

International OECD WATCH Training and Strategy Seminar on the OECD Guidelines for Multinationals

**Organised by Germanwatch, IRENE and SOMO
Thursday 14 – Friday 15 October 2004**

Venue: Dietrich-Bonhoeffer-Haus

The aim of this training and strategy seminar was to support and build capacity on the use of the OECD Guidelines amongst NGOs in the EU member states, including the new EU members and the applicant countries. It followed a seminar held in March 2003 organised by IRENE, FOE and SOMO which resulted in the setting up of an NGO network - OECD Watch www.oecdwatch.org. The network currently has 37 members from 24 countries and groups together NGOs from Europe, the Americas, Australia, Africa and Asia who share a common vision about the need for corporate accountability and sustainable investment. OECD Watch aims to help facilitate NGO activities around the OECD Guidelines and the work of the OECD Committee on International Investment and Multinational Enterprises (CIME) – now known as the Investment Committee.

The seminar brought together more than 40 participants from 20 countries and provided an opportunity for information sharing, updates on complaints raised with National Contact Points (NCPs) and discussion of key issues and problems. The seminar also focussed on non-adhering countries and on other binding and non-binding instruments.

Seminar organisers Cornelia Heydenreich (Germanwatch) and Peter Pennartz (IRENE) welcomed participants. The programme was outlined :

Day 1 to concentrate on information, including a basic introduction to the issues, and training, including a number of case studies of complaints and lessons learned

Day 2 to look at how the OECD Guidelines work with other instruments including the UN Norms for Business, national and international law, and strategy-building, including how OECD Watch can help NGOs make complaints to NCPs.

In addition, there was a report on new funds secured by IRENE from the Dutch Ministry of Foreign Affairs for capacity building amongst NGOs in Asia, Africa and Latin America on the OECD Guidelines.

SESSION 1: INFORMATION

Basic introduction to CSR and the OECD Guidelines for Multinational Enterprises

Joris Oldenziel from SOMO, an NGO that looks at the regulatory frameworks that govern the corporate sector, gave a brief introduction to corporate social responsibility (CSR) explaining that it is based on the premise that companies are responsible for the effects of their core activities. CSR may involve voluntary practices going "beyond" the law, but it should have as its starting point, respect and support for European law and International Agreements and for all other standard-setting instruments.

He went on to summarise key points in the OECD Guidelines (Box 1); NCP procedures and outcomes to date (Box 2); how to use the complaint mechanism (Box 3); and key concerns raised by complaints already submitted (Box 4)

Box 1 The OECD Guidelines for Multinational Enterprises

are non-binding recommendations addressed by governments to multinational enterprises (MNEs) operating in or from adhering countries. The Guidelines are supported by the 30 OECD participating countries Australia, Austria, Belgium, Canada, the Czech Republic, Denmark, Finland, France, Germany, Greece, Hungary, Iceland, Ireland, Italy, Japan, Luxembourg, Mexico, the Netherlands, New Zealand, Norway, Poland, Portugal, the Slovak Republic, South Korea, Spain, Sweden, Switzerland, Turkey, the United Kingdom and the United States), and eight non-Member countries (Argentina, Brazil, Chile, Estonia, Israel, Latvia, Lithuania and Slovenia). The Guidelines provide voluntary principles and standards for responsible business conduct in areas such as:

information disclosure; employment and industrial relations; environment; combating bribery; consumer interests; science and technology; competition; and taxation

Core issues include:

respect for labour standards; contribution to sustainable development; respect for human rights; environment (precautionary principle); bribery and corruption; and whistleblower protection

Box 2 NCP procedure and outcomes

- complaints can be raised at the NCP of the country where the violation took place
- if there is no NCP in that country, then the NCP where the company has their headquarters can be used (locate as many NCPs as possible for maximum pressure)
- after initial assessment, NCPs will bring parties together and mediate although the timescale and what happens is very vague
- when no agreement is reached, the NCP will issue a public statement. This can be a joint statement with the NGO. If the NGO disagrees with the outcome they can issue a separate statement.

Box 3 How to use the Guidelines:

- collect evidence, document evidence
- analyse which elements of the Guidelines have been violated
- analyse the company structure as there is a need to know where responsibilities lie (eg Talisman (Canadian company) has committed violations in Sudan, but it was a subsidiary Dutch company responsible for the violations)
- define expectations, consider strategy - is it useful? consider counter arguments
- consider international coalition

Box 4 Key concerns raised by cases already submitted:

- **supply chain responsibility:** NCPs are rejecting complaints saying that they are based on trade, not investment issues. OECD decided in 2003 that only complaints with an “investment nexus” would be accepted under the Guidelines¹
- **confidentiality:** this is an issue when NGOs want to publicise that they have filed a complaint
- **investigative powers and resources of NCPs:** NGOs have reported that they feel NCPs do not fully investigate complaints before reaching their conclusion
- **added value and usefulness of complaints procedures and outcomes:** complaints need selecting carefully to make them a useful test for the Guidelines

¹ In classical economic theory an investor means an owner. In the context of the Guidelines, investment is defined in terms of influence. The commentary of the Guidelines states that “in the case of no direct influence, companies still have the responsibility to encourage their business partners to comply with the Guidelines” (II.10) So in principle, NCPs have room for a broad interpretation of the investment nexus.

Questions and discussion focused on four key areas and the following points were made:

- **What is the role of OECD Watch and it's relationship with NCPs?**
 - members participate in quarterly Investment Committee (formerly CIME) meetings and provide input from the NGO position
 - OECD Watch conducts a yearly review of the effectiveness of the Guidelines and NCPs. This review was presented at the annual NCP meeting in 2004 and was welcomed.
- **Why raise a complaint at an NCP and what should be included?**
 - it gathers evidence about how governments and companies are acting and will help to build the case for binding legislation
 - good information (including information sharing with other NGOs) and strategic analysis are important to build a successful case
 - need to monitor that successful complaints are actually changing company behaviour
- **What is the structure / staffing of NCPs?**
 - the positioning of NCPs in different government ministries has led to different priorities and approaches
 - NCP structures differ from country to country: only 8 out of 38 work on a traditional ILO-out tri-partite structure; two are quadro-partite; the majority is a single department. Examples were given from:
 - The Netherlands** – mixture of government departments plus consultation with business and NGOs
 - Finland** – government department, business, banks and Chambers of Commerce
 - Chile** – part of Foreign Affairs Department with Advisory Group made up of companies, NGOs and trade unions
- **What is the role of NGOs at NCPs?**
 - NGO presence and oversight is important to keep NCPs transparent. This can include structural cooperation – information exchange, regular meetings – rather than participation in decisions on complaints. NCPs should be independent mediators.

SESSION 2: GOING INTO TRAINING

Introduction

Tricia Feeney, Rights and Accountability in Development (RAID), UK

Tricia Feeney gave more details about the complaints procedure, noting that it is the only existing mechanism like this and of the need to exploit and test it. She gave details of NGOs' experience of filing complaints and also noted the recent weakening of statements issued by NCPs when cases are concluded.

*To date: NGOs have presented 32 cases – 17 are still open
Trade unions have presented about 40 cases (mostly concentrated in Asia, and, Central & Eastern Europe). About twenty cases are no longer before NCPs.*

She made the following key points:

Who can make a complaint? This is not defined and there are no limitations. For example, NGOs in Zambia have filed a complaint with the UK NCP and it has been accepted. But this open-endedness has both positive and negative sides to it.

What should be included in the complaint? The Guidelines are full of loop-holes and caveats. There is a need to build more mandatory-sounding language into complaints and to define very precisely which Guidelines have been breached in order to strengthen them. The Zambian experience has highlighted this as the UK NCP has reacted to the complaint with a whole barrage of questions.

Evidence – how much work? She advises avoiding substantial detail and focusing on one or two key violations unless it's part of a much wider campaign.

Where to go. The Guidelines say approach the NCP of the country where the breach has occurred. She advises developing and non-adhering countries to make the complaint to the NCP of where the company has its headquarters **and** to the Embassy of the NCP country to let them know about it and to raise awareness.

Process and outcomes. She advises reading other case studies – there is wide variation in how different NCPs deal with complaints.

Once the case is concluded, the Guidelines say that a public statement is only necessary when there is disagreement. She notes that over the last 2 years NCPs have been reluctant to find companies in breach of the Guidelines and only positive statements have been issued.

She supports alternative, genuine appraisal by NGOs and the issuing of their own statements on the outcomes of complaints, stressing that complaints are aimed at encouraging companies to behave better in the future, they are not about their past activities.

*****Summary points*****

- **develop centres of information to provide the technical and commercial information required to develop good cases**
- **avoid substantial detail and focus on one or two key violations unless it's part of a much wider campaign**
- **build more mandatory-sounding language into complaints and precisely define which Guidelines have been breached**
- **developing and non-adhering countries should also present the written complaint to the Embassy of the NCP country to let them know about it and to raise awareness**
- **read other case studies**
- **alternative, genuine appraisal by NGOs and the issuing of their own statements on the outcomes of complaints are important when no agreement is reached**
- **work with friendly NCPs to increase influence and promote change at governmental level**

SESSION 3: SHOWCASES (full details are available in the Reader Part III)

Four showcase presentation were made by NGOs who had submitted complaints to different NCPs. NGOs explained the reasons for using the OECD Guidelines, how the complaints were prepared, and the contact with both the NCP and the companies involved. The presentations also included information on the barriers and opportunities presented by their cases, the other steps or instruments they had also used, and a summary of the results and lessons learned.

1. TOTAL-case from Greenpeace: environmental pollution and posing danger to human health in Russia

Karsten Smid, Energy-Unit Greenpeace, Germany

Complaint and outcome: TOTAL/FinaElf is the main importer of Russian crude oil to Germany and the pipeline is causing environmental pollution and posing danger to human health through numerous leaks and spillages in the Komi region, Western Siberia.

Greenpeace Germany had brought a criminal court case against TOTAL in March 2002 and then made a complaint under the Guidelines to the German NCP in April of the same year. In a long process, and despite Greenpeace detailing the arguments for Guidelines applicability, the German NCP did not accept the case due to the lack of an investment nexus.

Opportunities and benefits of bringing the complaint: the oil industry has had to think about the Guidelines

Lessons: the German NCP is not neutral and it did not “play fair” (letter from Greenpeace was sent directly to TOTAL, but they were never informed of the reply); the German NCP is strongly influenced by the oil industry (clear advice from the BDI (Umbrella Organisation of German Industry) not to talk further about the TOTAL case). The interpretation of the investment nexus was felt to be biased.

Outlook: Greenpeace need more experience with the Guidelines; this is not the end of the case as more and more companies are going into this region.

Points raised in discussion:

Greenpeace decided to bring both a criminal court case and a complaint using the Guidelines because it sees the Guidelines as the next strongest instrument.

Although the NCP issued a statement in 2004 concluding the case, they never actually accepted it or gave any evidence as to why it was not a case. Greenpeace does not accept that the case is now closed and continues this work.

2. Sandvik & Atlas Copco case from Attac Sweden: human rights violations and environmental pollution in Ghana

Bernard Huber, Attac, Sweden and Hannah Owusu-Koranteng, WACAM (Wassa communities affected by mining, Ghana

Complaint and outcome: Sandvik is a Swedish company producing drills and provides services to the Ashanti Goldfields Company (AGC) in Ghana. Reports from the area (from WACAM, FIAN and others) show that AGC, in pursuing more land for mining and production of gold, has repeatedly violated human rights and environmental conventions including forced eviction of local village people, destroyed villages, persecution, killings, cyanide discharges in rivers and on soil destroying water and farming.

Attac filed the complaint with FOE Sweden in February 2003 at the Swedish NCP. Five meetings took place between February and June of that year and the complaints was closed in June 2003 without proper dialogue taking place. The NCP issued a statement where it held that Sandvik had not failed to comply with the OECD Guidelines in respect of human rights and environmental considerations. The NCP recognised that environmental and social problems exist in connection with mining in Ghana, but that the role played by the company in these problems was limited.

Opportunities and benefits of bringing the complaint: learned more about OECD Guidelines, tested the Swedish NCP, and raised media attention about CSR

Lessons: OECD Guidelines need to be used with other strategies to bring public attention – media attention had already been raised by a popular Swedish TV documentary

Points raised in discussion:

It was queried how the NCP could acknowledge the social and environmental problems that exist in connection with mining and not implicate the company’s activities.

The NCP statement said that the companies’ on-site personnel did not have sufficient knowledge of their responsibilities under the Guidelines and encouraged Sandvik to enhance knowledge of the Guidelines, both internally and externally. It was also held that established processes in the form of a regulatory framework and judicial institutions exist to tackle these problems. However, these processes and institutions wrestle with the difficulties normally associated with developing countries such as insufficient resources and capacity.

3. Continental AG case from Germanwatch, Germany: workers’ rights violations in Mexico

Cornelia Heydenreich, Germanwatch, Germany

Complaint and outcome: The closure of subsidiary company, Euzkadi, in El Salto, Mexico, without proper prior notice to employees and trade unions which was not in accordance with Mexican law. The case was brought 2 ½ years ago but has still not reached a conclusion. There has been confusion over which NCP is responsible. The German NCP claimed that the Mexican NCP would be responsible with “official help” provided on request by them.

Opportunities and benefits of bringing the complaint: Although parallel legal procedures have found in favour of the workers, the company keeps appealing. The Guidelines have been used as part of the mediation process.

Lessons:

NGOs can handle trade union cases

Transferring cases takes time: simultaneously filing cases at 2 NCPs means at least they have to work together.

Confidentiality: NCPs react badly to media releases. Germanwatch think communications during the process of the Guidelines should be confidential, but the NGO has a right to release information from their point of view when they file a complaint. This puts NCPs and companies under pressure to keep moving.

Outlook: There is now the possibility that the company will be bought by a Mexican investor. Germanwatch want to wait until the future of company is decided and the case is still open with the Mexican NCP.

Points raised in discussion: Danish NGOs have written to the Danish ombudsman for clarification about confidentiality and were told to write to CIME. They wrote 6 months ago and have had no reply to date.

4. Chemie Pharmacie Holland (CPH) case from NiZA, The Netherlands and Novib, The Netherlands: human rights violations, environmental pollution and illegal exploitation of natural resources of the DRC

Jolien Schure NiZA and Sander van Bennekom, Novib, The Netherlands

Complaint and outcome: From October 1999 until March 2002, CPH was part of the American-Dutch commercial agreement EWRI (Eagle Wings Resources International) and regularly imported coltan from Eastern DRC. The mining activity resulted in environmental damage and countless human rights violations, including killings during fighting over mining areas, villages being burned down and prisoners and street children being transported by the Rwandese army from Rwanda to DRC to work in the mines. The complainants also consider it possible that the revenue generated from CPH business have directly supported war efforts of the RCD-Goma rebels and the Rwandan army. Another issue that needs clarification is whether tax payments made by EWRI to the RCD-Goma over its coltan exports are in accordance with the Guidelines.

The complaint was made to the Dutch NCP in July 2003. In May 2004 the Dutch NCP said that the Guidelines were not applicable in this case due to lack of an investment nexus, concluding that there is no investment like relationship between CPH and EWRI or EWRI’s suppliers. Nevertheless it issued a declaration of lessons learned on the basis of the common values for responsible business conduct that are reflected in the Guidelines. The parties could not agree on a joint statement.

Opportunities and benefits of bringing the complaint: the Ministry for the Environment got involved and the issue of taxation was raised which opens a new area for lobbying. The involvement of more ministries and departments helps build a stronger case.

Lessons: The NGOs were told that 3 years is the minimum term for bringing cases based on supply chain issues. This needs clarification as other complainants have been told differently.

Outlook: the implications of the Dutch decision could be far reaching and may endanger the relevance of the Guidelines for international businesses, especially for supply chain issues.

Summary Points

➤ **Opportunities and benefits of bringing the complaints:**

raised awareness of the Guidelines with NGOs and multinational companies; tested NCPs; raised media attention about CSR; used in parallel with legal proceedings the Guidelines were part of the mediation process; involving more government ministries and departments in the case opened new areas for lobbying

➤ **Lessons:**

NCPs may not be neutral and may not share information with NGOs; NGOs can handle trade union cases; transferring cases takes time: simultaneously filing cases at 2 NCPs means at least they have to work together; confidentiality needs clarification - NCPs react badly to media releases; the minimum term for bringing cases based on supply chain issues needs clarification

SESSION 4: USING THE GUIDELINES: POTENTIAL CASES

Working groups were asked to look at a specific case and decide if it should be filed as a complaint, considering which parts of the Guidelines were applicable, likely problems, and the outcome that might be expected.

SESSION 5: GENERAL ASSESSMENT OF THE RELATIONS BETWEEN THE OECD GUIDELINES FOR MNEs AND CORPORATE ACCOUNTABILITY

Four panel members gave presentations which looked at how the OECD Guidelines work with other OECD instruments, the UN Norms for Business, export credit agencies and national and international law. They considered what can be done to make the OECD Guidelines stronger and how the experience of bringing complaints can be used with other instruments.

Other OECD instruments

Shirley van Buiren, Transparency International, Germany

Most NGOs believe that legally binding instruments are the best way to secure corporate accountability. In 1997 the OECD Convention on Combating Bribery of Foreign Public Officials was signed by 35 countries and then ratified within 2 years. However, this OECD convention has made no discernable difference; there has not been a single conviction worldwide which undermines the case for legally binding regulations. Laws without effective law enforcement may very well be weaker than consensually developed standards with an effective monitoring system in place.

The OECD Guidelines are one of a number of standards and although they are voluntary, they differ from others as they incorporate unique innovations:

- **developed in a consensual process** – this broader acceptance can be expected to lead to higher degree of compliance
- **governments have agreed to promote adherence** -elevates Guidelines to level of “government acceptance” which could lead to a position where non-compliance is not an option.
- **require adhering countries to set up NCPs as implementation and monitoring mechanism** - which make MNEs more accountable and the Guidelines more effective

The major potential strength of the NCPs is their institutional and operational flexibility; their major weakness is that in practice, by and large, they have been left to monitor themselves.

- **flexibility in the institutional arrangements and in dealing with formal complaints** – has led to very unequal results from complaints brought to different

NCPs. Some do investigate and pro-actively promote compliance of the Guidelines but others don't. The CIME annual report for 2004 highlights "some significant and unexplained differences in practice" of NCPs².

- **monitoring system created in and for the Guidelines is a major innovation** – but the absence of elements of independent objective review and evaluation is a basic flaw.

She proposes an **improved monitoring system** to strengthen the effectiveness of the Guidelines and to reduce the inconsistencies and other systemic weakness of the NCPs' current implementation practice.

The Peer Review is a well-established, tried and proven OECD monitoring tool used to monitor the members' adherence to OECD recommendations in whole policy areas. This is a periodic critical, independent review conducted by a team of examiners. The review starts with written statements from the country under review, followed by in-country visits from the reviewers, submission of their report (with findings, conclusions and recommendations) for discussion by the entire Committee and subsequent publication. She concludes this is a highly regarded and effective report and would address all the current problems with the Guidelines if repeated periodically (say at first every two and later every 3 years).

UN Norms for Business

Brigitte Hamm, FIAN, Germany

Brigitte Hamm looked at why the UN Norms for Business are an important additional instrument and addressed some of the deficiencies in the OECD Guidelines.

The UN Norms for Business were developed by an expert group of a sub-organ of the Human Rights Commission and they cover international human rights, environmental and consumer law. The Norms are based on the premise that states have the major responsibility to respect human rights law but MNEs and other businesses have other responsibilities to promote and fulfil human rights law (as in the OECD Guidelines)

The Norms differ from other instruments as they are applicable to all countries. They are subject to monitoring and verification by the UN and the commentary to each chapter is a contrast to the OECD Guidelines as these talk about concrete sanctions if the Norms are violated. In August 2003, the UN Sub-Commission approved the Norms and handed responsibility to the UN Commission to compile a report on the value added by them. They are currently inviting comments from interested parties, which includes NGOs and trade unions.

The Norms would be a strong instrument but they need strong lobby work from NGOs to make them work. She concludes that the OECD Guidelines are the strongest international instrument currently available.

Questions and discussion raised the following:

- **Why has the Bribery Convention not led to any convictions?**
 - companies have been reluctant to bring cases
 - need to create political will to get more investigative lawyers trained to do this work
- **Have NGOs already been involved in UN and/or OECD Peer Reviews?**
 - There are no rules - NGOs have been involved
- **If UN Norms become law are cases heard at national or international courts?**

² Annual Report on the OECD Guidelines for MNE: 2004 Edition, pp. 3 and 16

- many of the laws referred to are already national laws, the problem is that the legislation is just not implemented. Need to strengthen national responsibility.
- some cases could go to the international courts
- **Do the UN Norms hold more potential than the OECD Guidelines – do they have more teeth?**
- if the political will exists, UN Norms would have more teeth (they are applied to all businesses (not just in the OECD), there is a monitoring mechanism, and there are sanctions and reparations).
- attention has been focused on the Guidelines because of the number of complaints that NGOs have filed at NCPs in recent years

Export Credit Agencies

Jan Capelle, Proyecto Gato, Belgium

Export Credit Agencies, ECAs, are public agencies that provide government-backed loans, guarantees and insurance to corporations from their home country when they seek to do business in developing countries and emerging markets. Most industrialized nations have at least one ECA.

ECAs are the world's biggest public institutions providing finance for private sector projects in the developing world. Most ECAs only recently adopted environmental policies that benchmark against those of the World Bank Group or regional development banks. These policies resulted from an agreed set of recommendations, dubbed the "Common Approaches," which was brokered in December, 2003 at the Export Credit Working Group of the OECD. But these are considered weak environmental policies; for example, although ECAs are now required to make the environmental impact assessments for large infra-structure projects public 30 days before approval by the board, most ECAs only allow ex-ante transparency with company approval. The Common Approaches does not adopt explicit human rights criteria and benchmark the environmental impact on a variety of standards and policies, for example by the World Bank group or the weak regional development banks.

This is relevant to the OECD Guidelines because some countries -The Netherlands and Belgium- think that ECAs should respect them. The Belgian case makes clear that the ECAs see this as a publicity stunt because they argue that the language of the Guidelines are too weak and, in addition, that it's not their task, but those of the NCPs, to investigate violations of the Guidelines. An additional conflict of interest is noted in Belgium as some ECA members also sit on the NCP. In the UK case, NGOs call into question the position of the NCP, since the NCP and the UK ECA (ECGD) are both within the Department for Trade and Industry. In Belgium, we decided to test how the Belgian ECA related to the OECD Guidelines by filing cases before the NCP.

National and international law

William Bourdon, lawyer, Association Sherpa, France

Sherpa aims to mobilise skills and know-how to instigate civil or criminal proceedings against companies committing violations in Southern countries.

In October 2003, Sherpa worked with FOE on a complaint to the French NCP on human rights violations by TOTAL/FinaElf in Burma. This was not a constructive dialogue – there are difficulties about the relationship between states and companies, in this case, between the French government and TOTAL/FinaElf.

He sees the soft law (OECD Guidelines) as a way of changing the minds of the managers and creating a new definition of the role of the companies. In the long term, and with a huge flight of the imagination, a combination of the UN Norms and the OECD Guidelines may result in new customary law.

Questions and discussion raised the following:

- Although Jan Cappelle makes clear not having a mandate to speak out for ECA-Watch, Jan thinks that ECA-Watch opposes ECAs respecting the Guidelines as a minimum. The Guidelines are weaker than the Jakarta Declaration, a global "call for reform", endorsed by 347 NGOs from 45 countries. The Jakarta Declaration describes the goals and demands of the ECA – Watch campaign.
- there is a primary need for MNEs to be incorporated in national law
- international law is administered by states even though companies have more power. States need to make companies the passive subject of international law. A passive subject is an entity that has rights and duties, but that has not played a role itself in the process of formulating these rights and duties.
- **Should there be an International Criminal Court for companies?**
 - France has proposed this but there was US and UK opposition – it should be noted that holding MNEs responsible for international crimes (like genocide) is very limited.
- there is a need to move to the risk of sanctions – the Norms do not threaten MNEs because there is no mechanism for prosecution.

*****Summary Points *****

- **improved monitoring and implementation of the Guidelines:**
 - introduce a system based on The Peer Review, a well-established, tried and proven OECD monitoring tool
- **the UN Norms:**
 - need strong lobby work from NGOs to make them work.
 - need to move to the risk of sanctions – the OECD Guidelines do not threaten MNEs because there is no mechanism for prosecution.
- **Export Credit Agencies:**
 - need to be held more accountable for environmental and human rights violations
 - country positions on ECAs, NCP membership and the Guidelines need resolving
- **Customary law:**
 - in the long term, a combination of the UN Norms and the OECD Guidelines may result in new customary law

Evaluations

Finally, participants gave brief evaluations of the seminar. Comments included: the need to focus on concrete action and present cases to expose unresolved issues eg supply chain; great for information sharing – we go home with ambition to use the Guidelines; OECD Watch should be for information sharing but cases come directly from NGOs; more time needed to discuss development of OECD Watch; good opportunity for networking – working group on Cases very useful; more time to discuss the case studies would have been beneficial; there is a need for a positive case; trade unions need to be included; the Background Papers were some of best ever seen; got what I expected from seminar – learned about work of other organisations, got strategies for future work, met new people; working groups not long enough; important to hear how people are applying the Guidelines – need strategy and allies/coalition as provided by OECD Watch; exploring the scope and limits of the Guidelines means progress; it was a learning process; the seminar will feed motivation.

Colophon:

writer: Julie Smith

Organisers: Cornelia Heydenreich, Peter Pennartz and Joris Oldenzien

heydenreich@germanwatch.org, peterpennartz@irene-network.nl, j.oldenzien@somo.nl

This seminar has been made possible with the support of the European Commission Employment and Social Affairs DG, NOVIB- Oxfam Netherlands, Germanwatch and EED.

The views expressed in this report are those of the organisers and can therefore in no way be taken to reflect the official opinion of the sponsors, i.c. the European Community. Sole responsibility lies with the organisers and the European Commission is not responsible for any use that may be made of the information contained herein.