Companies and the Australian immigration detention system
Profiting from human rights abuse

Australia sends asylum seekers to offshore camps where they are detained indefinitely and subjected to well-documented abuses, in violation of their human rights. The Australian Government outsources the operations at the camps, and Spanish company Ferrovial has responsibility for the system’s largest operational contracts. Investors in Ferrovial, including the Norwegian Pension Fund, are exposed to the significant risks of association with human rights abuse.

Briefing note
Brynn O’Brien
October 2016
ABOUT THE AUSTRALIA INSTITUTE

The Australia Institute is an independent public policy think tank based in Canberra. It is funded by donations from philanthropic trusts and individuals and commissioned research. Since its launch in 1994, the Institute has carried out highly influential research on a broad range of economic, social and environmental issues.

OUR PHILOSOPHY

As we begin the 21st century, new dilemmas confront our society and our planet. Unprecedented levels of consumption co-exist with extreme poverty. Through new technology we are more connected than we have ever been, yet civic engagement is declining. Environmental neglect continues despite heightened ecological awareness. A better balance is urgently needed.

The Australia Institute’s directors, staff and supporters represent a broad range of views and priorities. What unites us is a belief that through a combination of research and creativity we can promote new solutions and ways of thinking.

OUR PURPOSE - ‘RESEARCH THAT MATTERS’

The Institute aims to foster informed debate about our culture, our economy and our environment and bring greater accountability to the democratic process. Our goal is to gather, interpret and communicate evidence in order to both diagnose the problems we face and propose new solutions to tackle them.

The Institute is wholly independent and not affiliated with any other organisation. As an Approved Research Institute, donations to its Research Fund are tax deductible for the donor. Anyone wishing to donate can do so via the website at https://www.tai.org.au or by calling the Institute on 02 6130 0530. Our secure and user-friendly website allows donors to make either one-off or regular monthly donations and we encourage everyone who can to donate in this way as it assists our research in the most significant manner.

Level 5, 131 City Walk
Canberra, ACT 2601
Tel: (02) 61300530
Email: mail@tai.org.au
Website: www.tai.org.au
# Table of Contents

Summary .......................................................................................................................... 4  
Introduction .................................................................................................................. 6  
Human rights abuses ....................................................................................................... 10  
A policy of secrecy .......................................................................................................... 15  
Worsening situation ........................................................................................................ 17  
Corporate involvement in offshore detention ............................................................... 20  
Ferrovial .......................................................................................................................... 22  
The Norwegian Pension Fund ....................................................................................... 24  
Conclusion and recommendations ................................................................................. 28
Summary

There is overwhelming evidence of ongoing, grave human rights abuses occurring in Australia’s system of offshore immigration camps located on the Pacific Islands of Manus and Nauru. People seeking asylum, as well as those found to be refugees, are detained arbitrarily and indefinitely and exposed to cruel, inhuman and degrading conditions.

Despite a government policy of secrecy, the abuses involved in this system have drawn repeated condemnation from international human rights experts, including numerous United Nations authorities. In October 2016 Amnesty International stated that the conditions appear deliberate and the system “amounts to torture under international law.”

Australia outsources the operations at the offshore detention camps to companies. It is not possible for these companies to meet the most basic human rights standards in their operations, and investors in these companies are associated with the flow-on risks of human rights abuses.

This paper surveys recent developments within the contract network that supports the operation of the camps, and the consequences of those developments for the corporations directly involved as well as their financial stakeholders.

Spanish company Ferrovial took responsibility for the system’s operational contracts earlier this year, when it acquired Australian company Broadspectrum. Importantly, Ferrovial knew about the human rights abuses at the camps, and that the offshore detention contracts made up a significant proportion of Broadspectrum’s underlying revenue, before the acquisition was completed.

One of Ferrovial’s biggest investors is the Norwegian Pension Fund (The Fund). The Fund is known for its strong ethical investment policies and processes. Although the Fund divested from Broadspectrum in 2015, Ferrovial later acquired Broadspectrum. As such, the Fund is once again exposed to the risks associated with the serious, persistent and well-documented human rights abuses occurring in these detention camps.

---

2 Correspondence with NBIM, September 2016.
Investing in Ferrovial, or indeed any company involved in such activity, is inconsistent with the Fund’s Ethical Guidelines and its expectations documents on Human Rights and Children’s Rights.

Recommendations:

In order to act consistently with its ethical standards and to avoid future shareholdings in companies that operate immigration detention centres where human rights standards are not met:

1. The Norwegian Pension Fund should divest its shareholding in Ferrovial;
2. The Norwegian Pension Fund should apply a conduct-based exclusion to Ferrovial for as long as the company is involved in the operation of Australia’s offshore detention camps; and
3. The Norwegian Ministry of Finance should consider amending its ethical guidelines to allow for a screen to be applied to companies involved in the operation of detention facilities.


Introduction

HISTORY

Australia’s longstanding policy of offshore detention currently rests on the existence of two extraterritorial detention camps, located on the remote islands of Nauru and Manus Island (part of Papua New Guinea). At these camps, asylum seekers and refugees are detained indefinitely, in inadequate conditions, without access to appropriate healthcare and without recourse to Australia’s legal system.6

The system of offshore detention has been condemned by the world’s leading international human rights authorities, including the United Nations High Commissioner for Refugees, the UN Special Rapporteur on Torture, the UN High Commissioner for Human Rights, the UN Special Rapporteur on the Human Rights of Migrants, Amnesty International, and Human Rights Watch, as well as Australia’s own Human Rights Commission (see section on Human Rights Abuses, below).

The offshore detention camps – known as the Pacific Solution – have been in existence for fifteen years.7 The Pacific Solution was established in 2001 after the Norwegian container ship, the MV Tampa, rescued asylum seekers in the waters to Australia’s north. The ship was prevented from disembarking the asylum seekers in Australia by the Howard Government, a position that Norway’s then Foreign Minister, Thorbjoern Jagland, described as “unacceptable and inhumane and contravening international law”8. Shortly thereafter, the Howard Government established offshore detention centres on Manus Island and Nauru.

The system was largely dismantled under the first Rudd Government, but reinstated by the Gillard Government in 2012.9 In July 2013, the second Rudd Government signed a

---

7 Peter Mares, Borderline: Australia’s Response to Refugees and Asylum Seekers in the Wake of the Tampa, 2nd ed. (Sydney, NSW: UNSW Press, 2002).
9 Australian Parliamentary Library and Elibritt Karlsen, “Australia’s Offshore Processing of Asylum Seekers in Nauru and PNG: A Quick Guide to Statistics and Resources,” text (Canberra: Department of
Memorandum of Understanding (MoU) with Papua New Guinea and announced that people who arrived after 19 July 2013 would not be resettled in Australia. Successive governments under Tony Abbott and Malcolm Turnbull have continued this policy.

CURRENT SYSTEM

As at 31 July 2016, there were 833 men detained on Manus Island and 411 people on detained on Nauru, including 49 children.10 These people arrived after the second Rudd Government’s announcement of the MoU between Australia and PNG.11 Consequently, at the time of writing, some people on Manus Island and Nauru have been in detention for over three years.

Within the cohort of people subjected to offshore detention, rates of acceptance of protection claims is high, for those who have had their claims determined. As at 31 May 2016, the rate of acceptance of people’s claims to refugee status was 98% on Manus Island, and 77% on Nauru.12

Some of the people who have been found to be refugees have been moved to accommodation outside the camps. In both PNG and Nauru, refugees face very serious personal safety issues in the community.13 Even these people live in limbo, with no genuine resettlement options available to them. In a letter addressed to the UN Secretary-General on the eve of the Obama Administration’s Leaders’ Summit on the Global Refugee Crisis in September 2016, a “Dad in Nauru,” who has had his claims determined and now lives “in the community”, wrote:

11 “Approximately 1,000 unauthorised maritime arrivals (UMAs) who entered Australia between 13 August 2012 and 19 July 2013 were taken to a regional processing country. On 19 July 2013, the former Rudd Government announced that these UMAs would be returned to Australia to create capacity for the transfer of UMAs who arrived after 19 July 2013. Returns occurred progressively and were completed in October 2015.” As per Australian Parliamentary Library and Elibritt Karlsen, “Australia’s Offshore Processing of Asylum Seekers in Nauru and PNG,” 5.
12 Ibid., 10.
To this day we are still like walking ghosts, utterly broken and hopeless. We are hollowed out and devoid of any enthusiasm for life, and we are stuck in an animalistic state of existence because that is what we have become.\textsuperscript{14}

The political justification for the existence of the offshore detention camps is that they act as a deterrent to people seeking asylum by boat and thus “stop the boats.” Arguments made for these camps range from humanitarian ("preventing deaths at sea")\textsuperscript{15} to appeals to national sovereignty ("we will decide who comes to this country and the circumstances in which they come").\textsuperscript{16}

While the issue remains controversial in Australia, indefinite detention in extraordinarily harsh conditions remains the cornerstone of a set of policies aimed at preventing unauthorised sea entry to Australia.

There can be no justification for conduct that amounts to cruel, inhuman and degrading treatment.\textsuperscript{17} This principle is non-derogable at international law,\textsuperscript{18} that is, states are not permitted under any circumstances to subject people to such treatment.

Meanwhile, people who arrive by plane and seek asylum are afforded a legal process under Australian law. Differential treatment based on mode of arrival amounts to a


\textsuperscript{17} Juan E. Mendez, “Report of the Special Rapporteur on Torture and Other Cruel, Inhuman or Degrading Treatment or Punishment,” March 6, 2015.

penalty for asylum seekers who arrive by sea and thus a breach of Article 31 of the Refugee Convention, to which Australia is a signatory.\textsuperscript{19}

Human rights abuses

Australia’s system of offshore detention has become notorious for human rights abuses, which have been condemned by leading local and international authorities. This section provides detailed quotes taken from the numerous forceful criticisms of conditions in the offshore detention system (emphasis in all quotes is added by the author, in bold).

In May 2016, the United Nations High Commissioner for Refugees released the following statement:

There is no doubt that the current policy of offshore processing and prolonged detention is immensely harmful. There are approximately 2000 very vulnerable refugees and asylum-seekers on Manus Island and Nauru. These people have already been through a great deal, many have fled war and persecution, some have already suffered trauma. Despite efforts by the Governments of Papua New Guinea and Nauru, arrangements in both countries have proved completely untenable.

The situation of these people has deteriorated progressively over time, as UNHCR has witnessed firsthand over numerous visits since the opening of the centres. The consensus among medical experts is that conditions of detention and offshore processing do immense damage to physical and mental health. UNHCR’s principal concern today is that these refugees and asylum-seekers are immediately moved to humane conditions with adequate support and services. 20

The United Nations High Commissioner for Human Rights commented in June 2015:

Australia’s response to migrant arrivals has set a poor benchmark for its regional neighbours. The authorities have also engaged in turn-arounds and push-backs of boats in international waters. Asylum-seekers are incarcerated in centres in Papua New Guinea and Nauru, where they face conditions that the Special Rapporteur on Torture has reported as amounting to cruel, inhuman or degrading treatment as defined by [the Convention Against Torture]. They also violate the Convention on the Rights of the Child, as the Australian Human

---

Rights Commission has justifiably declared. Even recognized refugees in urgent need of protection are not permitted to enter Australia, which has set up relocation arrangements with countries that may be ill-prepared to offer them any durable solution.

Such policies should not be considered a model by any country. Given that most of today's Australians themselves descend from migrants – and given that the country maintains sizeable regular programs for migration and resettlement – I am bewildered by the hostility and contempt for these women, men and children that is so widespread among the country's politicians.\(^\text{21}\)

In a 2015 report, the United Nations Special Rapporteur on Torture stated:

the Government of Australia, by failing to provide adequate detention conditions; end the practice of detention of children; and put a stop to the escalating violence and tension at the Regional Processing Centre [on Manus Island], has violated the right of the asylum seekers, including children, to be free from torture or cruel, inhuman or degrading treatment, as provided by articles 1 and 16 of the [Convention Against Torture].\(^\text{22}\)

In their joint report on Nauru published in August 2016, Amnesty International and Human Rights Watch stated:

About 1,200 men, women, and children who sought refuge in Australia and were forcibly transferred to the remote Pacific island nation of Nauru suffer severe abuse, inhumane treatment, and neglect, Human Rights Watch and Amnesty International said today. The Australian government’s failure to address serious abuses appears to be a deliberate policy to deter further asylum seekers from arriving in the country by boat.

Refugees and asylum seekers on Nauru, most of whom have been held there for three years, routinely face neglect by health workers and other service providers who have been hired by the Australian government, as well as frequent unpunished assaults by local Nauruans. They endure unnecessary delays and at times denial of medical care, even for life-threatening conditions. Many have dire mental health problems and suffer overwhelming


\(^{22}\) Juan E. Mendez, “Report of the Special Rapporteur on Torture and Other Cruel, Inhuman or Degrading Treatment or Punishment,” 8.
despair – self-harm and suicide attempts are frequent. All face prolonged uncertainty about their future.⁴³

In its 2016 World Report, Human Rights Watch said that:

the [Australian] government’s failure to respect international standards for asylum seekers and refugees continues to take a heavy human toll. In 2015, Australia’s practices of mandatory detention of asylum seekers, abuses related to offshore processing, and outsourcing of refugee obligations to other countries were heavily criticized by United Nations experts, foreign governments, and even some Australian government-funded inquiries.⁴⁴

In a September 2016 report, the Australian Human Rights Commission stated that:

Since the processing of asylum claims in Nauru and Papua New Guinea’s Manus Island recommenced in 2012, numerous reports and inquiries as well as the Commission’s own research have documented a range of serious shortcomings in third country processing arrangements. Key issues of concern have included:

- the discriminatory nature of third country processing (it applies only to people who arrived by boat to seek asylum within a specific time period)
- inadequate pre-transfer assessment processes, which fail to adequately consider the best interests of the child and lack sufficient safeguards against refoulement (with particular concern having been raised about same-sex attracted people being sent to countries which criminalise same-sex sexual activity)
- prolonged, indefinite and potentially arbitrary immigration detention (including of children)
- harsh living conditions, including inadequate accommodation and sanitation facilities, limited privacy, extreme heat and overcrowding
- access to adequate health care services, including maternal, paediatric and mental health care services


• physical safety, particularly in relation to reports of physical and sexual assault of people in detention and the Nauruan community (with women and children at particular risk) and a violent incident at the Manus Island detention facility in 2014 which left one person dead and dozens injured

• delays in the processing and finalisation of asylum claims

• limited access to sustainable durable solutions, with the vast majority of people who have been found to be refugees still waiting for a solution and several of the refugees resettled in Cambodia having subsequently returned to their countries of origin

• the cumulative negative impacts of these conditions on the development of children and on the physical and mental health of all people subject to third country processing (which may also impact on their ability to present their asylum claims)

• lack of independent and transparent monitoring of third country processing facilities and arrangements.

These issues engage numerous human rights obligations under international treaties to which Australia is a party as well as under the Convention Relating to the Status of Refugees (Refugee Convention).25

In its report released on 17 October 2016, Amnesty International stated:

The conditions on Nauru — refugees’ severe mental anguish, the intentional nature of the system, and the fact that the goal of offshore processing is to intimidate or coerce people to achieve a specific outcome — amounts to torture under international law.

A traumatologist with experience counselling those affected by terrorism and natural disasters called Australia’s system of offshore detention “an atrocity.” He said it was the worst situation of trauma he’d ever seen, over a 43 year career.26

---


A joint Save the Children Australia and UNICEF Australia report, published in September 2016, detailed the harms to children subjected to Australia’s policies:

Children and their families who have sought Australia’s protection... have been exposed to the following potential dangers and harms:

- the anxiety and despair of a life-in-limbo
- prolonged exposure to detention and detention-like conditions
- deterioration in mental health leading to despair and self-harm
- impaired childhood development
- exposure to violence, abuse and exploitation
- indefinite family separation
- impaired access to appropriate education and healthcare
- incapacitation of parents and family break-down
- social isolation, negative stereotyping and discrimination
- in the case of families transferred to Nauru, increased instances of babies born stateless
- in the case of families transferred to Nauru, impaired enjoyment of cultural rights and identity...

A leaked report by the UNHCR into conditions on Nauru, details of which were published in The Saturday Paper, stated:

It appears that PTSD and depression have reached epidemic proportions ... UNHCR anticipates that mental illness, distress and suicide will continue to escalate in the immediate and foreseeable future.28

---


A policy of secrecy

The human rights abuses detailed above are both the cause and effect of secrecy at Australia’s offshore detention camps. Access to the camps and the people detained there is extremely limited. This has made it difficult to monitor the conditions on the camps.

The Australian Border Force Act 2015 establishes a criminal offence, punishable by two years’ imprisonment, for the unauthorised disclosure of information about the camps by certain people, including contractors, who work in them.29

The governments involved have issued blanket refusals of access to the centres for journalists30 (or even, in the case of Nauru, denial of visas to media).31 Danish parliamentarians who had planned a visit to the centre had their applications for visas denied.32

While on a visit to Nauru, Australian Senator Sarah Hanson-Young, a long-time critic of the centres, was spied on by private security contractor Wilson Security. Wilson representatives then provided false information to an Australian Senate inquiry about the company’s activities.33

In 2015, the United Nations Special Rapporteur on the Human Rights of Migrants was forced to cancel a planned visit to Australia due to the Australian governments’ failure

---


to cooperate “regarding protection concerns and access to detention centres [including offshore centres].”\textsuperscript{34} He stated:

In preparing for my visit, it came to my attention that the 2015 Border Force Act, which sanctions detention centre service-providers who disclose ‘protected information’ with a two-year court sentence, would have an impact on my visit as it serves to discourage people from fully disclosing information relevant to my mandate... This threat of reprisals with persons who would want to cooperate with me on the occasion of this official visit is unacceptable,... Since March 2015, I have repeatedly requested that the Australian Government facilitate my access to its off-shore processing centres... I was also extremely disappointed that I was unable to secure the cooperation needed to visit any off-shore centre, given the international human rights and humanitarian law concerns regarding them, plus the Australian Senate Inquiries on the off-shore detention centres in Nauru and Papua New Guinea, which raised concerns and recommendations concerning these centres.\textsuperscript{35}

A joint September 2016 report by Save the Children Australia and UNICEF Australia criticised these “policies of operational secrecy” as means to hinder public debate in Australian and to impair Australians’ ability “to assess whether these policies are necessary or appropriate, nor to understand the true quantum of the human, economic and strategic costs they entail.”\textsuperscript{36}

\textsuperscript{35} Ibid.
\textsuperscript{36} Save the Children Australia and UNICEF Australia, “At What Cost?”
Worsening situation

Conditions in the camps have deteriorated and it is inevitable that, over time, the situation will worsen. Rates of self-harm in Australia’s detention camps are already at “epidemic” levels. Medical research indicates that the mental and physical health of people held in Australia’s immigration detention centres deteriorates the longer they are detained, a fact acknowledged by the Australian Department of Immigration and Border Protection as well as IHMS, the government’s health contractor on Manus Island and Nauru.

In May 2016, UNHCR stated:

The situation of these people [subjected to offshore detention by Australia] has deteriorated progressively over time, as UNHCR has witnessed firsthand over numerous visits since the opening of the centres. The consensus among medical experts is that conditions of detention and offshore processing do immense damage to physical and mental health. UNHCR’s principal concern today is that these refugees and asylum-seekers are immediately moved to humane conditions with adequate support and services.

This statement was released following a UNHCR visit to Nauru during which UNHCR representatives were witnesses to the self-immolation of 23-year-old Iranian man who

---

40 UNHCR, “Statement - UNHCR Calls for Immediate Movement of Refugees and Asylum Seekers to Humane Conditions.”
later died from his injuries.\textsuperscript{41} A young Somali woman set herself alight only days later, suffering burns to 70\% of her body.\textsuperscript{42}

The environment of offshore detention is profoundly harmful to children. 13-year old refugee Misbah said in an interview broadcast on 17 October 2016 by \textit{4 Corners}:

\begin{quote}
We feel very sad. Most of the people even think they will suicide and that's better for them, than having like this much stress.\textsuperscript{43}
\end{quote}

At the time of broadcast, Misbah had been on Nauru for 1179 days.

Another child refugee, 17-year old Shamim, who had spent 1090 days on Nauru at the time of broadcast, described her self-harming behaviour:

\begin{quote}
I wasn't feeling ok, and it was so, so bad, and I want to feel the pain which I'm having in my like heart and it's so bad, so I'm just taking it out. But still when I did it, did it, it wasn't painful. But I still did it, I wasn't ok and I just did some stupid things. Maybe just for a while I forgot the feeling pain, but so bad, but after the pain from my hand gone, it started back again.\textsuperscript{44}
\end{quote}

Two teachers who had worked on Nauru described the environment to \textit{4 Corners}:

\begin{quote}
GABBY SUTHERLAND: Well it's death by slow torture. It's, it's just how to, the place is set up to make people go mad or just make people, just make people die inside.

JUDITH REEN: You know what, because the harm is permanent. It's the damage is done for these children. It is done. Three years of their lives has been- have been spent, sorry, in the camp - sorry [crying] I just want to make sure it doesn't happen to another generation.\textsuperscript{45}
\end{quote}

Both women risked prosecution under the \textit{Border Force Act} and a sentence of 2 years’ imprisonment for disclosing information to the program. They spoke out anyway.\textsuperscript{46}

\begin{footnotes}
\item[42] Ibid., -.\footnotesymbol
\item[44] Ibid.
\item[45] Ibid.
\item[46] Ibid.
\end{footnotes}
In the UNHCR report leaked to *The Saturday Paper*, details of which were published in October 2016, the escalating toll of prolonged detention is clear:

UNHCR anticipates that mental illness, distress and suicide will continue to escalate in the immediate and foreseeable future.47

---

Corporate involvement in offshore detention

Corporations play a central role in Australia’s offshore detention system. Because the detention camps are located in other countries with limited resources, the Australian government needs the active participation of companies in order to operate the centres upon which its policy relies. Australia outsources the operation of these centres to companies through contracts valued at over AU$1 billion per annum.

Put simply: without companies willing to do the work of operating, maintaining and providing services to the centres, Australia’s offshore detention system would cease to exist.

The companies involved in the offshore detention system since 2012 include:

- G4S,
- Broadspectrum, formerly known as Transfield Services,

---


• IHMS,\textsuperscript{53} and
• Wilson Security.\textsuperscript{54}

A report released in November 2015 by human rights campaign group No Business in Abuse documented the contribution of Australian listed company Transfield Services Limited (now known as Broadspectrum) to the human rights violations at the camps.\textsuperscript{55} This report found that the abuses in the camps (centrally the abuses of arbitrary detention and cruel, inhuman and degrading treatment) are inherent in the operation of the system.

In this context, there is no way that corporations (or other organisations) can profit from such operations as well as meet their responsibilities under the UN Guiding Principles on Business and Human Rights\textsuperscript{56} and other relevant standards. There is also no way that contracting companies can mitigate the risk of human rights abuses in offshore detention, given their systemic nature.

No company acts in a vacuum in today’s global economy. The companies contracting to Australia’s detention system rely on material support from other companies – especially in the form of finance and investment – in order to conduct their business activities.

The systemic nature of the abuses at the offshore camps are not only the responsibility not only of companies that operate them, but also of concern to their investors and financiers. Business risks of association with abuse will flow onto the financial backers of contracting companies, should they fail to take appropriate action.\textsuperscript{57}

\textsuperscript{53} “IHMS Contract for Provision of Health Service for People in Detention,” n.d.
\textsuperscript{54} Transfield and Wilson, “Wilson Subcontract with Transfield,” 2013.
Spanish infrastructure company Ferrovial S.A. is currently responsible for the largest contracts to operate the offshore detention system.

Ferrovial had no association with the camps until it bought Broadspectrum in May 2016.\textsuperscript{58} At this time, Broadspectrum was operating the camps. In taking over Broadspectrum, Ferrovial acquired responsibility for the detention contracts with the Australian government.\textsuperscript{59}

Ferrovial made this acquisition subsequent to being provided with detailed information about the abuses in the camps.\textsuperscript{60} When acquiring Broadspectrum, Ferrovial fell short of conducting adequate due diligence on this acquisition, or failed to respond appropriately to human rights concerns.\textsuperscript{61} This failure is outlined in a report released in July 2016, \textit{Association with Abuse}.\textsuperscript{62}

\textbf{This governance failure should have been a red flag to Ferrovial’s financial backers.}

When the takeover of Broadspectrum proceeded, Ferrovial released a statement indicating that detention centre work “will not form part of its services offering in the future”.\textsuperscript{63}

This was widely interpreted to mean that the company would not bid for a new contract after the current contract expires, and that its work at the offshore centres would cease in February 2017 with the expiration of that contract. In August 2016, however, Ferrovial announced that the Australian Government had extended the

\begin{itemize}
\item 59 No Business in Abuse, Human Rights Law Centre, and GetUp!, \textit{“Association with Abuse: The Financial Sector’s Association with Gross Human Rights Abuses of People Seeking Asylum in Australia,”} 4.
\item 60 No Business in Abuse, Human Rights Law Centre, and GetUp!, \textit{“Association with Abuse: The Financial Sector’s Association with Gross Human Rights Abuses of People Seeking Asylum in Australia.”}
\item 61 Ibid.
\item 62 Ibid.
\end{itemize}
contract for a further eight months to 27 October 2017 (under an extension clause in the contract), despite Ferrovial’s “eagerness to withdraw” from operations at the camps.  

In summary: Ferrovial will now be an active participant in the abusive offshore detention system for a total of 18 months, or over 500 days – from the time it assumed responsibility for the camps in May 2016 to the end of its final contract extension on 27 October 2017.

Ferrovial’s continued participation in the system of offshore detention falls foul of its responsibility to respect human rights, a requirement which “exists over and above compliance with national laws,” including contractual obligations.

During the time in which Ferrovial has responsibility for the detention contracts it will be exposed to the serious business risks (operational, legal, financial and reputational) posed by association with gross human rights abuses.

Ferrovial’s continued involvement in the system of offshore detention – especially in the context of an explicit UNHCR recommendation that the camps be immediately emptied – poses an unacceptable moral and governance risk to any company with which Ferrovial has business relationships, including Ferrovial’s investors.

---


66 No Business in Abuse, Human Rights Law Centre, and GetUp!, “Association with Abuse: The Financial Sector’s Association with Gross Human Rights Abuses of People Seeking Asylum in Australia.”

67 UNHCR, “Statement - UNHCR Calls for Immediate Movement of Refugees and Asylum Seekers to Humane Conditions.”
The Norwegian Pension Fund

One of the biggest investors in Ferrovial has been Norges Bank Investment Management (NBIM) – the investment arm of the Norwegian Pension Fund Global.

On the most recent available market, NBIM holds approximately 1.71% (valued at US$283 million) of Ferrovial, making NBIM one of Ferrovial’s top ten shareholders. When contacted by The Australia Institute to confirm current holdings, NBIM declined to comment, as per the fund’s “standard policy” not to “comment on individual holdings.”

NBIM has strict expectations, in respect of human rights and children’s rights of the companies in which it invests.

NBIM previously divested from Broadspectrum. At this time, Broadspectrum was responsible for offshore detention contracts. With Ferrovial’s acquisition of Broadspectrum, the Fund is once again exposed to the human rights abuses occurring at the camps.

NBIM’s Human Rights Expectations document expressly refers to the UN Guiding Principles on Business and human rights as the relevant normative standard for companies in which they invest. In particular, it provides that:

 Companies should carry out relevant impact and risk assessments prior to for example making significant investments in new business activities, agreeing mergers and acquisitions, entering into new countries, regions or locations and establishing new business relationships.

Ferrovial fell short of its responsibilities in this regard, or failed to appropriately respond to the findings of such assessments.

---

69 Correspondence with NBIM, October 2016.
72 Correspondence with NBIM, September 2016.
74 No Business in Abuse, Human Rights Law Centre, and GetUp!, “Association with Abuse: The Financial Sector’s Association with Gross Human Rights Abuses of People Seeking Asylum in Australia.”
In addition, under the UN Guiding Principles on Business and Human Rights, NBIM has its own responsibility to respect human rights, which requires it to “seek to prevent or mitigate adverse human rights impacts that are directly linked to [its] operations, products or services by [its] business relationships, even if [NBIM has] not contributed to those impacts”.75

Continued investment in Ferrovial, while Ferrovial remains responsible for operating detention camps where well-documented human rights abuses are occurring, is inconsistent with these ethical and governance standards.

COMPANY (CONDUCT-BASED) SCREEN

NBIM excludes companies based on the failure of their conduct to meet certain standards. This is governed by the fund’s Ethical Guidelines.76 The Guidelines provide that companies may be put under observation or be excluded if there is an unacceptable risk that the company contributes to or is responsible for ... serious or systematic human rights violations, such as murder, torture ... and deprivation of liberty.

According to a report in the Guardian: “[NBIM] has acknowledged the potential for an ethical problem [with its investment in Ferrovial], and has referred the issue to Norway’s Council on Ethics for an independent judgment”.77

Conduct-based exclusions rely on the provision of evidence of a company’s involvement in human rights abuses. The human rights abuses in the offshore detention camps are well-documented by the world’s leading human rights authorities. Furthermore, NBIM and the Ethics Council were provided with detailed information about corporate involvement in human rights abuses at the camps, as well as the high likelihood of success of Ferrovial’s takeover of Broadspectrum, by No Business in Abuse over April and May of 2016.

---


Failing to act decisively on this information now would be inconsistent with the Norwegian Pension Fund’s internal and external human rights governance frameworks.

SECTOR (PRODUCT-BASED) SCREEN

In addition to divesting from particular companies, NBIM’s Ethical Guidelines provide for the application of a negative screen to certain sectors or operating environments in which the risk of a company’s activities resulting in human or environmental harm is very high.

Presently, these sectors include the production of controversial weapons and tobacco, as well as, where certain conditions are triggered, coal mining.78

The Norwegian Pension Fund’s guidelines do not currently include a negative screen of companies involved in the operation of detention facilities. However the operation of detention facilities by companies is a business activity that carries a significant risk of corporate involvement in harm to human beings.

Specifically, the Australian offshore detention system is an operating environment in which companies contracting to it cannot mitigate the risk of involvement in serious and systematic violations of international human rights standards,79 including those contained in NBIM’s expectation documents on human rights and children’s rights and its Ethical Guidelines.

Any company that contracts to this system faces the inescapable proposition that the portions of Australia’s present policy framework which it is contracted to implement not only permit but require violations of basic tenets of international human rights law. This position is, as outlined above, confirmed by numerous international authorities.

By implementing a sector or product based screen, NBIM could avoid a repeat of this situation in the future. The need for such a screen is shown in NBIM’s previous divestment from Broadspectrum, only to find itself holding shares in Broadspectrum’s new parent company Ferrovial. Recognition of the risks inherent in the privatised detention sector may have protected the fund against the financial, moral and reputational risk to which it is now exposed.

Privatised detention is an expanding industry. Given the likelihood of increasing involvement of companies within the Fund’s investment universe in detention

78 “Observation and Exclusion of Companies.”
activities, the Norwegian Ministry of Finance may wish to consider adopting a screen to identify companies involved in such operations.

A screen could be designed in a number of ways. It could take the form of a presumption against investment in companies with detention operations, which is rebuttable in cases where it can be demonstrated that a company has taken measures to prevent their involvement in human rights abuse. Alternatively, it could consist of an automatic, blanket screen on investing in companies conducting certain kinds of detention operations known to pose high risks of involvement in human rights abuses.
Conclusion and recommendations

The camps that constitute Australia’s offshore detention system are, as Amnesty International has stated, places of intentional cruelty.\(^\text{80}\) Australia can only maintain its abusive policies with the participation of the companies that operate the camps, and the wilful inaction of those companies’ financial backers.

**Without companies’ participation in the offshore detention system, the abuses would stop.**

Ferrovial’s shareholders have a responsibility to end their linkage to the human rights abuses at the camps. By holding shares in Ferrovial, the Norwegian Pension Fund is directly linked to – and holding a financial stake in – the human rights abuses.

Allowing a financially beneficial relationship to continue in the face of such overwhelming evidence of abuse is inconsistent with NBIM’s own standards.

**Recommendations:**

In order to act consistently with its ethical standards and to avoid future shareholdings in companies that operate immigration detention centres where human rights standards are not met:

1. The Norwegian Pension Fund should divest its shareholding in Ferrovial;
2. The Norwegian Pension Fund should apply a conduct-based exclusion to Ferrovial for as long as the company is involved in the operation of Australia’s offshore detention camps; and
3. The Norwegian Ministry of Finance should consider amending its ethical guidelines to allow for a screen to be applied to companies involved in the operation of detention facilities.
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