



**London 23 May 2016** - LPHR notes G4S' response of 20 May 2016 and would like to raise two points:

1. G4S has, yet again, failed to acknowledge LPHR's letter dated 28 October 2015, and has made no effort to respond to any of the 16 specific questions that it raises. It should be noted that it was this letter that G4S was invited to respond to by the Business and Human Rights Resource Centre. Instead, G4S' response largely refers to [two commentaries](#) that LPHR published on its website two weeks earlier, and that G4S was not invited to respond to. Whilst LPHR does not object to G4S responding to these commentaries, it does object to it failing to respond to a letter that it has been sent repeatedly and that raises issues of fundamental concern. **In the interests of transparency to shareholders and stakeholders in the run up to its AGM on 26 May, LPHR would again like to invite G4S to respond to the 16 questions raised in its letter of 28 October 2015.**
2. For the purpose of clarity to readers, G4S incorrectly asserted in its response on this website that LPHR has stated that 'G4S did not engage in the NCP review process'. LPHR did not state this because, as G4S states, this is not true. What LPHR actually stated was that the company's engagement was 'minimal'. This statement was made because it withheld material information to the UK National Contact Point and LPHR by asserting commercial confidentiality, and it declined to enter into 'mediation', which is the most effective and most substantive way in which to engage in the process. LPHR is [aware, and noted](#), that G4S did not substantially participate on the grounds of confidentiality. It remains the case however, that G4S' engagement was minimal.