



## 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 complaint has been filed against a factory in Turkey which is a supplier of the FWF affiliate hessnatur.

### 3. Date of receipt complaint

17 March 2010

### 4. Filing party

A worker who had been dismissed from the factory contacted the off-site worker interviewer after FWF conducted an audit at the factory.

### 5. The case

The complaint concerned two FWF labour standards Legally binding employment relationship and Freedom of association and the right to collective bargaining.

According to the plaintiff, he had been dismissed for being a member of a trade union and speaking to a newspaper about the conditions in the factory. Other workers have been intimidated by management not to join a trade union.

### 6. Admissibility

On 18 March 2010 FWF decided that the complaint is admissible as it relates to the Code of Labour Practices and the accused party has an active business relationship with an affiliate member of FWF.



## 7. Investigation

A FWF factory audit had been carried out recently in the factory and information from this was used in the investigation. Apart from the audit report, FWF also undertook further investigations by interviewing the plaintiff and the management of the factory.

## 8. Findings and conclusions

The factory audit carried out shortly before receiving the complaint confirmed issues raised by the plaintiffs regarding fear of organising in the factory. Interviews with the plaintiff and the management confirmed that the plaintiff had been unjustly dismissed.

## 9. Corrective action

Two possible ways to solve the issue with the dismissed worker were proposed. One was to pay the legal compensation to him, the other was to reinstate him and sign an agreement that there would be no further harassments.

Furthermore, it was recommended to do a training on communication and freedom of association in the factory in order to make progress on the issue of freedom of association.

## 10. Verification

FWF monitored the development through direct contact with the plaintiff and the factory management after the investigation was completed.

The factory did not respond to the demands of hessnatur that were communicated repeatedly to the management over a period of several months. This led hessnatur to halt orders to the supplier. After this decision was communicated to the factory, the factory finally reinstated the dismissed worker in accordance with recommendations from the FWF.

hessnatur decided not to restart cooperation with the factory after the worker had been reinstated. The reasons given for this was that the factory had severe problems in other areas, including quality and delivery reliability. hessnatur has informed FWF that they have repeatedly communicated these problems to the factory and clearly stated the improvements that needs to be done without any response from the factory.

Since hessnatur does not have an active business relation with the factory anymore, the recommendation to undertake a training on communication and freedom of association in the factory has not been followed up.