



**London, 05 June 2017** – The G4S response to our statement dated 23 May 2017 is appallingly and regrettably deceptive. For a company that claims to "take its human rights responsibilities seriously", it is shocking that it has chosen to repeat the misleading public framing that led the UK National Contact Point (UK NCP) itself to critically state in July 2016 that G4S has been "selective and misleading" in its response to their serious findings.

In order to correct the record on behalf of G4S, we do strongly suggest that G4S' Corporate Director, Debbie Walker, closely read Paragraphs 23-27 of the UK NCP Follow-Up statement published on 7 July 2016 (bolded and italicised by LPHR for emphasis):

23. The UK NCP notes the complainant's observations that G4S comments made immediately after the UK NCP's Final Statement misrepresented its findings. ***The UK NCP separately noted the G4S response at that time, and considered that it referred to the Final Statement in a selective way that was misleading.***

24. The UK NCP does not advise parties on their own statements, and recognises that parties will inevitably refer publicly to its statements in a way that plays to their own interests and stakeholders. However, ***the UK NCP notes that G4S's public response to the UK NCP's findings and recommendations was an early opportunity to signal the seriousness of its intention to address them. It is disappointing that G4S did not take this opportunity.***

25. ***For the avoidance of doubt, the UK NCP re-iterates that its Final Statement found actions of G4S to be inconsistent with its obligation under Chapter IV, Paragraph 3 of the OECD Guidelines to address [adverse human rights] impacts it is linked to by a business relationship. This finding was unqualified.***

26. ***Because G4S's actions were inconsistent with Chapter IV, Paragraph 3, the UK NCP found them also to be inconsistent with wider general provisions of the Guidelines in regard to respecting human rights (Chapter IV, Paragraph 1 and Chapter II, Paragraph 2).*** Only this finding on the wider provisions was described by the UK NCP as arising technically - because it arises out of the way in which the Guidelines define the general obligation - and as not representing a broad failure to respect human rights.

27. ***The UK NCP additionally notes its observation in Paragraph 76. of the Final Statement that: 'Until G4S publicly communicates the actions it is taking to address the [adverse human rights] impacts it is linked to by the contracts referred to in the complaint, the UK NCP considers that its actions are not consistent with its obligation under Chapter IV, Paragraph 3 of the OECD Guidelines to address [adverse human rights] impacts it is linked to by a business relationship.***

G4S' acutely concerning approach to selectively and misleadingly represent the UK NCP's findings has been illustrated by LPHR in a [comparison table](#), which sets out the text of the UK

LAWYERS FOR PALESTINIAN  
HUMAN RIGHTS

---



NCP's Conclusions, extracted directly from the UK NCP's Follow-Up Statement, against the text of G4S' Statement dated 7 July 2016 on those conclusions.

Contact information: Tareq Shrourou, Director of LPHR, [contact@lphr.org.uk](mailto:contact@lphr.org.uk)