



Complaint – Hessnatur – Turkey

FWF is responsible for setting up a complaints procedure in production countries where FWF is active. The complaints procedure allows third parties to make complaints about the working conditions or the way the Code of Labour Practices is implemented in factories which supply FWF members.

The responsibility of FWF includes investigating the complaint, verifying whether the agreed corrective action plan is implemented and public reporting. This complaint report gives an overview of a complaint filed to FWF, the investigation and agreed corrective action plan as well as how the outcome is verified. For more information on the complaints procedure see the FWF website. FWF also publishes an overview of complaints received in its annual reports.

1. Affiliate involved

Hessnatur

2. Accused party

The accused party is a factory in Turkey supplying the affiliate.

3. Date of receipt complaint

Complaint received on June 2, 2013 through FWF local hotline.

4. Filing party

A worker employed in the accused factory.

5. The case

The plaintiff claimed that the line supervisor limits the access of workers to the in-house doctor at the factory. It was also mentioned that the management could hinder workers from seeing a doctor outside the factory by not allowing them to use some time off, unless it was recommended by the factory in-house doctor.

6. Admissibility

The issue is related to a supplier of an FWF affiliate, and is related to the following labour standards:

Safe and healthy working conditions



7. Investigation

The FWF local complaints handler visited the factory for the investigation of the complaint.

8. Findings and conclusions

The investigation showed that the in-house factory doctor works in compliance with the total time determined by the law and is seeing workers frequently, also from the department of plaintiff. Nevertheless, it was also confirmed by other workers and the in-house doctor that some supervisors, and specifically the same supervisor accused by the plaintiff, are reluctant in giving workers off to see either the in-house doctor or outside medical services.

In the system as it is now, supervisors are in the position to allow or deny workers time off, and it is not registered which requests were denied. Like that decisions taken by supervisors cannot be checked and monitored by management.

9. Corrective action

Actions required are communicating to all supervisors clearly that there shall be no limitation in access of workers to in-house factory doctor and outside medical services, and establishing a management system that allows registration of all requests of workers for time off, so that the implementation can be monitored.

10. Evaluation by the plaintiff

11. Verification