



Complaint – Hess Natur, Triaz and Gruene Erde – 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

Hess Natur, Triaz and Gruene Erde

2. Accused party

The complaint was filed against a factory in Turkey which is a supplier of the three FWF affiliates mentioned above.

3. Date of receipt complaint

The complaint was formally received by FWF through its local complaints handler in Turkey on April 10 2012.

4. Filing party

A former worker of the factory contacted FWF's complaints handler by phone.

5. The case

Plaintiff indicated he had worked in the past 5 years, each year around five months in the factory. Large part of this period he was not registered in the social security mechanism.

6. Admissibility

The complaint is related to a factory which is a supplier of FWF affiliates and relates to the FWF Code of Labour practices, namely: Legally binding employment relationship.



7. Investigation

An FWF audit supervisor held interviews with both the plaintiff and the management of the factory and did a document inspection on the production location. A report was shared with the involved parties.

8. Findings and conclusions

The plaintiff has worked in the facility as a temporary worker time to time, but no social security insurance provided except for a 45 days period.

All employees (temporary or permanent) shall be registered to Social Security Institute one day before starting to work (As per Social Security Law no:506 and 5510. The investigation could prove that the plaintiff worked in January, February, June, July and August 2011 almost fully. There was no payment record for 2010 and there were a couple of records for 2009.

9. Corrective action

Factory management was required to register the plaintiff at Social Security Institute for the period and amounts that documented proof has been found that plaintiff indeed worked at that factory without social security. The amounts are mentioned in the investigation report.

10. Evaluation by the plaintiff

Implementation of the corrective action was monitored by plaintiff and local complaints handler through the records of Social Security Institution. Plaintiff's records showed that the factory made the plaintiff registered to Social Security Institute for the documented period but for lesser amount than plaintiff's actual earnings during that period.

11. Verification

The local complaints handler communicated the issue with factory management that the corrective action includes plaintiff to be registered to Social Security Institution not only for the duration he worked there, but also for the amounts plaintiff earned during that period. The factory registered the plaintiff to Social Security Institution for an additional duration of three more months. That additional registration for three months also monitored by plaintiff and local complaints handler via records of Social Security Institution. At the end of this additional period, plaintiff started to work for another textile factory with a legally binding employment contract. With this the complaint is closed.