



## **Complaint – Takko – Myanmar**

### **Status: Resolved**

*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. Member company involved**

Takko

### **2. Accused party**

An active supplier of Takko in Myanmar.

### **3. Date of receiving complaint**

29 May 2017

### **4. Filing party**

A worker that is currently employed by the factory.

### **5. The complaint**

The complainant claimed that his section (Ironing) department was asked to do overtime on that day until 8:30pm, and OT was not voluntary.

### **6. Admissibility**

FWF decided that the case is admissible on 29 May 2017

The factory is an active supplier of Takko, a member of FWF.



The case is relevant to the following labour standards of FWF's Code of Labour Practices:

- Reasonable Hours of Work
- Employment is freely chosen

## **7. Investigation**

FWF informed the case to the factory management shortly after the call to get their response.

FWF also asked the complainant if he told his supervisor and he said that the supervisor asked them to do OT. Since the supplier has a WCC, FWF also checked with the plaintiff if he raised it to WCC members from workers' side. However, he said that he did not trust the WCC members because they all are supervisors.

## **8. Findings and conclusions**

It was found out that there was an OT assignment for the ironing section. FWF concluded that the worker should not feel forced to work for overtime by his supervisor.

## **9. Remediation**

FWF suggested to the factory management to inform his supervisor from the ironing section to let the workers know that it is not obligatory to do overtime.

## **10. Verification**

FWF called the plaintiff on the same day and checked if his supervisor came and told the workers to leave if they wanted to. The worker confirmed that the supervisor came twice and said to each of them that overtime was voluntary and that they could go home if they wanted to.

## **11. Evaluation by the complainant**

The complainant indicated his satisfaction that the factory management conveyed that overtime is voluntary and workers are free to leave if they did not want to conduct overtime.

Nonetheless, the worker decided to continue to perform the OT because everyone else from his section agreed to continue working, and if he refused, it would be immediately found out that he was the complainant. He wanted to stay



anonymous. He said that he would inform FWF if there would be the similar case in the future.