

**Industry-Specific Multi-Stakeholder Initiatives That Govern Corporate Human Rights Standards –
Legitimacy Assessments of the Fair Labor Association and the Global Network Initiative**

Dorothee Baumann-Pauly (New York University, Stern School of Business, Center for Business and Human Rights, New York):
dorobaumann@gmail.com

Justine Nolan (University of New South Wales, Faculty of Law, Sydney):
justine.nolan@unsw.edu.au

Auret van Heerden (Equiception & NYU Center for Business and Human Rights):
equiception@yahoo.com

Michael Samway (Georgetown University, School of Foreign Service, Washington DC):
michael_samway@yahoo.com

Abstract

Multi-stakeholder initiatives (MSIs) are increasingly used as a default mechanism to address human rights challenges in a variety of industries. MSI is a designation that covers a broad range of initiatives from the very general (for example, the UN Global Compact) to those targeted at a single issue (such as child labor). Critics contest the legitimacy of the private governance model offered by MSIs. The objective of this paper is to assess the dominant approaches to business and human rights challenges and discuss their legitimacy generally and with respect to accountability and effectiveness specifically. We argue that one type of MSI, namely industry-specific MSIs have the potential to serve as a model for a democratically legitimate form of private governance. We analyze two industry-specific MSIs - the Fair Labor Association and the Global Network Initiative - to get a better understanding of how these MSIs formed, how they define and enforce standards, and how they seek to ensure accountability. Based on these empirical illustrations, we discuss the value of this specific MSI model and draw implications for the democratic legitimacy of private governance mechanisms.

Keywords: Legitimacy, Multi-Stakeholder Initiatives, Business and Human Rights, Private Governance Mechanisms, Voluntary Corporate Social Responsibility Initiatives

Acknowledgments

The authors thank Sarah Labowitz, Michael Posner, Andreas Georg Scherer, and Batia Wiesenfeld for helpful comments on the manuscript.

Introduction

In a global economy, multinational companies often operate in jurisdictions where governments are either unable or unwilling to uphold even the basic human rights of their own citizens (Scherer et al. 2006). The absence of state regulation presents major business challenges for corporations. Clothing retailers like Walmart and H&M face unsafe factory conditions in Bangladesh in the wake of the Rana Plaza tragedy. Internet service providers like Facebook and Google wrestle with their users' expectations to guarantee freedom of expression in China and other non-democratic regimes. Oil and mining companies like Shell and Newmont operating in conflict zones from the Congo to Iraq struggle to provide security for their people and facilities in these inherently dangerous places. In these contexts, multi-stakeholder initiatives (MSIs) have become the default response for addressing so-called "governance gaps".

The case for MSIs is compelling. Tulder (2012) notes that "most of the issues we face today are neither owned nor solved by individual stakeholders anymore. With growing interdependence comes a growing need to search for collaborative approaches." MSIs therefore increasingly serve a global governance function in regulating what governments leave effectively unregulated (Nolan & van Heerden 2013). We understand "multi-stakeholder initiative" or "MSI" to mean an entity that works with multiple stakeholders (usually business and civil society, along with others, including governments, universities, and/or investors) to solve a business and human rights problem that no actor can solve alone (van Huijstee 2012).

The amount of MSIs has rapidly increased over the past two decades. A number of academic observers therefore argue that MSIs represent an important new mechanism of global

governance (e.g. Reinicke & Deng 2000; Hemmati 2002; Benner et al. 2003). While the current landscape of MSIs is at this point not comprehensively tracked or documented¹, MSIs differ broadly on the following four dimensions -

1. MSIs differ in scope: MSIs may be formed to address social and environmental issues related to (a) the production of specific commodities (e.g., palm oil, cocoa, cotton etc.), (b) the situation in specific countries (e.g., Bangladesh, Myanmar), (c) specific issues (e.g., child labor), or (d) specific industries (textiles, toys etc.).
2. MSIs differ in their purpose: Some MSIs are created for a specific purpose (e.g., the MFA Forum that was created to mitigate negative effects on workers after the phase-out of the Multi-Fibre Arrangement) while others address ongoing issues in different human rights areas (e.g., improving labor standards in global supply chains).
3. MSIs differ on the functions they perform: Some MSIs mainly focus on fostering dialogue among stakeholders (e.g., the Ethical Trading Initiative) while others create standards and come up with mechanisms to enforce them. Some MSIs have certification schemes (e.g., Rainforest Alliance); others accredit the management systems of participants and verify remedial efforts at suppliers (e.g., Fair Labor Association).
4. MSIs differ in form: There is no uniform approach to MSI governance structure and participatory makeup. Some MSIs, for example, include governments (e.g., Voluntary Principles on Security and Human Rights) while others explicitly exclude government involvement (Global Network Initiative).

¹ A new initiative run out of Harvard Law School, the “MSI Integrity” project plans to map the landscape of MSIs and some researchers have started to compile lists of MSIs, however these are neither complete nor up-to-date (see e.g. Waddock 2008). See MSI Integrity Mapping project: http://www.msi-integrity.org/?page_id=1490

To fill governance gaps, MSIs need to establish or reinforce standards of expected conduct that, while not legally binding, may have normative value in prescribing corporate behavior that ‘socially binds’ corporations to respect human rights (Baccaro & Mele 2011). Whether MSIs achieve this objective depends on their ability to develop input legitimacy (rule credibility, or the extent to which the regulations are perceived as justified) and output legitimacy (rule effectiveness, or the extent to which the rules effectively solve the issues) (Mena & Palazzo 2012). With the proliferation of MSIs, questions about their legitimacy (their accountability and effectiveness to provide and enforce rules) have become louder and exploring the legitimacy of such “private governance schemes” is currently at the top of the research agenda of many scholars in law, political science and management (Koechlin & Fenner Zinkernagel 2009, Mena & Palazzo 2012, Papadopoulos 2013).

In this paper, we argue that one specific type of MSI, namely industry-specific MSIs, are likely to be successful in legitimately filling governance gaps. In academic research as well as in practice, the different types of MSIs are rarely taken into account when assessing MSI accountability and effectiveness (for an exception, see Fransen & Kolk 2007, van Huijstee 2012). As a result, the MSI model is underexplored in theory and often criticized and dismissed in practice (see *e.g.* Gordon 2014²). To better understand the MSI model, we explore two industry-specific MSIs and assess whether they have potential for addressing business and human rights challenges in a way that is considered legitimate by the public.

For our assessment of industry-specific MSIs, we apply a legitimacy concept from political science (Scharpf 1999). Scharpf (2009) argues that the democratic legitimacy of a regulatory body can be understood as the “socially shared belief” that the regulator has the capacity and

² See <http://www.opensocietyfoundations.org/events/problem-multi-stakeholder-initiatives>

the authority to impose rules on a community of citizens (Scharpf, 2009: 173). Democratic legitimacy focuses on two principal questions: To what extent is the regulation perceived as justified or credible (input legitimacy)? To what extent does the regulation effectively solve the issues that it targets (output legitimacy) (Risse, 2004; Scharpf, 1999)?

In the first section, we argue that the dichotomy between voluntary and mandatory approaches to regulating the human rights behavior of companies is too limited to capture the range of responses to governance gaps in the human rights context. In the second section, we examine the emergence of MSIs as a governance model that falls between voluntary and mandatory approaches. We focus our analysis on a subset of MSIs that define and enforce standards to address human rights issues in specific industry settings. In the third section, we further explore the industry-specific model through two MSIs at different stages of development, the FLA and the GNI. In the fourth section, we explore the legitimacy of the “private governance” model that MSIs represent along two dimensions, input and output legitimacy (Mena & Palazzo 2012). This assessment draws on the two case illustrations of MSIs that have defined and implemented industry specific standards. Based on these empirical illustrations, we discuss the advantages and limitations of the industry-specific approach. We highlight the potential economic benefits and legitimacy gains for corporations that participate in an industry-specific MSI. Finally, we discuss implications of industry-specific MSIs as forms of “private governance” that go beyond the human rights context.

I Business and Human Rights: Defining the Role of Corporations in Society

As the language of human rights has started to permeate business operations (Ruggie 2011, Deva & Bilchitz 2013, Wettstein 2012), two dominant approaches to addressing Business and Human Rights (BHR) challenges have emerged.

a) Voluntary initiatives that are not industry-specific

Voluntary initiatives typically promote broad principles of responsible business conduct. Fuelled by the growing popularity of the CSR concept, they cover a large variety of topics, including human rights. The initiatives often focus on dialogue and shared learning through so-called “best practice” examples. Through these learning processes, implementation guidelines are developed over time. The guidelines remain voluntary and often weak assessments or monitoring mechanisms of implementation levels are introduced. Businesses have favored such voluntary initiatives since companies can typically determine the sequence and pace of the implementation process.

The UN Global Compact (UNGC) is currently the largest global CSR initiative and rests upon ten principles in the areas of human rights, labor rights, environment and anti-corruption. By signing the UNGC, corporations are asked to embrace these principles as evidenced by their business conduct and to share learnings and best practices.³ The organizational design of the UNGC acknowledges that its primary purpose is to be a learning platform not an accountability mechanism. The realization that private actors can actively contribute to solutions to address pressing global issues like poverty and climate change provided the background for conceptualizing the UNGC. Today, however, over a decade after the launch of the UNGC, our understanding of the political role of corporations in

³ UNGC expectations of business participants:
http://www.unglobalcompact.org/HowToParticipate/Business_Participation/index.html

global governance processes has evolved and it is no longer a question of whether, but how, corporations can integrate principles of responsible business conduct in their core business processes (Baumann-Pauly 2013). Initiatives that are based on broad principles point to a general direction which interested companies might follow in pursuing the ideal of CSR, but often these initiatives fail to provide concrete guidance on what is practically expected from corporations. Implementation of policies and practices based on broad principles is often selective, and accompanying accountability mechanisms are generally weak (Nolan 2005, Deva 2006).

b) Legal approaches that focus on strengthening the regulatory capacity of nation states

Many civil society groups have grown weary of voluntary initiatives to regulate corporate performance with human rights (Human Rights Watch 2013). Allegations of greenwashing, (or: bluewashing in the context of the UN) and selective implementation are pervasive and call into question the credibility of some of these initiatives (see e.g. Sethi & Schepers 2014). Various corporate scandals among participants in voluntary CSR initiatives have raised further doubts about these initiatives' effectiveness (e.g., BP's oil spill in the Gulf of Mexico). These instances give rise to the question of whether "private regulation" can or should replace government regulation when governments are weak, undemocratic, or fail to regulate.⁴ Human rights groups like Amnesty International and Human Rights Watch generally support the view that governments are the only legitimate guarantors of human rights. They support legal approaches that strengthen the national capacity to make corporate

⁴ See: <http://sustainability.thomsonreuters.com/2014/03/01/executive-perspective-can-private-politics-replace-government-regulation/>

respect for human rights legally binding nationally and internationally.⁵ At this point, however, it is unclear how to obtain intergovernmental agreement for legally binding human rights standards and in what timeframe.

Nevertheless, as the frustrations over the limited change from corporate engagement in voluntary initiatives grow, the support for legal interventions is becoming stronger. Some civil society groups also highlight practical obstacles for their long-term engagement in voluntary initiatives.⁶

The adoption by the UN Human Rights Council in Geneva in June 2013 of a resolution "to establish an open-ended intergovernmental working group with the mandate to elaborate an international legally binding instrument on Transnational Corporations and Other Business Enterprises with respect to human rights" is the latest in an ongoing debate around how best to ensure accountability in international law, business and human rights for corporate rights violations.⁷ The resolution is currently being discussed controversially.⁸ While not denying the potential value of targeted and specific government regulation in this field, we point to an alternative and complementary model through which business and human rights challenges can be addressed and which may, under certain circumstances, involve government participants. A treaty may well be part of the solution but will not resolve implementation challenges on the ground in either the short or longer term. The regulation of corporate

⁵ See Amnesty International's latest publication entitled: "Injustice incorporated: Corporate abuses and the human right to remedy" (2014). Available at: <http://www.amnesty.org/en/library/info/POL30/001/2014/en> and Human Rights Watch World Report 2013 USA, 2013 at 29. Also Peter Frankental, "A Business and Human Rights Treaty? We shouldn't be afraid to frighten the horses" 10 June 2014: <http://www.ihrb.org/commentary/guest/business-and-human-rights-treaty-we-shouldnt-be-afraid.html>

⁶ Daniele Gosteli, Amnesty International's business and human rights expert in Switzerland, for example points out in an interview with us that voluntary initiatives are resource consuming for NGOs and "often result in a compromise around the lowest common denominator" that her organization could not support. Gosteli also argues that the power inequalities among participating stakeholders in these initiatives are significant and the decision-making processes are often dominated by the most powerful participants, typically corporations (sometimes together with governments).

⁷ UN Human Rights Council Resolution, 24 June 2014, A/HRC/26/L.22/Rev.1

⁸ See <http://business-humanrights.org/en/binding-treaty-pros-and-cons/un-human-rights-council-sessions>

activity with respect to human rights requires a multiplicity of stakeholders and at times a nuanced mix of public and private regulation that may be difficult to replicate easily across different sectors, states and cultural boundaries. Industry-specific human rights standards that are defined and enforced through MSIs, present a viable option for addressing human rights challenges created and faced by corporations.

II Beyond the Voluntary-Mandatory Dichotomy: The Emergence of Multi-Stakeholder Initiatives

As the limits of inward focused corporate self-regulation were debated, alternative approaches emphasizing collaboration and the inclusion of multiple stakeholders in standard setting and verification of corporate performance began to emerge in the late 1990s as a default to counter complex regulatory imbalances in global marketplaces. Multi-stakeholder initiatives (MSIs) began to emerge *en masse*. The first MSIs focused initially on influencing environmental policy (in the wake of the UN Conference on Environment and Development held in Rio de Janeiro in 1992⁹), but quickly broadened to encompass other sectors and issues.¹⁰ The growth in MSIs in recent decades can be attributed to a range of factors including increasingly vocal dissatisfaction of civil society with corporate reliance on self-

⁹ The substantive outcome from the Rio conference was Agenda 21 which acknowledged the important role of non-state actors in developing environmental policy. United Nations Sustainable Development 'United Nations Conference on Environment and Development, *Agenda 21*' Rio de Janeiro, Brazil, 3-14 June 1992, available at: <http://sustainabledevelopment.un.org/content/documents/Agenda21.pdf> Another MSI, the Rainforest Alliance, emerged in the late 1980s and predates the 1990s surge of MSIs.

¹⁰ Between 1993 and 1998 a number of diverse initiatives emerged including: the Forest Stewardship Council (1993), the Marine Stewardship Council (1997), Social Accountability International (1997), the Fair Labor Association (1998) and the Ethical Trading Initiative (1998). Each of these, in its own way, attempted to regulate what each viewed as a (partially) unregulated market. Each had different goals and processes for achieving this, but what they had in common was an approach that brought together a multiplicity of stakeholders to work together to achieve their goals. The establishment of MSIs continued unabated in the following decades which, more recently, have witnessed the launch of the Voluntary Principles on Security and Human Rights (2000), the United Nations Global Compact (2000), the Kimberley Process Certification Scheme (2002), the Extractive Industries Transparency Initiative (2003), the Global Network Initiative (2008) and the nascent International Code of Conduct for Private Security Providers (2010).

regulation in order to improve their social and environmental performance (Utting 2002). The 1990s was a period when globalisation gathered force (including a growth in the number and influence of civil society actors) and media interest focused on headline grabbing issues, such as the use of sweatshops by well-known brands like Nike, Disney and Levi Strauss (Herbert 1995, Bernstein 1997 and Egan 1998). Corporate self-regulation was the key buzz phrase in this context (Haufler 2001). The establishment and development of corporate codes of conduct from 1991 (when Levi Strauss first introduced its code) to the end of the decade was remarkable. It was accompanied by an impressive body of research literature focused on exploring this new phenomenon (Bank Jørgensen 1999, Gordon & Miyake 1999, Sabel 2000, Diller 1999). Writing in 2007, the UN Special Representative for business and human rights commented on this phenomenon by noting that MSIs are:

[d]riven by social pressure, [and]... seek to close regulatory gaps that contribute to human rights abuses. But they do so in specific operational contexts, not in any overarching manner. Moreover, recognizing that some business and human rights challenges require multi-stakeholder responses, they allocate shared responsibilities and establish mutual accountability mechanisms within complex collaborative networks. These can include any combination of host and home States, corporations, civil society actors, industry associations, international institutions and investors groups (Ruggie 2007).

The development and reliance on MSIs in recent decades implicitly acknowledges the limitations of traditional 'command and control' regulation, a technique that relies primarily on the state to regulate corporate performance (Sinclair 1997). MSIs instead embody a form of 'networked governance' (Baccaro & Mele 2011) that places corporate behavior under the

scrutiny of a multiplicity of stakeholders including not only states, but also NGOs, unions, industry bodies and international organizations. However, the establishment of an MSI is no panacea for ending all corporate rights violations as the initiatives vary widely in their focus and processes for regulating corporate social performance and their effectiveness. The extent to which MSIs offer such ‘solutions’ is a vexed one and requires some analysis of both the strengths and challenges facing this type of regulatory initiative.

III Industry-Specific MSIs – Fair Labor Association (FLA) and Global Network Initiative (GNI)

In this paper we argue that the industry level is the most promising unit of analysis to effectively advance the BHR agenda. The following reasons explain our argument.

Firstly, for corporations, the industry level is the *primary reference point*. Competition with peers on an industry level is more relevant than on an issue or regional level. The motivation for corporations to engage in BHR themes often comes from industry leaders that have put such topics on the agenda. Imitating “best in class” approaches are therefore particularly typical in the industry setting. In the ICT industry, for example, it was Google which first published a so-called “transparency report” in 2010.¹¹ The move to publishing the number of requests for data from law enforcement agencies was considered progressive at the time. Within only four years, many others followed, continuously raising the bar of reporting standards.¹² The practice of one industry leader thus initiated isomorphic corporate behavior and created a de-facto industry standard for reporting. It also started an industry-wide

¹¹ For more information on Google’s transparency report see <http://www.google.com/transparencyreport/>

¹² See, for example, the comment of the Institute for Human Rights and Business on the latest transparency report from Vodafone: <http://ihrb.org/commentary/staff/vodafone-transparency-report.html>

discourse over transparency standards on practices that affect the human rights of privacy and free expression.

Secondly, the industry level is also most likely the *most appropriate forum for committing to joint standards*. To respect human rights, corporations cannot isolate issues. In fact, they may need to reflect on their business model that puts human rights at risk systematically. For example, studies in the textile sector show how current sourcing practices negatively impact working conditions upstream (Labowitz & Baumann-Pauly 2014). Fundamentally revising business models may, however, come at a cost. For individual companies, such additional costs can be a threat to their competitiveness and even survival in the short-term. Industry-wide human rights standards, in contrast, create a level playing field that has the potential to neutralize or at least significantly reduce cost disadvantages.

Thirdly, in the absence of enforceable governmental regulation, *peer control also creates a strong incentive for corporations to comply with rules, even if these rules are “voluntary”*. What is legally sanctioned is distinguishable from activities that are not, but reputational sanctions can be crucial to business and the voluntary/mandatory distinction can be blurry (Oka 2010). If a critical mass of players in one industry defines and adopts rules, they can jointly create a new level playing field. Industry-specific MSIs present an institutional platform for bringing all relevant actors together and defining standards and enforcement mechanisms. Rules that are created in an industry context are then no longer truly voluntary but de-facto binding as they present the industry standard that is expected from all industry participants.

Our understanding of what constitutes an industry is broad and linked to studies that argue that industries are “cultural artefacts” (Beschorner & Hajduk 2013: 29). In this conception, industrial sectors – similarly to national cultures – can be seen as “frames that structure the perceptions of industry participants about a wide range of things, including products and services, competitors and peers, customers and regulators. These perceptions also include the meaning of CR within industries by determining, for example, the materiality of issues or the legitimacy of stakeholder demands.” (Beschorner & Hajduk 2013: 287). For assessing the legitimacy of industry-specific MSIs, this cultural business ethics definition is particularly useful. It includes not only corporate actors but any actor that shapes the perceptions of the industry. Therefore, critical stakeholders from civil society that also participate in MSIs are within the frame of an industry.

Case Selection

To select data-rich cases for assessing the legitimacy of industry-specific MSIs, we applied two major criteria.

1. The MSI needs to be well-known in its industry and represent “critical mass” of industry players. Critical mass in this context is not defined by the actual number of participants. What matters most is their collective leadership potential to re-define the rules of the game. If the largest players with the most prominent brand names support an MSI, they most likely also have transformative power.
2. The MSI should “fully regulate” governance gaps, meaning that it not only defines but also provides mechanisms to enforce human rights standards. This criteria rules out dialogue platforms that merely focus on raising awareness for human rights issues in a sector.

Two organizations that meet these criteria are the Fair Labor Association (FLA) and the Global Network Initiative (GNI). They are both industry-specific as they focus on two specific sectors. The FLA concentrates on targeted sectors in the manufacturing industry (textiles, footwear, agriculture, university branded-goods, and electronics); the Global Network Initiative (GNI) operates in the information and communications technology (ICT) industry.

FLA and GNI are well-known organizations in their respective industries. Both organizations have a critical mass in subsections of their sectors. The FLA encompasses most of the major sportswear brands¹³; GNI comprises some of the biggest Internet service providers in the ICT industry¹⁴. FLA is older and more established than GNI and is often considered a best-practice example of MSIs.¹⁵ Both initiatives are regularly subject to intense public criticism; an indication that these organizations matter in their respective industries.¹⁶

FLA and GNI also both defined specific standards and they monitor them. Non-compliance with standards is remedied and remediation is verified by independent third parties.

Data collection

All authors of this paper have first-hand experience working for MSIs. Two co-authors were instrumental in creating and managing the MSIs selected for this study and they provided unique inside knowledge about these organizations. All authors have stepped back from their MSI roles. To explain how the selected MSIs formed, evolved and operate the insider

¹³ The FLA does not consider itself an industry-specific initiative. In fact, it operates in multiple industries in the manufacturing sector and even in agriculture. Its profile in the sportswear industry, however, is strongest. All major sportswear brands participate and hence it meets our case selection criteria in the context of this study.

¹⁴ See <http://globalnetworkinitiative.org/participants/index.php>

¹⁵ John Ruggie, the former UN Special Representative for Business and Human Rights, for example, declared the FLA as the “gold standard” within MSIs and the leader in its field (Ruggie 2009)

¹⁶ See for example the criticism of American student organizations on the more recent work of the FLA with Apple (<http://flawatch.usas.org>).

perspective is irreplaceable. We are aware of the potential bias of such quasi participant perspectives. We therefore complement and balance the insights of these practitioners with publicly available sources about these MSIs and additional interviews with relevant stakeholders.¹⁷

In analyzing these two MSIs we consider (1) how the MSI came into existence, (2) how common human rights standards were defined, (3) how these standards are enforced, and (4) what kind of accountability mechanisms were put in place.

IV Assessing the Legitimacy of the Industry-Specific MSI Model - Potential and Challenges for Closing the Governance Gap

From a legitimacy perspective, the evolution of MSIs can be regarded as emblematic for the “remarkable period of institutional innovation in transnational governance” (Hale & Held 2010). In the context of BHR, the political role of corporations is explicit and therefore the question of how to legitimize private governance in the human rights context is even more pronounced. The political role of private actors has raised concerns over the legitimacy of private actors’ rule-making activities. Political scientists refer to this development as “private governance” and discuss whether and how such constructs can be legitimized in the absence of democratically elected governments (Büthe 2010, Papadopoulos 2013).

Mena & Palazzo (2012) define criteria for the legitimate transfer of regulatory power from traditional democratic nation-state processes to private regulatory schemes, such as MSIs. They refer to political science literature in which democratic legitimacy is typically concerned with input legitimacy (rule credibility, the extent to which regulations are

perceived as justified) and output legitimacy (rule effectiveness, the extent to which the rules effectively solve issues) (Mena & Palazzo 2012, Scharpf 1997, 1999). Mena & Palazzo (2012) define four criteria for input legitimacy (inclusion, procedural fairness, consensual orientation, and transparency) and three criteria for output legitimacy (coverage, efficacy, and enforcement) and they also operationalize these legitimacy criteria (Mena & Palazzo 2012: 539). We adopt their operationalization for our study (see Table 1) and apply it to FLA and GNI.

Table 1: Criteria of MSI Democratic Legitimacy

Dimension	Criterion	Definition and Key Questions
Input	Inclusion	Involvement of stakeholder affected by the issue <i>Are the involved stakeholders representative of the issues at stake? Are important stakeholders excluded from the process?</i>
	Procedural fairness	Neutralization of power differences in decision-making structures <i>Does each of these stakeholders have a valid voice in decision-making processes?</i>
	Consensual orientation	Culture of cooperation and reasonable disagreement <i>To what extent does the MSI promote mutual agreement among participants?</i>
	Transparency	Transparency of structures, processes, results <i>To what extent are decision-making and standard-setting processes transparent? To what extent are the performance of the participating corporations and the evaluation of that performance transparent?</i>
Output	Coverage	Number of rule-targets following the rules <i>How many firms per industry/region comply with the rules?</i>
	Efficacy	Fit of the rules to the issue <i>To what extent do the rules address the issue at hand?</i>
	Enforcement	Practical implementation of the rules and their verification procedures <i>Is compliance verified and non-compliance sanctioned?</i>

Source: Adapted from Mena & Palazzo 2012: 539

The conceptualization of legitimacy borrowed from political science literature is rather positivistic. Alternative legitimacy conceptions from sociology would focus specifically on

the perceptions of different constituents and ask whether the activities of the MSI under review are perceived as socially acceptable (Suchman 1995). However, measuring perceptions across a variety of global stakeholders, over time, and without a benchmark, is too challenging given the scope of our research. We therefore use the existing operationalization of democratic legitimacy from Mena & Palazzo (2012) as a starting point for assessing the potential and limits of MSIs legitimately filling governance gaps.

Input dimension of legitimacy

Input legitimacy is potentially high for industry-specific MSIs, at least if all relevant stakeholders of the industry are participating in the MSI formation process (inclusion). Governance mechanisms and standards can be defined jointly (procedural fairness), discussed openly and with a consensus orientation (consensual orientation). Transparency over procedures ensures accountability of decision-making (transparency).

The case illustrations of the FLA and the GNI show, however, that the ideal of input legitimacy is not easily achieved. MSIs that come close to the ideal in the Habermasian sense can typically already look back to a multi-year engagement process. To date, both organizations do not fully meet all input legitimacy criteria. In terms of inclusion, the FLA had a good start. After a series of labor rights scandals that involved US brands, President Clinton used his convening power to bring together relevant industry stakeholders. In August 1996 the White House convened industry, labor, consumer, NGO and government leaders and challenged them to develop a system to prevent such abuses. These disparate stakeholders formed the Apparel Industry Partnership (AIP) and negotiated a workplace code of conduct that companies agreed to attach to all their contracts or purchase orders.

Initially, a broad array of stakeholders participated in the process of defining a common standard for the apparel industry. But soon, this process turned into a battle. While stakeholders shared the common objective to improve working conditions in the global apparel supply chain, they often clashed over the strategies to achieve this objective. The disagreements escalated and the union representatives ultimately disengaged from the process, though only following a very intense internal debate within the trade union ranks. This early, often volatile history of the FLA, points to the limits of the consensual orientation of the participants and the difficulties of establishing processes that all parties consider fair and reflects the criticisms and frustrations of some civil societies today with MSIs.

There was also a series of events prior to the creation of the GNI that raised questions about the role of ICT companies in protecting the right to free expression in repressive regimes and the privacy rights of their users. The tipping point for public concern over the Internet and risks of corporate complicity in certain parts of the world was the case of Chinese journalist Shi Tao. In 2004, Yahoo!'s subsidiary in Beijing complied with a Chinese law enforcement demand for user account data, which ultimately led the Chinese police to Mr. Shi, who was accused of leaking state secrets by sending to a U.S.-run website official Chinese press coverage rules distributed by the government on the fifteenth anniversary of the tragic events in Tiananmen Square. Mr. Shi was eventually convicted and sentenced to ten years in prison. When these trial documents were discovered, translated and released in the Fall of 2005, Shi Tao's case attached a name, face, and personal tragedy to the argument that U.S. technology companies were complicit in the failure of certain governments to protect the rights of their own citizens.

Each of these American high-tech companies felt pressure from users, employees, the public, civil society, socially responsible investors, and from legislators in the United States and Europe. Like in the case of the FLA, the US government got involved and threatened to legislate. The U.S. House of Representatives held a hearing in February 2006 in which executives from Cisco, Google, Microsoft and Yahoo! were excoriated for being complicit in the Chinese government's unjust online censorship and surveillance. Congressman Chris Smith (R-NJ) and others proposed legislation to regulate American companies doing business in Internet restricting countries.¹⁸ The U.S. Department of State, under Secretary Condoleeza Rice, created the Global Internet Freedom Taskforce in 2006 to address challenges around the globe to freedom of expression and the free flow of information on the Internet. It became increasingly clear to stakeholders across civil society, investors, academics, and government that there was a growing governance gap between corporate practices and human rights that national and international laws did not guarantee.

In 2006, a group of stakeholders organized to develop an industry code of conduct and further mechanisms to address the issue of corporate complicity in violations of the rights to freedom of expression and privacy. These stakeholders then agreed to work together in a multi-stakeholder dialogue, with the various constituencies on equal footing. Unlike in certain other multi-stakeholder dialogues, all parties agreed early in the process that governments should not participate in the dialogue. This was principally because governments were perceived as central in creating an environment that led to violations of rights to freedom of expression and privacy and put companies at risk of complicity in those human rights violations.

¹⁸ The Global Online Freedom Act was introduced in 2013: <https://beta.congress.gov/bill/113th-congress/house-bill/491>

As in the case of the FLA, the years that eventually led to the creation of the GNI were tension-filled. This new initiative not only had to overcome the traditional distrust between human rights groups and companies, but also the distrust between companies in a fiercely competitive and often-secretive industry. The newly formed initiative faced difficult decisions as to the specific sectors that should be covered within the industry. In addition to the initial companies, Google, Microsoft and Yahoo!, four European telecommunication companies joined the dialogue and remained involved for nearly two years before concluding that the multi-stakeholder dialogue was not in their companies' best interests, leading them to leave. Despite repeated requests to join the discussion and pressure from civil society and U.S. lawmakers, hardware manufacturers like Cisco did not participate in the dialogue and did not join GNI for reasons that never became public. Therefore, similar to the case of the FLA, one critical stakeholder group left the discussions early in the process.

The participants continued to negotiate until an agreement was finally reached in the fall of 2008 on a set of principles, implementation guidelines and a governance, accountability and shared learning framework. The Global Network Initiative was launched publicly in October 2008.

While these formative discussions in the FLA and the GNI were not easy, they were essential for building trust among participants. Today, the FLA and the GNI have both established strong working relationships among their stakeholders. Given the differing perspectives of the stakeholders involved in the separate initiatives achieving consensus remains challenging. The trust established among the various parties in each MSI means that the discussions can be robust, but are driven by the ultimate goal of achieving consensus. Both MSIs will likely

continue to face challenges on this front. Within the FLA, for example, one of the challenges of achieving consensus is evidenced by the case of one of its participating companies, Russell Corporation, being placed on “special review” by the other participants.¹⁹

For the GNI, the recent revelations by Edward Snowden about the NSA and other intelligence services have placed technology companies in the public spotlight in an unprecedented way. GNI participants now jointly lobby the US Senate to lead surveillance reforms.²⁰

The formation process of the FLA and the GNI also illustrates that the criteria for input legitimacy are closely interconnected and subject to compromise. For example, the strength of certain participants’ commitment to transparency and procedural fairness may override consensus orientation and inclusion. Consensus is not often achieved easily and this is most apparent in the start-up phase of an MSI. In both of these cases, critical stakeholders left the negotiations and the remaining participants had to accept that not all stakeholders were fully represented in the process.

Thus, while the general consensus orientation was strong for both organizations in the formation phase, it was not absolute as it would have blocked progress. The level of representativeness of MSI participants represents an issue that requires critical attention. Both organizations under review have been criticized for their lack of inclusion of relevant industry stakeholders although no stakeholder group has been explicitly excluded from the deliberation processes. According to some campaign groups, the FLA’s governance structure

¹⁹A summary of the case and all relevant documents are available on the FLA website. See <http://www.fairlabor.org/report/jerzees-de-honduras-honduras>

²⁰See <https://www.globalnetworkinitiative.org/news/gni-urges-us-senate-lead-surveillance-reform>

is lacking appropriate representation of workers' rights organizations, though major unions have refused to join.²¹ Critical stakeholder groups also chose to exit the GNI (*e.g.*, Amnesty International) and critics of the GNI argue that the initiative's participant base has not yet reached a critical mass in the industry²². Therefore, whether FLA and GNI have reached appropriate levels of "inclusion" is contested.

Conflict in those early negotiations arose particularly over the level of transparency that the initiatives would require. Accountability required the review of corporate conduct against a substantive standard and reasonable levels of disclosure, but this was not an easy sell, particularly for the companies involved. The FLA, for example, increased transparency requirements incrementally over time. With strengthened levels of trust in the organization, the participating stakeholders realized that greater transparency could lend their efforts greater credibility. In addition, the FLA deliberately created accountability mechanisms at multiple levels. Participating companies commit to meeting the Obligations of Companies over a period of time (normally 2-3 years). Their progress is monitored in a variety of ways, including independent external audits and assessments and an accreditation review that involves headquarter and field reviews. The results of all these processes are fully transparent and published on the FLA website. A second level of accountability is exercised by the tripartite Board of Directors and its Monitoring Committee who receive staff reports on the audit and review processes and who vote on the accreditation of companies. A third level of accountability is to be found in the FLA complaint system that allows any third party to lodge a complaint if they believe that an FLA-affiliated company does not adhere to its code of obligations.

²¹ See <http://usas.org/campaigns-old/sweat-free-campus/dont-pay-the-fla/about-the-fla/>

²² See <http://www.forbes.com/sites/larrydownes/2011/03/30/why-no-one-will-join-the-global-network-initiative/>

The inclusion of transparency and accountability mechanisms from the outset was in both MSIs crucial for establishing their legitimacy. Transparency requirements have a history of reluctant acceptance by corporations, but when corporations assume a role of both regulator and ‘regulatee’, the transparency of standards, monitoring results and governance structure are key in helping to boost the legitimacy quota of the regulatory initiative. However transparency, like the MSIs themselves, is most effective when targeted. The FLA and the GNI both have transparent standards and information is released publicly about company performance. Critics may debate the adequacy of the standards but this is distinct from the transparency around both the standard itself and its implementation. Broad CSR initiatives with amorphous standards, in contrast, do not produce targeted information and thus these initiatives lack the accountability mechanisms that are critical for their legitimacy.

Could both the volume and the specificity of the information be increased in both the FLA and the GNI? Yes, but the content and quality of the information released should be the ongoing focus rather than simply quantity of information. Increased transparency or ‘regulation by information’ (Slaughter 2003) is also a key component of recent US regulatory initiatives to increase the flow of information about corporate performance in countries rife with human rights violations²³, but whether deployed in MSIs or laws, transparency is most effective when it serves a targeted purpose and is in a form that is useful for encouraging improved corporate performance whether used by the corporation itself, corporate peers, the government or advocacy constituents.

²³ For example, The Dodd–Frank Wall Street Reform and Consumer Protection Act, Pub. L. No. 111-203, 124 Stat. 1376 (2010) (codified at 12 U.S.C. §5301 note), addresses financial transparency. Section 1504 requires all listed oil and mining companies to disclose the revenues that they pay to governments worldwide. The European Parliament has recently approved a Directive on the disclosure of non-financial information by European Union (EU) companies. The Directive will require EU public interest entities with more than 500 employees to provide an annual written report on human rights, environmental and social issues to give an understanding of their impact in each of these areas See Directive 2013/34/EU of the European Parliament and of the Council of 26 June 2013, Article 2(1)).

The input dimension of broad based initiatives, in contrast, is difficult to assess due to the low entry barrier to participation. In broad MSIs, such as the UN Global Compact, tight industry collaboration does not exist. The pressure to solve human rights issues is different for different participating companies and hence the general principles to which participants have committed are often not easily implementable or assessable. Broad initiatives typically lack rigor in translating principles into standards and enforcement mechanisms. Legal approaches, in contrast, primarily allow for limited deliberation prior to the formulation of hard law. While legal approaches have great accountability due to the rigid procedures upon which they are built, inclusion and consensus orientation are less pronounced.

Table 2: Overview of empirical findings; input dimension of legitimacy

Input Legitimacy	FLA	GNI
Inclusion	Governance structures: most of the relevant stakeholders but limited civil society participation and no unions	Governance structures: most of the relevant stakeholders but telecommunication and hardware companies
Procedural Fairness	Jointly defined procedures; clear decision-making structures that apply even in challenging cases; good representation of NGOs a challenge	Jointly defined procedures; clear decision-making structures
Consensual orientation	In principle; grew stronger over time as trust was built	In principle, grew stronger over time as the industry faced collective challenges (Snowden, NSA)
Transparency	Full disclosure of verified remediations; levels of transparency increased in stages	Transparency was from the very beginning a condition for companies to stay engaged

Output dimension of legitimacy

Both the FLA and the GNI rest upon rights-based standards that are enforced through clearly defined monitoring mechanisms. The standards are monitored by independent third parties and remediation is verified. If a participant violates the standards or procedures, peer pressure and the threat of exclusion from the MSI can correct non-compliance.

The rules defined by the FLA and the GNI only apply to the initiatives' participating companies. Yet given the large representation of, for example, sportswear brands in the FLA, the FLA's Workplace Code of Conduct has, according to some observers, turned into a de facto standard for the entire industry (reference omitted for anonymity). The content of the standards and the monitoring and reporting of corporate compliance with the MSI's benchmark have a direct correlation with the number of participants who choose to be part of a specific MSI. The broader and more general the approach, the lower the barrier to entry thus resulting in a higher number of participants. With over 8,000 corporate participants in the UN Global Compact it stands in stark contrast to the less than 60 brands and suppliers participating in the FLA (although there are a significant number of US universities and colleges and their licensees participating) and the 6 ICT companies in the GNI. Disparity in numbers can be partly explained by the narrow focus of these two MSIs, but the more stringent accountability mechanisms in the FLA and the GNI also serve as a barrier to entry.

Legal approaches, in contrast, would by definition have greater coverage than MSI rules. Yet, the extraterritorial application of legislation is difficult to design, apply, and monitor on a large scale (Hathaway 2011). Extraterritorial legislation also rarely exists and if it exists, it is

likely not adopted. Companies in such situations need practical alternatives to legislation and hence MSIs prevail.

Efficacy of rules, namely how well the rules fit the problems at hand, is greater if rules are designed in industry-specific MSI settings than through generalized legal processes. MSI processes allow for greater flexibility to adapt rules to changing expectations and new challenges (*e.g.*, emerging markets). The FLA, for example, adapts its rules and procedures regularly. The most recent code revision of the FLA was just completed in 2013. Rules designed in industry-specific MSI settings can also be more specific than legislation. Industry insiders (both corporate and non-corporate MSI participants) know the risk points for potential human rights violations best. They are therefore often in a better position than legislators to design appropriate processes to prevent and remediate human rights violations. The ICT industry representatives in the GNI, for example, are arguably more likely to have greater (technological) insights into risks that could compromise privacy than any public actor.

Legislation commonly has to be general and abstract to capture a large number of cases. Like the principles of voluntary CSR initiatives, they provide general guidance. Rule-addressees need to interpret and apply these general rules in their specific context. However, if each company interprets general rules on their own instead of collectively, companies in the same industry may end up with entirely different priorities. Such a situation limits the potential leverage of corporate actions, hampers comparability and disables accountability. The specificity and flexibility of industry-specific MSI rules can better ensure a consistent fit between the rules and the issues at hand but such inherent flexibility also contains risks where internally generated rules allow too much leeway for companies in complying with human

rights. The natural ‘check and balance’ to this in a legitimized MSI is the inclusion and equal participation of a multiplicity of stakeholders in the design and implementation process of the MSI. Equal participation of all stakeholders is not easily achieved and the power balance may naturally veer toward corporate and government participants who are primarily responsible for implementing the standards at ground level.

The involvement of companies in industry specific MSIs like the FLA and the GNI helps clarify and refine the application of international human rights standards to specific business operations and provides them with input that includes voices beyond their own company and peers to non-corporate participants. Broad industry participation in turn, assists in the development of accepted norms that will guide corporate performance. The challenge in all such initiatives is to raise the bar beyond the minimum of what the law requires and attain compliance with international standards. The MSIs provide a valuable and targeted platform for the practical application and monitoring of international standards to specific business settings.

In the previous discussion on input and output legitimacy in the dominant BHR approaches, we presented them as if they exist in opposition to each other. These approaches, however, often exist in parallel and are potentially complementary. The reliance on voluntary initiatives is viewed by some as impeding or supplanting legal regulatory efforts to improve corporate compliance with human rights (Human Rights Watch 2013). However, the breadth of voluntary initiatives is diverse and as is evident from the above discussion such conclusions cannot be drawn so broadly without assessing the particulars of a specific initiative. Both the FLA and the GNI deliberately excluded government participation from the MSI, but each was convened in a moment of crisis partly at the behest, or at least with the

encouragement, of a particular government. In some of their countries of operation, the private regulatory efforts of the FLA and the GNI occasionally act as substitutes for the absence of enforced government regulation and/or supplementing national legal standards. The sustainability of such tactics as a rights protection mechanism seems more assured with an industry-specific approach with committed participants and a relatively narrow issue focus.

Table 3: Overview of empirical findings; output dimension of legitimacy

Output Legitimacy	FLA	GNI
Coverage	Participating Companies (39), participating suppliers (19), university licensees (613), licensees (1473), universities and colleges (172), and civil society organizations (4)	ICT companies (6), civil society (13), academia (10) and investors (9)
Efficacy	Mission and rules are aligned: FLA Workplace Code of Conduct	Mission and rules are aligned: GNI Principles
Enforcement	Compliance is verified and non-compliance is sanctioned	Compliance is verified and non-compliance is sanctioned

V Limitations of the MSI Model

The general limitations of voluntary initiatives to counter corporate human rights abuses are well documented (Utting 2005, Peters et al. 2009, Simons 2004). Questions about their sustainability and legitimacy prevail and, as we have noted, the many and varied

shortcomings of such mechanisms have contributed to the ongoing call for broader legal regulation of corporate compliance with human rights (Human Rights Watch 2013).

Reliance on MSIs has emerged in part because of the lack of better alternatives, but dependence on this regulatory mechanism has also at times been a deliberate choice as a means of attracting a broad array of relevant participants in a non-legally binding manner. The binding/non-binding nature of MSIs is contentious. Characterizing participation as non-binding is accurate only in the strict legal sense but participation in a MSI can trigger socially induced compliance, which, while not legally binding, may have regulatory force by virtue of the scale of consent of the participants (such as governments, companies, and other civil society actors).

Industry-specific MSIs such as the FLA and GNI have developed standards that, while reflective of broader international human rights norms, are specifically targeted to those rights issues most pertinent to their industry. The standards developed aim to reflect international standards and societal expectations, and while not legally binding can have ‘force’ by the degree of consensus and acceptance linked to their particular monitoring and enforcement instruments. However, the standards imposed by a MSI are naturally self-selective. There is a danger of resorting to the lowest common denominator in order to achieve consensus and maintain the participation of key stakeholders. What is key here is the makeup of the ‘multi-stakeholder’ aspect of the initiative and the bargaining powers that each group wields over the other. Within the FLA, board seats are equally divided (six each) between corporate, NGO and university and collegiate participants with an independent Chair. The sustainable and meaningful participation of NGO stakeholders in the FLA presents a challenge. Most of the NGOs active in the business and human rights sphere have

limited staff resources trying to cover a multitude of MSIs and find it difficult to commit to join boards and working groups. An MSI like the FLA may be only one of a number of initiatives one specific NGO engages with in the business and human rights space and that may not even be the main focus of that NGO. Unlike FLA company affiliates, which generally have a “CSR” or “compliance” department working on these issues, NGO staff participating in FLA governance structures generally cover a number of different issues and organizations and cannot devote the same amount of time as their corporate counterparts. This does not call into question the FLA structure or charter but does point to a reality of multi-stakeholder initiatives. The structure of stakeholder representation most commonly adopted by MSIs, including the FLA and the GNI, means that direct decision making power is wielded by the stakeholders on the board. In the case of the FLA, this means that workers primarily rely on the indirect representation of their needs via NGO board participants. The civil society representation on the FLA Board has always been North American and the Board has discussed the need to ensure engagement with NGOs in the supply chain, especially from major sourcing countries such as China. The FLA has suppliers from China sitting on the employer bench but has not managed to secure regular participation from Asian NGOs. A crucial factor which may balance the bargaining power of board participants is recognition that ongoing NGO participation is key to MSI credibility. The board makeup of the GNI is also designed to allow all stakeholder input into the governance of the MSI. The GNI board is comprised of an independent chair, 5 corporate participants, 3 from civil society and 2 each from academia and the investment community.

The private voluntary nature of MSIs also lends them a certain degree of agility in adapting and responding to new issues as they arise. That agility engenders flexibility, which can be both a benefit and limitation of MSIs in advocating compliance with human rights (Nolan 2013, Baccaro & Mele, 2011). The absence of legally binding regulation can also be

beneficial to MSIs in attracting participants but much depends again on the particular structure and function of the individual MSI. Participation in a MSI is self-selective and the participation numbers in MSIs reflect the stringency of their approach to standard setting and compliance. The UN Global Compact has proved successful in attracting a large number of stakeholders, but it has also attracted significant criticism relating to the very soft commitments required of its participants (the very factor which may have induced participants to join) (Deva, 2006; Nolan, 2005). The scaling up of the FLA and GNI has been confronted with serious limits precisely because of what some might perceive as the arduous nature of the commitment required (including adherence to MSI standards and the level of monitoring and transparency required from participation in the initiatives). Limited membership can affect the ability of the MSI to level the playing field in improving compliance with human rights standards. However, if a MSI is able to attract significant key players from a particular industry, such peer pressure and leadership may then be effective in shaping broader corporate approaches to human rights. The GNI for example includes the leading companies operating in the consumer-facing Internet sector, but to broaden its impact it needs to address the future participation in adjacent industries such as hardware and telecommunications. The FLA has attracted significant participation from key sportswear brands and the university and collegiate sector but lacks a real presence in the retail sector.

Finally, as MSIs such as the FLA have now been in operation for more than a decade, the limitation of a ‘monitoring only’ approach is becoming more apparent. The FLA has analyzed audit results every year since it started external auditing in 2002 and concluded that while audits are reasonably effective in identifying violations they are less so in effecting lasting change. The number of violations (a global average of 13 per factory) has remained stubbornly high, despite thousands of audits and remedial programs. As reliance on MSIs in

a variety of industries has increased so too has an industry focused on developing processes to manipulate the audit process.

“The result is that code of conduct audits have provoked a veritable industry of falsified wage and hour records as suppliers attempt to “comply” with code standards. Newspapers in south China, for example, carry advertisements by consultants offering to game audits and by software providers offering programs that fake wage and hour records. Social auditors have become adept at exposing fake records but this cat-and-mouse game has become a treadmill” (Nolan & van Heerden 2013: 14).

Audits can be effective in righting specific wrongs, but they are less effective in changing the culture of non-compliance that reigns in many exporting countries. The FLA’s investment in a ‘sustainable compliance’ approach that invites suppliers to be part of the solution is indicative of its evolution and acknowledgement of the weakness of relying purely on a ‘policing’ approach (Locke 2013). Sustainable compliance is now pursued through needs assessment followed by capacity building rather than coercion. To be effective capacity building must involve not only management and supervisory staff but also workers who are empowered to understand their rights and who are provided with channels and guarantees that allow them to exercise those rights.

VI Discussion of Case Studies

The legitimacy of MSIs in general and industry-specific MSIs in particular is an underexplored area of research and our two case studies of FLA and GNI highlight several aspects that can improve our understanding of these private governance mechanisms (Siggelkow 2007).

Firstly, on the input dimension of legitimacy, we have seen across both cases that inclusion, nor consensus orientation, and transparency are absolute criteria that need to be in place for an MSI to start operating. In fact, those criteria can develop over time. As trust among heterogeneous participants in these organizations develops, consensus building becomes easier and so does the commitment to disclose and share sensitive information. While wide representation of all stakeholders is certainly desirable it cannot come at the expense of stalling the process (like in the case of the unions in the FLA) or creating conflict of interest (like in the case of governments in the GNI). We therefore contest that with increasing levels of trust, input legitimacy increases in industry-specific MSIs.

Secondly, the assessment of the output dimension of legitimacy shows that the number of rule-targets is an insufficient criterion for assessing coverage. High standards and rigor in enforcing standards may limit the number of participants in some MSIs yet these aspects also alter the quality of the coverage. We suggest that output legitimacy tends to be higher in organizations with high standards and rigorous enforcement mechanisms.

The case data also provide novel insights on the efficacy of rules and show that for creating a “fit” between the rules and the issue, rules need to be subject to regular review. The discussion of the experience with monitoring mechanisms in the FLA has shown that, as issues evolve, organizations need to learn from past experience and adjust mechanisms to improve efficacy. We therefore suggest that the output legitimacy of an industry-specific MSI increases with the organization’s ability and willingness to learn and adjust.

Finally, the case studies have shown that the input and output of legitimacy are inextricably linked. Both of these dimensions of legitimacy mutually enforce each other and cannot be analyzed separately. The form of industry-specific MSIs enables delivering on its purpose. In

other words, input legitimacy is a precondition for output legitimacy. Output legitimacy, in turn, reinforces trust within the organization and hence is critical for further developing the criteria of the input dimension of legitimacy (inclusion, consensus-orientation, transparency). We therefore suggest that industry-specific MSIs that develop input and output legitimacy in parallel will have higher legitimacy long-term than MSIs that neglect one of these dimensions.

Conclusion

The focus on the dichotomy of voluntary and mandatory approaches in the human rights field does not capture how business and human rights challenges are de facto addressed today. New and hybrid forms of regulation have emerged and they are often institutionalized through MSIs (Nolan 2014). In this paper, we have analyzed one specific type of MSI, namely industry-specific MSIs that were set up to prevent and address corporate human rights abuses. Our case illustrations of the FLA and the GNI show that current industry-specific MSIs are far from perfect but they offer valuable insights into the conditions of success for private governance initiatives.

The assessment of the legitimacy of industry-specific MSIs on the input and output dimension highlights both the potential and challenges of this model of private governance. The results of our analysis demonstrate that industry-specific MSIs can, at least in principle, be a legitimate and effective approach to protect human rights. However, devising an effective and legitimate MSI is easier to do in theory than practice. More research is needed on what particular aspects of this targeted MSI approach process are most effective in providing greater protection for human rights and how (or if) such mechanisms should collaborate with government actors. Can the lessons learned from the FLA and the GNI be

replicated in other industries and what levers can be applied to reduce the entry barriers so that these industry specific MSIs can attain broader coverage? MSIs are viewed by some as a stop-gap measure for improving corporate respect for human rights, but increasingly it appears that MSIs are more of a long-term mechanism to fill governance gaps and as such it is critical to establish how and in what situations such private regulation can be most effective.

References

- Baccaro, L. & Mele, V. (2011): For Lack of Anything Better? International Organizations and Global Corporate Codes. *Public Administration* 89 (2): 451–470.
- Bauer, J. (2011): Business and Human Rights. A New Approach to Advancing Environmental Justice in the United States. In Hertel, S. & Liban, K. (eds): *Human Rights in the United States. Beyond Exceptionalism*. Cambridge, Cambridge University Press: 175-196.
- Baumann-Pauly, D. (2013): *Managing Corporate Legitimacy. A Toolbox*. Sheffield, Greenleaf Publishing.
- Benner, T., Reinicke, W. H. & Witte, J.M (2003): Global Public Policy Networks: Lessons Learned and Challenges Ahead, *Brookings Review*, 21 (2), 18-21.
- Bernstein, A. (1997): A Potent Weapon in the War Against Sweatshops. *Business Week* (United States), 1 December 1997, 40.
- Beschorner, T., Hajduk, T. & Simeonov, S. (2013): Sector-specific CR in Europe: Rethinking Responsibility. In *Corporate Responsibility in Europe: Government Involvement in Sector-specific Initiatives*. Guetersloh: Verlag Bertelsmann Stiftung, 23-39.
- Bernstein, A. (1998): A Floor under Foreign Factories?. *Business Week* (United States), 9 November 1998, 126.
- Braithwaite, J., & Drahos, P. (2000): *Global Business Regulation*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Büthe, T. (2010): Private Regulation in the Global Economy: A (P)Review. *Business and Politics* 12 (3): 2
- Crane, A., Palazzo, G. , Spence, L. & Matten, D. (2014): Contesting the Value of “Creating Shared Value”. *California Management Review*, 56 (2): 130 – 153.
- Crane, A., Matten, D. & Spence, L. (eds.) (2013): *Corporate Social Responsibility. Readings and Cases in a Global Context*. London and New York, Routledge: 6-9.
- Deva, S. (2006): The UN Global Compact for Responsible Corporate Citizenship: Is it still too compact to be global?. *Corporate Governance Law Review* 145 (2).
- Deva, S. & Bilchitz, D. (Eds.) (2013): *Human Rights Obligations of Business. Beyond the Corporate Responsibility to Respect?* Cambridge, Cambridge University Press.
- Diller, J. (1999): A Social Conscience in the Global Marketplace? Labor Dimensions of Codes of Conduct, Social Labelling and Investor Initiatives. *International Labour Review* 138 (2): 99 – 129.

Egan, T. 'The Swoon of the Swoosh', *The New York Times* (New York), 13 September 1998, 66.

Fransen, L. W. & Kolk, A. (2007): Global Rule-Setting for Business: A Critical Analysis of Multi-Stakeholder Standards. *Organization* 14 (5): 667-684.

Gordon, K. & Miyake, M. (1999): Deciphering Codes Of Corporate Conduct: A Review Of Their Contents', Working Paper 1999/2, Organization for Economic Co-Operation and Development <<http://www.oecd.org/dataoecd/23/19/2508552.pdf>

Hale, T. & Held, D. (2010): Editors Introduction: Mapping Changes in Transnational Governance. In Hale, T & Held, D. (Eds.): *Handbook of Transnational Governance. Institutions & Innovations*. Cambridge: Polity Press: 1-36.

Hathaway, O. (2011): Human Rights Abroad: When Do Human Rights Treaty Obligations Apply Extraterritorially? *Arizona Law Journal*. Available at: http://www.law.yale.edu/documents/pdf/cglc/Hathaway_HumanRightsAbroad.pdf

Haufler, V. (2001): *A Public Role for the Private Sector. Industry-Self Regulation in a Global Economy*. Washington D.C., Carnegie Endowment for International Peace.

Hemmati, Minu (2002): *Multi-Stakeholder Processes for Governance and Sustainability: Beyond Deadlock and Conflict*. London: Earthscan Publications.

Herbert, B. (1995): 'Children of the Dark Ages', *The New York Times* (New York), 21 July 1995, A25.

Human Rights Watch (2013): *World Report 2013 USA*. Available at: <http://www.hrw.org/world-report/2013>

Institute for Human Rights and Business, 'From Red Flags to Green Flags: The corporate responsibility to respect human rights in high-risk countries' (2011): www.ihrb.org/pdf/from_red_to_green_flags/complete_report.pdf

Jørgensen, H., Bank, P. M., Pruzan-Jørgensen, Jungk, M., & Cramer, A. (2003): Strengthening Implementation of Corporate Social Responsibility in Global Supply Chains, Corporate Social Responsibility Practice, World Bank Group.

Kingsbury, B. (2003): The International Legal Order. In *The Oxford Handbook of Legal Studies*, ed. P. Cane and M. Tushnet. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 271-97.

Koehlin L., & Fenner Zinkernagel, G. (2009): Non-state actors as standard setters; framing the issue in an interdisciplinary fashion. In Peters, A., Koehlin, L., Forster, T. & Fenner Zinkernagel, G. (eds): *Non-State Actors as Standard Setters*. Cambridge, Cambridge University Press.

Labowitz, S. & Baumann-Pauly, D. (2014): Business as Usual is Not an Option. Supply Chains and Sourcing After Rana Plaza. NYU Stern Center for Business and Human Rights. Available at:

Matten, D. & Crane, A. (2005): Corporate Citizenship: Towards an extended theoretical conception. *Academy of Management Review*, 30: 166-179.

Mena, S. & Palazzo, G. (2012): Input and Output Legitimacy of Multi-Stakeholder Initiatives. *Business Ethics Quarterly*, 22 (3): 529-559.

New York University Stern Center for Business and Human Rights (2014): 'Written Submission to the U.S. Senate Committee on Foreign Relations Hearing: Prospects for Democratic Reconciliation and Workers' Rights in Bangladesh', February 11 2014 at Appendix 1. Available at:
http://www.stern.nyu.edu/cons/groups/content/documents/webasset/con_046298.pdf

Nolan, J. M. (2009): The China Dilemma: Internet Censorship and Corporate Responsibility. *Asian Journal of Comparative Law*, 4 (1): 3.

Nolan, J. (2005): 'The United Nations' Compact with Business: Hindering or Helping the Protection of Human Rights?'. *University of Queensland Law Journal* 24: 445.

Nolan, J. & van Heerden A. (2013): Engaging Business in the Business of Human Rights. In Pedersen, M. & Kinley, D. (eds.) *Principled Engagement: Negotiating Human Rights in Repressive States* Ashgate , 2013.

Nolan J. (2013): The Corporate Responsibility to Respect Human Rights: Soft Law or Not Law?' in Deva, S. & Bilchitz, D. (eds.): *Human Rights Obligations of Business: Beyond the Corporate Responsibility to Respect?* Cambridge University Press: 138-161 at 141.

Nolan, J. (2014): Refining the Rules of the Game: The Responsibility to Respect Human Rights. *Utrecht Journal of International and European Law*, 30 (78): 7-23.

Oka, C. (2007): Accounting for the Gaps in Labour Standard Compliance: The Role of Reputation-conscious Buyers in the Cambodian Garment Industry *European Journal of Development Research* 22, no. I (2010), 59-78.

Ottaway, M. (2001): Corporatism Goes Global: International Organizations, Nongovernmental Organization Networks, and Transnational Business. *Global Governance*, 7 (3): 265-292.

Palazzo, G. & Scherer, A. G. (2007): Corporate legitimacy as deliberation: A communicative framework. *Journal of Business Ethics*, 66: 71-88.

Papadopoulos, Y. (2012): The challenge of transnational private governance: Evaluating authorization, representation, and accountability. LIEPP Working Paper, February 2013, No.8.

Peters, A., Koechlin, L. & Fenner Zinkernagel, G. (2009): Non-state actors as standard setters; framing the issue in an interdisciplinary fashion' in Peters, A., Koechlin, L., Forster, T. & Fenner Zinkernagel, G. (eds): *Non-State Actors as Standard Setters* . Cambridge 2009: 18.

Pflitsch, G. (2009). Möglichkeiten und Grenzen von Stakeholderdialogen im Bereich Corporate Social Responsibility untersucht am Beispiel der "Banzer Gespräche" der COMPANY A (company name). MA Thesis, University of Münster.

Porter, M. E. & Kramer, M. R. (2006): Strategy and society: the link between competitive advantage and corporate social responsibility. *Harvard Business Review* (December 2006): 78-92.

Rasche, A. (2009): What the United Nations Global Compact Is and Is Not. *Business and Society*, 48 (4): 511-537.

Reinicke, W. H. & Deng, F. (2000): Critical Choices: The United Nations, and the Future of Global Governance. Ottawa: International Development Research Centre.

Risse, T. (2004): Transnational Governance and Legitimacy. Working Paper. Available at: http://userpage.fu-berlin.de/~atasp/texte/tn_governance_benz.pdf

Ruggie J. (2007): 'Business and Human Rights: Mapping International Standards of Responsibility and Accountability for Corporate Acts', A/HRC/4/035 (4 February, 2007).

Ruggie, J. (2008): "Protect, Respect and Remedy: A Framework for Business and Human Rights: Report of the Special Representative of the Secretary General on the Issue of Human Rights and Transnational Corporations and Other Business Enterprises", A/HRC/8/5 (7 April 2008).

Ruggie, J. (2009): Video Message to VPs Plenary, Oslo, 16 March 2009. Available at: <http://www.business-humanrights.org/Links/Repository/172345>>

Ruggie, J. (2011): 'Guiding Principles on Business and Human Rights: Implementing the United Nations "Protect, Respect and Remedy" Framework: Report of the Special Representative of the Secretary-General on the issue of Human Rights and Transnational Corporations and Other Business Enterprises', A/HRC/17/31 (21 March 2011).

Ruggie, J. (2014): A UN Business And Human Rights Treaty? Issues Brief of the Harvard Kennedy School, January 28, 2014. Available at: <http://www.hks.harvard.edu/m-rcbg/CSRI/UNBusinessandHumanRightsTreaty.pdf>

Sabel, C. et al. (2000): Social Protection Unit, World Bank Group, *Ratcheting Labor Standards: Regulation For Continuous Improvement In The Global Workplace*, Discussion Paper No 11 (2000) <<http://www.archonfung.net/papers/RLS21.pdf>

Scharpf, F. W. (1999): *Governing in Europe. Effective and Democratic?* Oxford. OUP.

Scherer, A. G. & Palazzo, G. (2007): Toward a political conception of corporate responsibility: Business and society seen from a Habermasian perspective. *Academy of Management Review*, 32: 1096-1120.

Scherer, A. G., Palazzo, G. & Baumann, D. (2006): Global rules and private actors: Toward a new role of the TNC in global governance. *Business Ethics Quarterly*, 16: 505-532.

Slaughter, A-M. (2003): Global Government Networks, Global Information Agencies and Disaggregated Democracy. *Michigan Journal of International Law*, 24: 1041-74.

Siggelkow, N. (2007): Persuasion With Case Studies. *Academy of Management Journal* 50 (1): 20-24.

Simons P. (2004): Corporate Voluntarism and Human Rights: The Adequacy and Effectiveness of Voluntary Self-Regulation Regimes. *Industrial Relations*, 59 (1): 101-141.

Sinclair (1997): Self-Regulation Versus Command and Control? Beyond False Dichotomies. *Law & Policy*, 19 (4): 529- 559.

Suchman, M. C. (1995). Managing Legitimacy: Strategic and Institutional Approaches. *Academy of Management Review*, 20: 571–610.

Trebeck, K. (2008): Corporate Social Responsibility and Democratization: Opportunities and Obstacles. In O'Faircheallaigh, C. & Ali, S.(Eds.): *Earth Matters*. Sheffield, UK: Greenleaf Publishing: 8-23.

Utting P. (2002): 'Regulating Business via Multi-stakeholder Initiatives: A Preliminary Assessment', 1-8 in *Voluntary Approaches to Corporate Responsibility: Readings and a Resource Guide* by the UN Non-Governmental Liaison Service (NGLS) and UNRISD Geneva, Switzerland, May 2002 Available at: <http://www.unrisd.org/80256B3C005BCCF9/%28httpAuxPages%29/35F2BD0379CB6647C1256CE6002B70AA?OpenDocument>

Utting, P. (2005): Rethinking Business Regulation, From Self-Control to Social Control. United Nations Research Institute for Social Development, Technology, Business and Society Programme Paper Number 15, September 2005.

Utting, P. & Zammit, A. (2006): Beyond Pragmatism: Appraising UN-Business Partnerships. Markets, Business and Regulation Programme, Paper 1, Geneva: UNRISD.

Van Huijstee, M. & Glasbergen, P. (2008): The practice of stakeholder dialogue between multinationals and NGOs. *Corporate Social Responsibility and Environmental Management*, 15 (5): 298-319.

Van Tulder, R. (2012): Foreword - The necessity of multi-stakeholder initiatives. In van Huijstee, M. (2012): *Multi-Stakeholder Initiatives: A Strategic Guide for Civil Society Organizations*, SOMO. Available at: <http://somo.nl/news-en/somo-publishes-strategic-guide-on-multi-stakeholder-initiatives-for-civil-society-organizations>

Waddock, S. (2008): Building a new institutional infrastructure for corporate responsibility. *Academy of Management Perspectives*, 22 (3): 87-108. Detailed tables are available at: <https://www2.bc.edu/~waddock/>

Wettstein, F. (2012): Human Rights as a Critique of Instrumental CSR: Corporate Responsibility Beyond the Business Case. POLITEI