

BIS | Department for Business
Innovation & Skills

**UK NATIONAL CONTACT POINT
FOR THE OECD GUIDELINES FOR
MULTINATIONAL ENTERPRISES**

Annual report to the OECD
investment committee for
2010/11

MAY 2011

DFID Department for
International
Development

Contents

- Contents 2
 - A. Institutional arrangements 3
 - B. Information and promotion 4
 - C. Implementation in specific instances 5
 - Accepted specific instances 6
 - Concluded specific instances 12
 - Transferred specific instances 23
 - Specific instances considered by NCPs to date 23
 - D. Other 23
- ANNEX 1 – Structure of the UK National Contact Point 25
- ANNEX 2 – Contact details for the UK National Contact Point 25
- ANNEX 4 - Specific instances considered by the UK National Contact Point26

REPORT OF NATIONAL CONTACT POINTS TO THE INVESTMENT COMMITTEE

Common Framework for Annual Reporting by National Contact Points for the period 1 July 2010 - 30 June 2011

UK National Contact Point

IMPORTANT NOTE: the information below is correct at the time of writing (13 May 2011)

A. Institutional arrangements

- **Annexes 1 and 2 to this questionnaire show, respectively, the “Structure of the National Contact Points” from the 2010 NCP Chair’s Summary and the list of National Contact Points (providing contact details) that is available on the OECD Guidelines website. NCPs are asked to update these tables if necessary.**

Annexes 1 and 2 have been updated (see separate attachments).

- **NCPs may wish to provide additional information regarding institutional arrangements (e.g. regarding the composition of the National Contact Point, including multi-stakeholder advisory or oversight bodies established to assist NCPs in their tasks).**

No new developments since 1 July 2010.

- **How does the NCP relate to other government agencies?**

No new developments since 1 July 2010.

- **How does the NCP relate to social partners (business and labour organisations) involved in the functioning of the National Contact Point?**

No new developments since 1 July 2010.

- **How does the NCP relate to other non-governmental organisations (NGOs) and other interested parties involved in the functioning of the NCP?**

No new developments since 1 July 2010.

- **How does the NCP relate to other leading corporate responsibility instruments, such as the ILO Tripartite Declaration on Multinational Enterprises and Social Policy, the UN Global Compact and its local networks?**

We continue to copy our Final Statements to the UK Global Compact Network, and we are closely liaising with the European Investment Bank and the World Bank's Office of the Compliance Advisor / Ombudsman (CAO) in respect of the complaint against BHP Billiton (in Mozambique) filed in October 2010.

B. Information and promotion

- **How have the Guidelines been made available in your country (translation, brochures, creation of a webpage or website, etc.)?**

Mainly through the UK NCP's website and UK NCP's booklet (available in English, French and Spanish). However, since May 2010, all UK Government advertising and marketing spend is frozen. The freeze covers almost all paid-for communications activity – this includes publications, events and research. The UK NCP has therefore focused its awareness-raising activity on low-cost initiatives including: responding to enquiries on the Guidelines; participating to surveys on the implementation of the Guidelines; meeting, where appropriate, officials from other countries; promoting the Guidelines as part of the training for government personnel joining UK embassies.

- **How is co-operation with the business community, trade unions, other non-governmental organisations and the interested public carried out, with respect to information on, and promotion and use of, the Guidelines (consultations, distribution of the Guidelines, etc.)?**

Since May 2007, the UK NCP has cooperated with UK businesses, trades unions and NGOs through the representatives of these constituencies in the UK NCP Steering Board. Since 1 July 2010, the UK NCP undertook the following activities.

On 27 July 2010, the UK NCP delivered a presentation on the OECD Guidelines at a meeting for UK businesses organised by the International Chamber of Commerce.

On 29 March 2011, the UK NCP participated to an event on conflict minerals, organised by the UK Foreign and Commonwealth Office, that provided a useful opportunity to raise awareness of the OECD Guidelines and the OECD Risk Awareness Tool amongst UK multinationals and SMEs in the mining sector.

On 4 April 2011, the UK NCP held a stakeholder event (with UK businesses, trades unions and NGOs) to take stock of the progress made in updating the OECD Guidelines.

- **How is co-operation with state owned agencies (export credits agency, state owned enterprises and others) in matters concerning information and implementation of the Guidelines?**

The UK NCP effectively relies on the following members of the UK NCP's Steering Board: representative of the Exports Credits Guarantee Department (ECGD); representative of the Department for International Development (which sponsors the state-owned Commonwealth Development Corporation (CDC)).

- **Have other information and promotion activities been held or planned (seminars and/or conferences on the Guidelines in general or on specific subjects, informative publications or guides, co-operation with investment promotion agencies, departments of education, business schools, etc.)?**

The UK NCP is considering these issues in the light of the need to raise awareness of the updated text of the OECD Guidelines.

- **Has the OECD Risk Awareness Tool for Multinational Enterprises in Weak Governance Zones been disseminated or otherwise referred to in the context of interactions with enterprises and stakeholders?**

Referred to in the April 2011 stakeholder event taking stock of progress in updating the OECD Guidelines. See also above answer to the second bullet point under B.

- **Annex 3 to this questionnaire presents Table 1 from the NCP Chair's Summary of the 2010 NCP Meeting ("The OECD Guidelines and Export Credit, Overseas Investment Guarantee and Inward Investment Promotion Programmes"). NCPs are asked to update this table. If no update is necessary, please indicate this. If the OECD Risk Awareness Tool for Multinational Enterprises in Weak Governance Zones is referred to in these programmes, please indicate this separately.**

No update necessary

- **Have enquiries been received from (a) other NCPs; (b) the business community, labour organisations, other non-governmental organisations, or the public; or (c) governments of non-adhering countries?**

(a) Yes, German, Swiss, French, Dutch, Australian, Norwegian, Danish and Canadian NCPs. In December 2010, the UK NCP also hosted an event with like minded NCPs aimed at sharing best practice on the implementation of the OECD Guidelines.

(b) Yes, about 10 enquiries from the public, one from a trade union, and two from US academic institutions (Stanford Law School, and Berkeley Human Rights Review).

(c) Yes, one but from a Member of Parliament (South Africa).

C. Implementation in specific instances

NCPs might want to provide the following information on specific instances that were raised and/or concluded during the July 2010 – June 2011 cycle. Please ensure that the information submitted is suitable for dissemination.

Subject to respecting adhering countries' commitments to operate in accordance with the core criteria of visibility, accessibility, transparency and accountability, NCPs may provide any information they want

Accepted Specific Instances

Since 1 July 2010, the UK NCP accepted for further consideration the following 4 new complaints (one was formally accepted in April 2010 but the publication of the Initial Assessment was delayed therefore the OECD Secretariat was not notified of this complaint in last year's contribution):

1) International Union of Food, Agricultural, Hotel, Restaurant, Catering, Tobacco and Allied Workers' Association (IUF) v. Compass Group (Algeria)

- **Date request to consider specific instance was received:** 14 December 2009.
- **Who raised the specific instance (e.g. business, trade union, NGO)?** Complaint raised by a trades union (the IUF).
- **Which chapters of the Guidelines are cited in the specific instance? If possible, please also cite the specific recommendation(s) covered by the request.** Chapters IV(1)(a) "Employment and Industrial Relations".
- **Has the specific instance involved business activities in a non-adhering country? Was the specific instance a multi-jurisdictional instance and involved other NCPs? Has the home NCP liaise with the parent company of the enterprise party to the specific instance?** The alleged breach of the Guidelines occurred in Algeria (a non-adhering country). The UK NCP is liaising with the parent company in the UK.
- **Sector of activity: extractive industry (which industry?); agriculture; other primary sectors; manufacturing (which sub-sector?); financial services; retail distribution; transport; other services.** Catering.
- **Was the request to consider the specific instance accepted or rejected (if possible, describe grounds for not taking up a request)? Has the NCP issued a public statement on its decision that the issues raised merit further examination or not? Please elaborate on the content of the statement?** Accepted. The Initial Assessment is published under <http://www.bis.gov.uk/assets/biscore/business-sectors/docs/i/10-1000-initial-assessment-ncp-compass-group-plc.doc>.
- **Were the issues raised in the specific instance also been addressed in parallel proceedings? If so, what was the nature of the latter proceedings? Were both parties involved in these proceedings? How the latter procedure affected the specific instance procedure? Did the NCP consult the institutions conducting the parallel proceedings?**

No.

- **In what form has the NCP provided its good offices?**

The UK NCP offered, and the parties accepted, conciliation/mediation (conducted by a professional mediator appointed by the UK NCP).

- **Did the parties reach agreement on the issues raised? If an agreement was reached, did the NCP issue a report on the results?**

N/A

- **Where the parties failed to reach agreement, did the NCP statement concluding the specific instance contained recommendations on the implementation of the Guidelines? Did the statement contained provisions on monitoring the implementation of the recommendations?**

N/A

- **What was the duration of the specific instance procedure? More specifically, what were the respective lengths of the three intermediate phases (1. initial assessment; 2. assistance to the parties and 3. conclusion of the procedures)?**

1. Initial Assessment completed on 28 April 2010.

- **Would the NCP care to contribute additional information about this specific instance -- e.g. how was the information on the specific instance gathered? Was accessibility to reliable information or the protection of confidentiality or the identity of the parties an issue? Did all parties agree with the final statement issued by the NCP?**

N/A

2) Justica Ambiental et al. v. BHP Billiton (Mozambique)

- **Date request to consider specific instance was received:** 18 October 2010.
- **Who raised the specific instance (e.g. business, trade union, NGO)?** Complaint raised by a group of NGOs (Justica Ambiental (lead), Centro Terra Viva, Livaningo, Liga Moçambicana dos Direitos Humanos, Centro de Integridade Pública, and Kulima).
- **Which chapters of the Guidelines are cited in the specific instance? If possible, please also cite the specific recommendation(s) covered by the request.** Chapters II(2), II(5) "Concepts and Principles"; Chapters III(1) and III(2) "Disclosure"; Chapters V(1)(a), V(1)(b) and V(2) "Environment".
- **Has the specific instance involved business activities in a non-adhering country? Was the specific instance a multi-jurisdictional instance and involved other NCPs? Has the home NCP liaise with the parent company of the enterprise party to the specific instance?** The alleged breach of the Guidelines occurred in Mozambique (a non-adhering country). The UK NCP is liaising with the parent company in the UK. As

BHP Billiton is also registered in Australia, the UK NCP is also liaising with the Australian NCP.

- **Sector of activity: extractive industry (which industry?); agriculture; other primary sectors; manufacturing (which sub-sector?); financial services; retail distribution; transport; other services.** Extractive industry – aluminium.
- **Was the request to consider the specific instance accepted or rejected (if possible, describe grounds for not taking up a request)? Has the NCP issued a public statement on its decision that the issues raised merit further examination or not? Please elaborate on the content of the statement?** Accepted. The Initial Assessment was published on the UK NCP's website (<http://www.bis.gov.uk/assets/biscore/business-sectors/docs/i/11-687-initial-assessment-ncp-bhp-billiton.pdf>). However, the UK NCP suspended the complaint process to take into account the parties' decision to undergo mediation outside of the UK NCP's complaint process. The UK NCP requested regular updates from the parties on the progress of the mediation process, and will consequently keep the decision to suspend the UK NCP's complaint process under review.
- **Were the issues raised in the specific instance also been addressed in parallel proceedings? If so, what was the nature of the latter proceedings? Were both parties involved in these proceedings? How the latter procedure affected the specific instance procedure? Did the NCP consult the institutions conducting the parallel proceedings?**

Yes, parallel proceedings had commenced in Mozambique courts and Parliament, and by the European Investment Bank and the World Bank. Neither party made a submission to the UK NCP to suspend the complaint process because of serious prejudice to the ongoing parallel legal proceedings. Therefore, the UK NCP progressed the complaint in accordance with the OECD Guidelines.

- **In what form has the NCP provided its good offices?**

The UK NCP offered conciliation/mediation (conducted by a professional mediator appointed by the UK NCP). However, both parties stated to the UK NCP that they preferred to undergo conciliation/mediation under the World Bank's Office of the Compliance Advisor / Ombudsman (CAO). The UK NCP accepted the parties' request and suspended the complaint process accordingly. The UK NCP receives regular updates from the parties on the progress of the CAO's mediation process.

- **Did the parties reach agreement on the issues raised? If an agreement was reached, did the NCP issue a report on the results?**

N/A

- **Where the parties failed to reach agreement, did the NCP statement concluding the specific instance contained recommendations on the**

implementation of the Guidelines? Did the statement contained provisions on monitoring the implementation of the recommendations?

N/A

- **What was the duration of the specific instance procedure? More specifically, what were the respective lengths of the three intermediate phases (1. initial assessment; 2. assistance to the parties and 3. conclusion of the procedures)?**

1. Initial Assessment completed on 2 February 2011.

- **Would the NCP care to contribute additional information about this specific instance -- e.g. how was the information on the specific instance gathered? Was accessibility to reliable information or the protection of confidentiality or the identity of the parties an issue? Did all parties agree with the final statement issued by the NCP?**

N/A

3) European Centre for Constitutional and Human Rights v. Cargill Cotton (Uzbekistan)

- **Date request to consider specific instance was received:** 1 December 2010.
- **Who raised the specific instance (e.g. business, trade union, NGO)?**
Complaint raised by an NGO (European Centre for Constitutional and Human Rights (ECCHR)).
- **Which chapters of the Guidelines are cited in the specific instance? If possible, please also cite the specific recommendation(s) covered by the request.** Chapters II(1), II(2), II(10) "Concepts and Principles"; Chapters IV(1)(b) and IV(1)(c) "Employment and Industrial Relations".
- **Has the specific instance involved business activities in a non-adhering country? Was the specific instance a multi-jurisdictional instance and involved other NCPs? Has the home NCP liaise with the parent company of the enterprise party to the specific instance?** The alleged breach of the Guidelines occurred in Uzbekistan (a non-adhering country). The UK NCP is liaising with the US NCP as the parent company is based in the US.
- **Sector of activity: extractive industry (which industry?); agriculture; other primary sectors; manufacturing (which sub-sector?); financial services; retail distribution; transport; other services.** Textile.
- **Was the request to consider the specific instance accepted or rejected (if possible, describe grounds for not taking up a request)? Has the NCP issued a public statement on its decision that the issues raised merit further examination or not? Please elaborate on the content of the statement?** Accepted, the Initial Assessment was published on the UK NCP's

website (<http://www.bis.gov.uk/assets/biscore/business-sectors/docs/i/11-764-initial-assessment-ncp-cargil-cotton.pdf>).

- **Were the issues raised in the specific instance also been addressed in parallel proceedings? If so, what was the nature of the latter proceedings? Were both parties involved in these proceedings? How the latter procedure affected the specific instance procedure? Did the NCP consult the institutions conducting the parallel proceedings?**

N/A

- **In what form has the NCP provided its good offices?**

The UK NCP offered, and both parties accepted, conciliation/mediation (conducted by a professional mediator appointed by the UK NCP).

- **Did the parties reach agreement on the issues raised? If an agreement was reached, did the NCP issue a report on the results?**

N/A

- **Where the parties failed to reach agreement, did the NCP statement concluding the specific instance contained recommendations on the implementation of the Guidelines? Did the statement contained provisions on monitoring the implementation of the recommendations?**

N/A

- **What was the duration of the specific instance procedure? More specifically, what were the respective lengths of the three intermediate phases (1. initial assessment; 2. assistance to the parties and 3. conclusion of the procedures)?**

1. Initial Assessment completed on 8 March 2011.

- **Would the NCP care to contribute additional information about this specific instance -- e.g. how was the information on the specific instance gathered? Was accessibility to reliable information or the protection of confidentiality an issue? Did all parties agree with the final statement issued by the NCP?**

N/A.

4) European Centre for Constitutional and Human Rights v. ICT Cotton (Uzbekistan)

- **Date request to consider specific instance was received:** 7 December 2010.
- **Who raised the specific instance (e.g. business, trade union, NGO)?**
Complaint raised by an NGO (European Centre for Constitutional and Human Rights (ECCHR)).
- **Which chapters of the Guidelines are cited in the specific instance? If possible, please also cite the specific recommendation(s) covered by the**

request. Chapters II(1), II(2), II(10) “Concepts and Principles”; Chapters IV(1)(b) and IV(1)(c) “Employment and Industrial Relations”.

- **Has the specific instance involved business activities in a non-adhering country? Was the specific instance a multi-jurisdictional instance and involved other NCPs? Has the home NCP liaise with the parent company of the enterprise party to the specific instance?** The alleged breach of the Guidelines occurred in Uzbekistan (a non-adhering country). The UK NCP is liaising with the Luxembourg NCP as the parent company is based in Luxembourg.
- **Sector of activity: extractive industry (which industry?); agriculture; other primary sectors; manufacturing (which sub-sector?); financial services; retail distribution; transport; other services.** Textile.
- **Was the request to consider the specific instance accepted or rejected (if possible, describe grounds for not taking up a request)? Has the NCP issued a public statement on its decision that the issues raised merit further examination or not? Please elaborate on the content of the statement?** Accepted. The Initial Assessment was published on the UK NCP’s website (<http://www.bis.gov.uk/assets/biscore/business-sectors/docs/i/11-765-initial-assessment-ncp-ict-cotton.pdf>).
- **Were the issues raised in the specific instance also been addressed in parallel proceedings? If so, what was the nature of the latter proceedings? Were both parties involved in these proceedings? How the latter procedure affected the specific instance procedure? Did the NCP consult the institutions conducting the parallel proceedings?**

N/A

- **In what form has the NCP provided its good offices?**

The UK NCP offered, and both parties accepted, conciliation/mediation (conducted by a professional mediator appointed by the UK NCP).

- **Did the parties reach agreement on the issues raised? If an agreement was reached, did the NCP issue a report on the results?**

N/A

- **Where the parties failed to reach agreement, did the NCP statement concluding the specific instance contained recommendations on the implementation of the Guidelines? Did the statement contained provisions on monitoring the implementation of the recommendations?**

N/A

- **What was the duration of the specific instance procedure? More specifically, what were the respective lengths of the three intermediate phases (1. initial assessment; 2. assistance to the parties and 3. conclusion of the procedures)?**

1. Initial Assessment completed on 8 March 2011.

- **Would the NCP care to contribute additional information about this specific instance -- e.g. how was the information on the specific instance gathered? Was accessibility to reliable information or the protection of confidentiality an issue? Did all parties agree with the final statement issued by the NCP?** N/A.

Concluded Specific Instances

Since 1 July 2010, the UK NCP concluded the following 7 complaints (ordered according to the date of publication of the Final Statement, or of the Initial Assessment rejecting the complaint). The UK NCP would like to draw the OECD Secretariat's attention to complaints (1), (5) and (7) which had previously been suspended because of ongoing parallel proceedings in the host country and have now been concluded thanks to the September 2009 UK NCP's guidance on dealing with Specific Instances in which there are parallel proceedings (<http://www.bis.gov.uk/assets/biscore/business-sectors/docs/a/11-652-approach-national-contact-point-parallel-proceedings.pdf>).

1) International Union of Food, Agricultural, Hotel, Restaurant, Catering, Tobacco and Allied Workers' Association (IUF) v. Unilever (India – Doom Dooma factory)

- **Date request to consider specific instance was received:** 19 October 2007.
- **Who raised the specific instance (e.g. business, trade union, NGO)?** Complaint raised by a trade union (the IUF).
- **Which chapters of the Guidelines are cited in the specific instance? If possible, please also cite the specific recommendation(s) covered by the request.** Chapter II(2) "Concepts and Principles"; and Chapters IV(1)(a) and IV(7) "Employment and Industrial Relations".
- **Has the specific instance involved business activities in a non-adhering country? Was the specific instance a multi-jurisdictional instance and involved other NCPs? Has the home NCP liaise with the parent company of the enterprise party to the specific instance?** The alleged breach of the Guidelines occurred in India (a non-adhering country). The UK NCP liaised with the parent company in the UK.
- **Sector of activity: extractive industry (which industry?); agriculture; other primary sectors; manufacturing (which sub-sector?); financial services; retail distribution; transport; other services.** Manufacturing – home and personal care products.
- **Was the request to consider the specific instance accepted or rejected (if possible, describe grounds for not taking up a request)? Has the NCP issued a public statement on its decision that the issues raised merit further examination or not? Please elaborate on the content of the statement?** Accepted. The Initial Assessment (<http://www.bis.gov.uk/files/file47352.doc>) was published on the UK NCP's website.

- **Were the issues raised in the specific instance also been addressed in parallel proceedings? If so, what was the nature of the latter proceedings? Were both parties involved in these proceedings? How the latter procedure affected the specific instance procedure? Did the NCP consult the institutions conducting the parallel proceedings?**

Yes. On 20 June 2008, the UK NCP suspended the complaint process on grounds of ongoing parallel proceedings in India. Between November 2009 and February 2010, the UK NCP reviewed this Specific Instance in the light of its parallel proceeding guidance (which was endorsed by the UK NCP's Steering Board on 16 September 2009). Having sought the views of both parties, the UK NCP informed both parties on 5 March 2010 that it would apply the guidance to this Specific Instance and progress the complaint in accordance with the UK NCP's complaint procedure.

- **In what form has the NCP provided its good offices?**

The UK NCP offered, and both parties accepted, conciliation/mediation (conducted by a professional mediator appointed by the UK NCP).

- **Did the parties reach agreement on the issues raised? If an agreement was reached, did the NCP issue a report on the results?**

Yes. The agreement is included in the published Final Statement.

- **Where the parties failed to reach agreement, did the NCP statement concluding the specific instance contained recommendations on the implementation of the Guidelines? Did the statement contained provisions on monitoring the implementation of the recommendations?**

N/A

- **What was the duration of the specific instance procedure? More specifically, what were the respective lengths of the three intermediate phases (1. initial assessment; 2. assistance to the parties and 3. conclusion of the procedures)?**

1. Initial Assessment completed on 10 April 2008; 2. Conciliation/mediation concluded on 29 September 2010; Final Statement concluded on 18 October 2010.

- **Would the NCP care to contribute additional information about this specific instance -- e.g. how was the information on the specific instance gathered? Was accessibility to reliable information or the protection of confidentiality an issue? Did all parties agree with the final statement issued by the NCP?**

No examination of the allegations was required because, thanks to the UK NCP's sponsored conciliation/mediation process, the parties reached a mutually satisfactory outcome. Final Statement published under <http://www.bis.gov.uk/assets/biscore/business-sectors/docs/f/10-1228-final-statement-ncp-iuf-unilever-doom-dooma.pdf> .

2) Corner House v. BAE Systems

- **Date request to consider specific instance was received:** 4 April 2005.
- **Who raised the specific instance (e.g. business, trade union, NGO)?**
Complaint raised by an NGO (Corner House).
- **Which chapters of the Guidelines are cited in the specific instance? If possible, please also cite the specific recommendation(s) covered by the request.** Chapter VI(2) “Combating Bribery”.
- **Has the specific instance involved business activities in a non-adhering country? Was the specific instance a multi-jurisdictional instance and involved other NCPs? Has the home NCP liaise with the parent company of the enterprise party to the specific instance? The alleged breach of the Guidelines occurred in the UK.**
- **Sector of activity: extractive industry (which industry?); agriculture; other primary sectors; manufacturing (which sub-sector?); financial services; retail distribution; transport; other services.** Manufacturing - aerospace.
- **Was the request to consider the specific instance accepted or rejected (if possible, describe grounds for not taking up a request)? Has the NCP issued a public statement on its decision that the issues raised merit further examination or not? Please elaborate on the content of the statement?** Accepted. No public statement accepting the complaint was issued at the time.
- **Were the issues raised in the specific instance also been addressed in parallel proceedings? If so, what was the nature of the latter proceedings? Were both parties involved in these proceedings? How the latter procedure affected the specific instance procedure? Did the NCP consult the institutions conducting the parallel proceedings?**

The UK Government ran a public consultation on some of the issues raised in the complaint. The results of the consultation led to a change in the relevant Government’s procedures mentioned in the complaint. The UK NCP took into account, in its Final Statement, the changes in the procedures.

- **In what form has the NCP provided its good offices?**

The UK NCP offered conciliation/mediation (conducted by a professional mediator appointed by the UK NCP), but the offer was declined.

- **Did the parties reach agreement on the issues raised? If an agreement was reached, did the NCP issue a report on the results?**

N/A

- **Where the parties failed to reach agreement, did the NCP statement concluding the specific instance contained recommendations on the implementation of the Guidelines? Did the statement contained provisions on monitoring the implementation of the recommendations?**

No.

- **What was the duration of the specific instance procedure? More specifically, what were the respective lengths of the three intermediate phases (1. initial assessment; 2. assistance to the parties and 3. conclusion of the procedures)?**

1. Complaint accepted for further consideration in May 2005; Final Statement concluded on 5 November 2010.

- **Would the NCP care to contribute additional information about this specific instance -- e.g. how was the information on the specific instance gathered? Was accessibility to reliable information or the protection of confidentiality an issue? Did all parties agree with the final statement issued by the NCP?**
The results of the examination and the process followed by the UK NCP are published under <http://www.bis.gov.uk/assets/biscore/business-sectors/docs/f/10-1265-final-statement-ncp-corner-house-bae-systems.pdf> .

3) Corner House v. Rolls-Royce Group

- **Date request to consider specific instance was received:** 4 April 2005.
- **Who raised the specific instance (e.g. business, trade union, NGO)?**
Complaint raised by an NGO (Corner House).
- **Which chapters of the Guidelines are cited in the specific instance? If possible, please also cite the specific recommendation(s) covered by the request.** Chapter VI(2) "Combating Bribery".
- **Has the specific instance involved business activities in a non-adhering country? Was the specific instance a multi-jurisdictional instance and involved other NCPs? Has the home NCP liaise with the parent company of the enterprise party to the specific instance?** The alleged breach of the Guidelines occurred in the UK.
- **Sector of activity: extractive industry (which industry?); agriculture; other primary sectors; manufacturing (which sub-sector?); financial services; retail distribution; transport; other services.** Manufacturing - aerospace.
- **Was the request to consider the specific instance accepted or rejected (if possible, describe grounds for not taking up a request)? Has the NCP issued a public statement on its decision that the issues raised merit further examination or not? Please elaborate on the content of the statement?** Accepted. No public statement accepting the complaint was issued at the time.
- **Were the issues raised in the specific instance also been addressed in parallel proceedings? If so, what was the nature of the latter proceedings? Were both parties involved in these proceedings? How the latter procedure affected the specific instance procedure? Did the NCP consult the institutions conducting the parallel proceedings?**

The UK Government ran a public consultation on some of the issues raised in the complaint. The results of the consultation led to a change in the relevant Government's procedures mentioned in the complaint. The UK NCP took into account, in its Final Statement, the changes in the procedures.

- **In what form has the NCP provided its good offices?**

The UK NCP offered conciliation/mediation (conducted by a professional mediator appointed by the UK NCP), but the offer was declined.

- **Did the parties reach agreement on the issues raised? If an agreement was reached, did the NCP issue a report on the results?**

N/A

- **Where the parties failed to reach agreement, did the NCP statement concluding the specific instance contained recommendations on the implementation of the Guidelines? Did the statement contained provisions on monitoring the implementation of the recommendations?**

No.

- **What was the duration of the specific instance procedure? More specifically, what were the respective lengths of the three intermediate phases (1. initial assessment; 2. assistance to the parties and 3. conclusion of the procedures)?**

1. Complaint accepted for further consideration in May 2005; Final Statement concluded on 5 November 2010.

- **Would the NCP care to contribute additional information about this specific instance -- e.g. how was the information on the specific instance gathered? Was accessibility to reliable information or the protection of confidentiality an issue? Did all parties agree with the final statement issued by the NCP?**
The results of the examination and the process followed by the UK NCP are published under <http://www.bis.gov.uk/assets/biscore/business-sectors/docs/f/10-1264-final-statement-ncp-corner-house-rolls-royce.pdf> .

4) Corner House v. Airbus

- **Date request to consider specific instance was received:** 4 April 2005.
- **Who raised the specific instance (e.g. business, trade union, NGO)?**
Complaint raised by an NGO (Corner House).
- **Which chapters of the Guidelines are cited in the specific instance? If possible, please also cite the specific recommendation(s) covered by the request.** Chapter VI(2) "Combating Bribery".
- **Has the specific instance involved business activities in a non-adhering country? Was the specific instance a multi-jurisdictional instance and involved other NCPs? Has the home NCP liaise with the parent company of**

the enterprise party to the specific instance? The alleged breach of the Guidelines occurred in the UK. As the parent company is located in France, the UK NCP kept the French NCP informed of the progress of the complaint.

- **Sector of activity: extractive industry (which industry?); agriculture; other primary sectors; manufacturing (which sub-sector?); financial services; retail distribution; transport; other services.** Manufacturing - aerospace.
- **Was the request to consider the specific instance accepted or rejected (if possible, describe grounds for not taking up a request)? Has the NCP issued a public statement on its decision that the issues raised merit further examination or not? Please elaborate on the content of the statement?** Accepted. No public statement accepting the complaint was issued at the time.
- **Were the issues raised in the specific instance also been addressed in parallel proceedings? If so, what was the nature of the latter proceedings? Were both parties involved in these proceedings? How the latter procedure affected the specific instance procedure? Did the NCP consult the institutions conducting the parallel proceedings?**

The UK Government ran a public consultation on some of the issues raised in the complaint. The results of the consultation led to a change in the relevant Government's procedures mentioned in the complaint. The UK NCP took into account, in its Final Statement, the changes in the procedures.

- **In what form has the NCP provided its good offices?**

The UK NCP offered conciliation/mediation (conducted by a professional mediator appointed by the UK NCP), but the offer was declined.

- **Did the parties reach agreement on the issues raised? If an agreement was reached, did the NCP issue a report on the results?**

N/A

- **Where the parties failed to reach agreement, did the NCP statement concluding the specific instance contained recommendations on the implementation of the Guidelines? Did the statement contained provisions on monitoring the implementation of the recommendations?**

No.

- **What was the duration of the specific instance procedure? More specifically, what were the respective lengths of the three intermediate phases (1. initial assessment; 2. assistance to the parties and 3. conclusion of the procedures)?**

1. Complaint accepted for further consideration in May 2005; Final Statement concluded on 5 November 2010.

- **Would the NCP care to contribute additional information about this specific instance -- e.g. how was the information on the specific instance gathered? Was accessibility to reliable information or the protection of confidentiality an issue? Did all parties agree with the final statement issued by the NCP?** The results of the examination and the process followed by the UK NCP are published under <http://www.bis.gov.uk/assets/biscore/business-sectors/docs/f/10-1263-final-statement-ncp-corner-house-airbus.pdf> .

5) International trades union v. UK registered multinational (operating in Bangladesh)

- **Date request to consider specific instance was received:** 6 December 2005.
- **Who raised the specific instance (e.g. business, trade union, NGO)?** Complaint raised by an international trade union.
- **Which chapters of the Guidelines are cited in the specific instance? If possible, please also cite the specific recommendation(s) covered by the request.** Chapters IV(1)(a) and IV(8) "Employment and Industrial Relations".
- **Has the specific instance involved business activities in a non-adhering country? Was the specific instance a multi-jurisdictional instance and involved other NCPs? Has the home NCP liaise with the parent company of the enterprise party to the specific instance?** The alleged breach of the Guidelines occurred in Bangladesh. The UK NCP liaised with the parent company in the UK.
- **Sector of activity: extractive industry (which industry?); agriculture; other primary sectors; manufacturing (which sub-sector?); financial services; retail distribution; transport; other services.** Manufacturing - textile.
- **Was the request to consider the specific instance accepted or rejected (if possible, describe grounds for not taking up a request)? Has the NCP issued a public statement on its decision that the issues raised merit further examination or not? Please elaborate on the content of the statement?** Rejected on the grounds that the allegations made in the complaint had not been supported by sufficient supporting evidence and therefore had not been substantiated. The Initial Assessment rejecting the complaint was published on the UK NCP's website (<http://www.bis.gov.uk/assets/biscore/business-sectors/docs/i/10-1301-initial-assessment-ncp-uk-multinational-bangladesh.pdf>).
- **Were the issues raised in the specific instance also been addressed in parallel proceedings? If so, what was the nature of the latter proceedings? Were both parties involved in these proceedings? How the latter procedure affected the specific instance procedure? Did the NCP consult the institutions conducting the parallel proceedings?**

Yes. In 2006, before completing the Initial Assessment, the UK NCP suspended the complaint on the grounds of ongoing legal proceedings in Bangladesh. On 16 September 2009, the Steering Board of the UK NCP endorsed a new parallel proceeding guidance which sets out how the UK NCP intends to approach current and future complaints in which there are parallel proceedings. On 6 November 2009, the UK NCP wrote to both parties offering them the opportunity

to comment on the application of the guidance to this complaint and/or request that the complaint remain suspended. On 18 December 2009, the company (B) requested that the complaint remain suspended in order to avoid causing serious prejudice to the parties involved in the ongoing legal proceedings in Bangladesh and especially to the company. On 16 March 2010, the UK NCP informed both parties of its decision to finalise the Initial Assessment on the complaint before considering B's request any further. The Initial Assessment, rejecting the complaint, was finalised on 24 November 2010.

- **In what form has the NCP provided its good offices?**

N/A

- **Did the parties reach agreement on the issues raised? If an agreement was reached, did the NCP issue a report on the results?**

N/A

- **Where the parties failed to reach agreement, did the NCP statement concluding the specific instance contained recommendations on the implementation of the Guidelines? Did the statement contained provisions on monitoring the implementation of the recommendations?**

N/A

- **What was the duration of the specific instance procedure? More specifically, what were the respective lengths of the three intermediate phases (1. initial assessment; 2. assistance to the parties and 3. conclusion of the procedures)?**

1. Initial Assessment (rejecting the complaint) concluded on 24 November 2010.

- **Would the NCP care to contribute additional information about this specific instance -- e.g. how was the information on the specific instance gathered? Was accessibility to reliable information or the protection of confidentiality an issue? Did all parties agree with the final statement issued by the NCP?**

The process followed by the UK NCP is published under

<http://www.bis.gov.uk/assets/biscore/business-sectors/docs/i/10-1301-initial-assessment-ncp-uk-multinational-bangladesh.pdf>

6) Corner House et al. v. BTC Corporation (Azerbaijan, Georgia, Turkey)

- **Date request to consider specific instance was received:** April 2003. The BTC Pipeline Specific Instance was one of the first complaints raised with the UK NCP in 2003 and resulted in a Final Statement in 2007. Following a procedural review by the UK NCP Steering Board this original Final Statement was withdrawn and a Revised Final Statement was published in March 2011. The complaint as a whole was not substantively reopened and the UK NCP reviewed the withdrawn Final Statement in line with the recommendations of the procedural review.

- **Who raised the specific instance (e.g. business, trade union, NGO)?**
Complaint raised by a group of NGOs (Friends of the Earth, Milieudefensie (Friends of the Earth Netherlands), The Corner House, Baku Ceyhan Campaign, Platform, Kurdish Human Rights Project).
- **Which chapters of the Guidelines are cited in the specific instance? If possible, please also cite the specific recommendation(s) covered by the request.** Chapter I(7) “Concepts and Principles”; II(5) “General Policies”; III(I) “Disclosure”; V(I), V(2)(a), V(2)(b), and V(4) “Environment”.
- **Has the specific instance involved business activities in a non-adhering country? Was the specific instance a multi-jurisdictional instance and involved other NCPs? Has the home NCP liaise with the parent company of the enterprise party to the specific instance?** The UK NCP liaised with the Turkish NCP and other relevant NCPs in accepting lead NCP status for the 2003 complaint. The UK NCP also informed the Turkish NCP and other relevant NCPs of progress in reviewing the withdrawn Final Statement in line with the recommendations of the procedural review.
- **Sector of activity: extractive industry (which industry?); agriculture; other primary sectors; manufacturing (which sub-sector?); financial services; retail distribution; transport; other services.** Extractive - oil.
- **Was the request to consider the specific instance accepted or rejected (if possible, describe grounds for not taking up a request)? Has the NCP issued a public statement on its decision that the issues raised merit further examination or not? Please elaborate on the content of the statement?** The UK NCP finalised a Revised Final Statement on this complaint on 22 February 2011 (<http://www.bis.gov.uk/assets/biscore/business-sectors/docs/r/11-766-revised-final-statement-ncp-btc.pdf>).
- **Were the issues raised in the specific instance also been addressed in parallel proceedings? If so, what was the nature of the latter proceedings? Were both parties involved in these proceedings? How the latter procedure affected the specific instance procedure? Did the NCP consult the institutions conducting the parallel proceedings?**

Reference to proceedings in the local court is included, where relevant, in the Revised Final Statement.

- **In what form has the NCP provided its good offices?**

Meeting with the parties and one field visit in 2005. The procedural review of the original Final Statement found that the UK NCP failed to provide an opportunity for the complainants to see and comment on a report by the company’s largest shareholder BP, and that this meant that the UK NCP had acted unfairly and should withdraw and review the original Final Statement. The BP report in question addressed compensation and grievance concerns identified in the 2005 field visit by the UK NCP and was an important part of the UK NCP’s decision-making in relation to certain parts of the complaint.

- **Did the parties reach agreement on the issues raised? If an agreement was reached, did the NCP issue a report on the results?**

The parties did not reach agreement on the complaint. In line with the recommendations of the procedural review, the UK NCP liaised with the parties to reach agreement that the complainants would be provided with an opportunity to see and comment on the BP report. This included successful mediation on the subject of a mutually acceptable partner in Turkey with whom the complainants could share the BP report.

- **Where the parties failed to reach agreement, did the NCP statement concluding the specific instance contained recommendations on the implementation of the Guidelines? Did the statement contained provisions on monitoring the implementation of the recommendations?**

Yes, the Revised Final Statement of 22 February 2011 includes one recommendation.

- **What was the duration of the specific instance procedure? More specifically, what were the respective lengths of the three intermediate phases (1. initial assessment; 2. assistance to the parties and 3. conclusion of the procedures)?**

Revised Final Statement concluded on 22 February 2011.

- **Would the NCP care to contribute additional information about this specific instance -- e.g. how was the information on the specific instance gathered? Was accessibility to reliable information or the protection of confidentiality an issue? Did all parties agree with the final statement issued by the NCP?** The UK NCP's handling of this complaint was reviewed by the UK NCP Steering Board. In light of the UK NCP Steering Board's recommendations, the UK NCP published a Revised Final Statement (<http://www.bis.gov.uk/assets/biscore/business-sectors/docs/r/11-766-revised-final-statement-ncp-btc.pdf>).

7) Malaysian Trades Union Congress v. British American Tobacco (Malaysia)

- **Date request to consider specific instance was received:** 11 December 2007.
- **Who raised the specific instance (e.g. business, trade union, NGO)?** Complaint raised by a trades union (Malaysian Trades Union Congress on behalf of the British American Tobacco Employees Union).
- **Which chapters of the Guidelines are cited in the specific instance? If possible, please also cite the specific recommendation(s) covered by the request.** Chapters IV(1)(a), IV(4)(a), IV(7) and IV(8) "Employment and Industrial Relations".
- **Has the specific instance involved business activities in a non-adhering country? Was the specific instance a multi-jurisdictional instance and involved other NCPs? Has the home NCP liaise with the parent company of the enterprise party to the specific instance?** The alleged breaches of the

Guidelines occurred in Malaysia (a non-adhering country). The UK NCP liaised with the parent company in the UK and directly with British American Tobacco Malaysia.

- **Sector of activity: extractive industry (which industry?); agriculture; other primary sectors; manufacturing (which sub-sector?); financial services; retail distribution; transport; other services.** Manufacturing - tobacco.
- **Was the request to consider the specific instance accepted or rejected (if possible, describe grounds for not taking up a request)? Has the NCP issued a public statement on its decision that the issues raised merit further examination or not? Please elaborate on the content of the statement?** Accepted. The Initial Assessment on this Specific Instance was published on the UK NCP's website (<http://www.bis.gov.uk/files/file47349.doc>).

- **Were the issues raised in the specific instance also been addressed in parallel proceedings? If so, what was the nature of the latter proceedings? Were both parties involved in these proceedings? How the latter procedure affected the specific instance procedure? Did the NCP consult the institutions conducting the parallel proceedings?**

Yes. On 21 April 2008, the UK NCP suspended the complaint process on grounds of ongoing legal proceedings in Malaysia. Between November 2009 and April 2010, the UK NCP reviewed this Specific Instance in the light of its parallel proceeding guidance (which was endorsed by the UK NCP's Steering Board on 16 September 2009). Having sought the views of both parties, the UK NCP informed both parties on 6 April 2010 that it would apply the guidance to this Specific Instance and progress the complaint in accordance with the UK NCP's complaint procedure.

- **In what form has the NCP provided its good offices?**

The UK NCP offered conciliation/mediation (conducted by a professional mediator appointed by the UK NCP), but the offer was declined.

- **Did the parties reach agreement on the issues raised? If an agreement was reached, did the NCP issue a report on the results?**

N/A

- **Where the parties failed to reach agreement, did the NCP statement concluding the specific instance contained recommendations on the implementation of the Guidelines? Did the statement contained provisions on monitoring the implementation of the recommendations?**

Yes, the Final Statement of 4 March 2011 includes one recommendation.

- **What was the duration of the specific instance procedure? More specifically, what were the respective lengths of the three intermediate phases (1. initial assessment; 2. assistance to the parties and 3. conclusion of the procedures)?**

1. Initial Assessment concluded on 9 April 2008; Final Statement concluded on 4 March 2011.

- **Would the NCP care to contribute additional information about this specific instance -- e.g. how was the information on the specific instance gathered? Was accessibility to reliable information or the protection of confidentiality an issue? Did all parties agree with the final statement issued by the NCP?**
The process followed by the UK NCP is published under <http://www.bis.gov.uk/assets/biscore/business-sectors/docs/f/11-774-final-statement-ncp-bat-malaysia.pdf>. In particular, the UK NCP took into account that the examination of some of the issues raised in the complaint would have led the UK NCP to override local law and regulation or place the company in a situation where it faced conflicting requirements; therefore those issues were not examined by the UK NCP.

Transferred Specific Instances

Since 1 July 2010, the UK NCP transferred 4 complaints to other NCPs: one complaint (host country: Turkey) to the Turkish NCP; one complaint (host country: Australia) to the Australian NCP; and two complaints (host country: Nigeria) to the Dutch NCP.

Specific instances considered by NCPs to date

Annex 4 presents a summary table intended to provide basic information about specific instances that have been accepted for consideration by NCPs up to June 2011. NCPs are asked to verify and update this table if necessary.

Annex 4 updated.

D. Other

- **How have the core criteria for the operation of NCPs (visibility, accessibility, transparency, and accountability) and, if the updated Guidelines are adopted, the additional guiding principles for specific instances (impartiality, predictability, equitability and compatibility with the Guidelines) been applied by your NCP to further the effectiveness of Guidelines implementation? Please provide examples that illustrate this.**

The UK NCP sits within the UK Government (namely, the Department for Business, Innovation and Skills (BIS), and the Department for International Development (DFID)) but its work is overseen by a Steering Board which includes four external members representing UK businesses, trades unions and NGOs. The UK NCP's published complaints procedures clearly set out the UK NCP's approach to Specific Instances under the Guidelines, including the timing to conclude complaints and the UK NCP's approach to situations where there are parallel proceedings.

- **Do you wish to provide any other information on the nature and results of NCP activities during this implementation cycle of the Guidelines, including on any useful experiences and/or difficulties encountered in carrying out the duties of the NCP?**

The UK NCP spent a considerable amount of time in resolving complaints submitted before the UK NCP's complaint procedure came into effect in April 2008. All these so-called "legacy cases" have now been concluded. The UK NCP would like to stress the importance of having a detailed published procedure to resolve complaints under the Guidelines.

- **If the NCP has surveys or statistics documenting companies' awareness of the Guidelines, do you wish to make this information available in your report?**

No statistics available.

- **What issues might deserve particular attention during the 2011-2012 implementation cycle of the OECD Guidelines? Please elaborate as appropriate.**

Raising awareness of the updated Guidelines (especially supply chain provisions) amongst businesses, trades unions and NGOs.

ANNEX 1 – Structure of the UK National Contact Point

	COMPOSITION OF THE NCP	GOVERNMENTAL LOCATION OF THE NCP	OTHER MINISTRIES AND/OR AGENCIES INVOLVED*	COMMENTS AND NOTES
United Kingdom	Two Departments	Department for Business, Innovation and Skills(BIS) and Department for International Development (DFID)	Department for Work and Pensions (DWP), Export Credits Guarantee Department (ECGD), Foreign and Commonwealth Office (FCO)	A Steering Board oversees work of the NCP. The Board includes four external members representing UK businesses, trades unions and NGOs. Other Government Departments and agencies with an interest in the OECD Guidelines are also represented. The Steering Board provides the UK NCP with strategic guidance, but does not become involved in individual cases, except to review any allegations of procedural failure. On a day to day level, the NCP liaises with other government departments as necessary and has regular informal contacts with business, trade union and NGO representatives.

ANNEX 2 – Contact details for the UK National Contact Point

Royaume-Uni - United Kingdom

UK National Contact Point
Department for Business, Innovation and Skills (BIS)
1-19 Victoria Street
London SW1H 0ET

Tel: (44) (0)20 7215 5756
Fax: (44) (0)20 7215 6767
Email: uk.ncp@bis.gsi.gov.uk
Web: www.bis.gov.uk/nationalcontactpoint

ANNEX 4 - Specific Instances considered by the UK National Contact Point to date

NCP concerned	Issue dealt with	Date of Notification	Host Country	Guidelines Chapter	Status	Final Statement	Comments
United Kingdom	Anglo American - issues arising from the privatisation of the copper industry in Zambia during the period 1995 -2000.	2002	Zambia	II. General Policies IV. Employment and Industrial Relations IX. Competition	Concluded	Yes	See Final Statement at http://www.bis.gov.uk/nationalcontactpoint/cases
United Kingdom	BTC Corporation – issues related to the construction of the Baku-Tbilisi-Ceyhan (BTC) pipeline.	2003	Azerbaijan, Georgia, Turkey	I. Concepts and Principles II. General Policies III. Disclosure V Environment	Concluded	Yes	See Revised Final Statement at http://www.bis.gov.uk/nationalcontactpoint/cases
United Kingdom	National Grid Transco – issues arising from the privatisation of the copper industry in Zambia	2003	Zambia	I. Concepts and Principles II. General Policies III. Disclosure IV. Employment and Industrial Relations V Environment VI. Combating Bribery VII. Consumer Interests IX. Competition X. Taxation	Concluded	Yes	See Final Statement at http://www.bis.gov.uk/nationalcontactpoint/cases

NCP concerned	Issue dealt with	Date of Notification	Host Country	Guidelines Chapter	Status	Final Statement	Comments
United Kingdom	Oryx Natural Resources – issues raised in the October 2003 report of the UN Panel of Experts on the Illegal Exploitation of Natural Resources and Other Forms of Wealth of the Democratic Republic of the Congo	2003	Democratic Republic of the Congo	This was not specified in the Panel Report	Concluded	Yes	See Final Statement at http://www.bis.gov.uk/nationalcontactpoint/cases
United Kingdom	De Beers – issues raised in the October 2003 report of the UN Panel of Experts on the Illegal Exploitation of Natural Resources and Other Forms of Wealth of the Democratic Republic of the Congo	2003	Democratic Republic of the Congo	This was not specified in the Panel Report	Concluded	Yes	See Final Statement at http://www.bis.gov.uk/nationalcontactpoint/cases
United Kingdom	Avient – issues raised in the October 2003 report of the UN Panel of Experts on the Illegal Exploitation of Natural Resources and Other Forms of Wealth of the Democratic Republic of the Congo	2003	Democratic Republic of the Congo	This was not specified in the Panel Report	Concluded	Yes	See Final Statement at http://www.bis.gov.uk/nationalcontactpoint/cases
United Kingdom	BAE Systems – issues related to disclosure of lists of agents.	2005	United Kingdom	VI. Combating Bribery.	Concluded	Yes	See Final Statement at http://www.bis.gov.uk/nationalcontactpoint/cases
United Kingdom	Airbus – issues related to disclosure of lists of agents.	2005	United Kingdom	VI. Combating Bribery.	Concluded	Yes	See Final Statement at http://www.bis.gov.uk/nationalcontactpoint/cases
United Kingdom	Rolls-Royce – issues related to disclosure of lists of agents.	2005	United Kingdom	VI. Combating Bribery.	Concluded	Yes	See Final Statement at http://www.bis.gov.uk/nationalcontactpoint/cases

NCP concerned	Issue dealt with	Date of Notification	Host Country	Guidelines Chapter	Status	Final Statement	Comments
United Kingdom	DAS Air - alleged failure to apply due diligence when transporting minerals and alleged breach of UN embargo.	2005	Democratic Republic of the Congo	I. Concepts and Principles II. General Policies	Concluded	Yes	See Final Statement at http://www.bis.gov.uk/nationalcontactpoint/cases
United Kingdom	UK registered multinational – issues related to trade union representation.	2005	Bangladesh	IV. Employment and Industrial Relations	Concluded	No (because the complaint was rejected at the Initial Assessment stage – the parties have therefore not been named)	See the Initial Assessment at http://www.bis.gov.uk/nationalcontactpoint/cases
United Kingdom	Peugeot - issues related to the closure of the Ryton manufacturing plant.	2006	United Kingdom	IV. Employment and Industrial Relations	Concluded	Yes	See Final Statement at http://www.bis.gov.uk/nationalcontactpoint/cases
United Kingdom	G4S - issues related to pay, dismissal, leave and health & safety entitlements.	2006	Mozambique, Malawi, Democratic Republic of the Congo, Nepal	II. General policies IV. Employment and Industrial Relations	Concluded	Yes	See Final Statement at http://www.bis.gov.uk/nationalcontactpoint/cases
United Kingdom	Unilever (Sewri factory) – Employment issues related to the transfer of ownership, and subsequent closure, of the Sewri factory.	2006	India	I. Concepts and principles IV. Employment and Industrial Relations	Concluded	Yes	See Final Statement at http://www.bis.gov.uk/nationalcontactpoint/cases

NCP concerned	Issue dealt with	Date of Notification	Host Country	Guidelines Chapter	Status	Final Statement	Comments
United Kingdom	Afrimex - alleged payments to armed groups and insufficient due diligence on the supply chain.	2007	Democratic Republic of the Congo	II. General policies IV Employment and Industrial Relations VI. Combating Bribery	Concluded	Yes	See Final Statement at http://www.bis.gov.uk/nationalcontactpoint/cases
United Kingdom	Unilever (Doom Dooma factory) - issues related to employees' right to representation.	2007	India	II. General Policies IV. Employment and Industrial Relations	Concluded	Yes	See Final Statement at http://www.bis.gov.uk/nationalcontactpoint/cases
United Kingdom	British American Tobacco – issues related to employees' right to representation.	2007	Malaysia	IV. Employment and Industrial Relations	Concluded	Yes	See Final Statement at http://www.bis.gov.uk/nationalcontactpoint/cases
United Kingdom	Vedanta Resources – impact of a planned bauxite mine on local community.	2008	India	II. General Policies V. Environment	Concluded	Yes	See Final Statement and Follow Up Statement at http://www.bis.gov.uk/nationalcontactpoint/cases
United Kingdom	Unilever (Rahim Yar Khan factory) – dismissal of temporary employees seeking permanent status in the factory.	2008	Pakistan	II. General Policies IV. Employment and Industrial Relations	Concluded	Yes	See Final Statement at http://www.bis.gov.uk/nationalcontactpoint/cases
United Kingdom	Unilever (Khanewal factory) – issues related to status of temporary employees.	2009	Pakistan	II. General Policies IV. Employment and Industrial Relations	Concluded	Yes	See Final Statement at http://www.bis.gov.uk/nationalcontactpoint/cases

NCP concerned	Issue dealt with	Date of Notification	Host Country	Guidelines Chapter	Status	Final Statement	Comments
United Kingdom	Compass Group – issues related to the establishment of a union branch.	2009	Algeria	IV. Employment and Industrial Relations	Ongoing	n.a.	Conciliation/mediation under way. See Initial Assessment at http://www.bis.gov.uk/nationalcontactpoint/cases
United Kingdom	BHP Billiton – issues related to environmental impact of aluminium smelter.	2010	Mozambique	II. General Policies III. Disclosure V. Environment	Suspended	n.a.	Conciliation/mediation (conducted by the Compliance Advisor Ombudsman of the World Bank) under way. See Initial Assessment at http://www.bis.gov.uk/nationalcontactpoint/cases
United Kingdom	Cargill Cotton Ltd – allegations of child and forced labour in harvesting cotton.	2010	Uzbekistan	II. General Policies IV. Employment and Industrial Relations	Ongoing	n.a.	Conciliation/mediation under way. See Initial Assessment at http://www.bis.gov.uk/nationalcontactpoint/cases
United Kingdom	ICT Cotton Ltd – allegations of child and forced labour in harvesting cotton.	2010	Uzbekistan	II. General Policies IV. Employment and Industrial Relations	Ongoing	n.a.	Conciliation/mediation under way. See Initial Assessment at http://www.bis.gov.uk/nationalcontactpoint/cases

© Crown copyright 2011

You may re-use this information (not including logos) free of charge in any format or medium, under the terms of the Open Government Licence. To view this licence, visit <http://www.nationalarchives.gov.uk/doc/open-government-licence/> or write to the Information Policy Team, The National Archives, Kew, London TW9 4DU, or e-mail: psi@nationalarchives.gsi.gov.uk. This publication is available on our website at www.bis.gov.uk/nationalcontactpoint. Any enquiries regarding this publication should be sent to:

UK National Contact Point for the OECD Guidelines for Multinational Enterprises
Department for Business, Innovation and Skills
3.1 Victoria Street
1 Victoria Street
London SW1H 0ET
Tel: 0044 (0)20 7215 5756

If you require this publication in an alternative format, email uk.ncp@bis.gsi.gov.uk, or call 0044 (0)20 7215 5756.

URN 11/P98