabilities,  
Philippines  
SEJIWA, Indonesia  
Psycho Social Support and Children's Rights Resource Center (PST CRRC), Philippines  
Habitat International Coalition/Housing and Land Rights Network, Egypt  
KEPA, Finland  
Egyptian Initiative for Personal Rights, Egypt  
State Enterprise Workers Relations Confederation (SERC), Thailand  
Vietnam Rivers Network  
EarthRights International  
International Rivers