ANALYTICAL BRIEF

on the practice of the Dutch NCP in responsible business conduct cases

Stellantis | Perfetti Van Melle | Pluspetrol | Uber

This brief analyses several cases considered by the Dutch National Contact Point under the OECD Guidelines for Multinational Enterprises (hereinafter, the Dutch NCP). The focus is not only on the factual background of each dispute, but also on the legal and practical function performed by the NCP: how it determines the relevance of a complaint, how it offers its good offices, how it responds to a refusal to engage in dialogue, and how it formulates recommendations to companies.

For each case, the brief first considers the submission/complaint itself: the company against which it was filed, the facts to which it related, and the geographic context in which the dispute arose. It then analyses the procedural aspects of the Dutch NCP's handling of the case: whether the case was accepted, whether good offices were offered, whether dialogue between the parties took place, and whether a further examination of the substance was conducted. The broader significance of each case is then assessed: what it demonstrates about the contemporary standard of responsible business conduct (hereinafter, RBC) and about the role of the NCP as a non-judicial mechanism.

The cases reviewed show that the Dutch NCP acts neither as a court nor as an enforcement authority, but as a procedural and analytical soft-law mechanism. Its strength lies in translating general OECD standards into concrete expectations for companies: due diligence, meaningful stakeholder engagement, transparency, risk management and remediation. Its limitation is the absence of powers to award compensation or compel the parties to mediate. The practical value of the NCP therefore lies not in sanctions, but in shaping the standard of responsible business conduct and publicly assessing the quality of corporate responsibility.

1. What the NCP Is and Why Its Findings Matter

The OECD Guidelines are a soft-law instrument, but their practical significance goes beyond declarations. An analysis by Sander van 't Foort and Joseph Wilde-Ramsing emphasizes that the Guidelines are the only international corporate responsibility instrument with a built-in grievance mechanism - National Contact Points (NCPs). NCPs are government-based but non-judicial mechanisms; they help resolve issues in a non-adversarial manner, primarily through mediation, conciliation and dialogue.

The Dutch NCP is traditionally regarded as one of the stronger NCPs because its procedure is relatively well structured and oriented toward public disclosure of outcomes. According to the analytical article, the standard procedure for handling a specific instance consists of three stages: initial assessment, good offices, and conclusion of the procedure/final statement. At the initial assessment stage, the NCP does not determine whether a violation has occurred on the merits; rather, it decides whether the issue merits further consideration: whether the complaint is bona fide and substantiated, whether it is relevant to the Guidelines, whether there is a link between the enterprise's activities and the issues raised, and whether consideration of the matter may contribute to the purposes of the Guidelines.

This is essential for correctly interpreting the cases. An initial assessment is neither a "victory" for the complainant nor a finding of a violation. It is a procedural filter. However, if a complaint passes this filter, the NCP recognizes that the issues raised are sufficiently serious and connected with the application of OECD standards. The NCP then either facilitates dialogue between the parties or, if dialogue is not possible, may prepare a final statement containing analysis and recommendations.

This is why an NCP remains important even in the absence of enforcement powers. In the final statements in the Uber, Pluspetrol and Stellantis cases, the NCP expressly notes that specific instances are not judicial proceedings, that NCPs are not judicial bodies, and that they cannot directly award compensation or compel parties to participate in mediation. However, the absence of judicial authority does not mean an absence of legal and reputational significance. A public final statement records expectations for the company and may serve as a reference point for corporate policy, stakeholder engagement, internal controls, disclosure and risk assessment.

2. Сравнительная карта кейсов

Case	Sector / geography	Complainant	Key issues	Procedural outcome	Case significance
IAATW v. Uber	Platform work; several countries	International Alliance of App-Based Transport Workers (IAATW)	Income, working hours, safety, account deactivation, COVID-19, stakeholder engagement	The parties accepted the NCP's good offices but did not agree on the terms of the procedure; the NCP conducted a further examination and issued recommendations	Shows that due diligence applies to the platform model regardless of the dispute over drivers' employment status
Indigenous Federations et	Oil and gas sector; Peruvian Amazon	Four federations of Indigenous Peoples and four NGOs	Environment, Indigenous Peoples' rights, disclosure,	The complainants accepted the NCP's good offices; the	The strongest example of substantive NCP

al. v. Pluspetrol			taxation, health, remediation	company declined; the NCP conducted a further examination and issued detailed findings	assessment without the company's consent to mediation
IUF v. Perfetti Van Melle - Bangladesh	Food industry; Bangladesh	International Union of Food, Agricultural, Hotel, Restaurant, Catering, Tobacco and Allied Workers' Associations (IUF)	Child labour, freedom of association, collective bargaining	A limited meeting was held on child labour; the NCP published a final statement with recommendations	Shows the parent company's responsibility for oversight of labour standards in subsidiaries
IUF v. Perfetti Van Melle - Türkiye	Food industry; Türkiye	IUF / Tekgıda-İş	Trade union organisation, collective bargaining, due diligence at headquarters level	The initial assessment was not published; good offices did not begin because the parties reached agreement outside the NCP procedure	Shows the preventive power of the procedure: the very existence of the NCP can stimulate an out-of-court settlement
Italian NGOs v. Stellantis/FCA Italy	Automotive industry; cobalt supply chain from the Democratic Republic of the Congo (hereinafter, DRC)	22 Italian associations and NGOs	Disclosure, traceability, risk assessment, due diligence regarding mineral raw materials	Mediation did not result in an agreement; the NCP did not find non-compliance with the 2011 OECD Guidelines, but issued forward-looking recommendations	Shows a shift from formal disclosure to extended due diligence in the face of systemic risks

3. IAATW v. Uber: Due Diligence in the Platform Economy

3.1. Background of the Case

On 6 April 2021, the International Alliance of App-Based Transport Workers (IAATW) filed a complaint against Uber Technologies, Inc. The complaint concerned Uber's alleged failure to conduct adequate due diligence with respect to drivers' health and safety, income and working hours, as well as account deactivation and blocking practices. It also raised the issue of how the COVID-19 pandemic affected drivers and how transparently Uber engaged with drivers themselves and their representatives.

The case had an international scope: the complainant referred to Uber's activities in Costa Rica, India, Nigeria, Panama, South Africa, the United Kingdom and Uruguay. The Dutch NCP accepted the case for consideration because it established a nexus with the Netherlands: a Dutch Uber affiliate was the contracting party for drivers in several of the countries identified in the complaint. At the same time, the NCP recognized a supporting role for the U.S. NCP because Uber's global headquarters are located in the United States.

3.2. Procedural Developments

The NCP found that the complaint merited further consideration and offered its good offices to the parties. Both parties formally accepted the offer, but mediation did not in fact begin because the parties were unable to agree on the Terms of Reference. The NCP then discontinued its good offices and proceeded to further examination of the substance of the case. This procedural development is important: the NCP did not merely record the failure of mediation, but used the final statement to conduct a substantive assessment of the issues raised by the complainant.

3.3. Key Findings and Recommendations

The core analytical question in the case is whether due diligence obligations apply to a platform company when the employment status of drivers is disputed. The NCP expressly stated that its mandate does not include determining whether Uber drivers are independent contractors or employees. However, this does not relieve Uber of its due diligence obligations: both the 2023 edition of the OECD Guidelines and the commentary to the 2011 OECD Guidelines confirm that Uber must take risks to drivers into account regardless of how they are classified.

With regard to income, the NCP concluded that there was a significant risk of a gap between drivers' actual earnings and a living wage/decent-income benchmark (living wage) or its equivalent. The NCP therefore recommended that Uber select a reliable calculation methodology, adapt it to platform work, establish a roadmap with milestones and deadlines, and report regularly on progress. With regard to deactivation, the NCP acknowledged that blocking an account may be necessary, but may also have serious consequences for a driver’s income and livelihood. Deactivation risks should therefore form part of due diligence; the NCP paid particular attention to the use of artificial intelligence in the deactivation process as a material risk, including the risk of discrimination.

With respect to stakeholder engagement, the NCP emphasized that meaningful engagement requires two-way communication. Individually informing drivers through an app or other one-way channels is not equivalent to meaningful engagement with workers and their representatives. The NCP therefore recommended that Uber develop systematic engagement with a broad range of stakeholders, including independent trade unions and driver representatives at local, national, regional and international levels.

3.4. Strength and Significance of the Case

The strength of the Uber case lies in the NCP’s application of due diligence to the context of the new labour economy. A company cannot neutralize risks by referring to its technological model or to the disputed status of workers. For the purposes of the Guidelines, what matters is not only the formal classification of the relationship, but also the actual existence of a sustained contractual and economic link between the platform and the people affected by its model. The Uber case therefore establishes an important direction: a platform company must assess the impacts of its algorithms, deactivation practices, income policies and communication channels as elements of responsible business conduct (RBC).

4. Indigenous Federations et al. v. Pluspetrol: A Multi-Level Standard of Responsibility in the Extractive Sector

4.1. Background of the Case

On 9 March 2020, four federations of Indigenous Peoples in Peru - FEDIQUEP, FECONACOR, OPIKAFPE and ACODECOSPAT - together with four NGOs filed a complaint against Pluspetrol Resources Corporation B.V., registered in Amsterdam. The complainants alleged that, while operating oil block Lot 1AB in Peru from 2000 to 2015, Pluspetrol failed to conduct adequate environmental and human rights due diligence, failed to remediate the harm caused, failed to disclose material information on its structure and operations, and used corporate and tax structures that raised concerns from the standpoint of tax transparency.

By its nature, this is more than an environmental dispute. It brings together several dimensions: the rights of Indigenous Peoples, environmental pollution, the right to health, access to remedy/remediation, transparency of the corporate structure, and tax integrity. The Pluspetrol case is therefore the most comprehensive of the cases considered.

4.2. Procedural Developments

The NCP found that the complaint merited further consideration. The complainants accepted the NCP's good offices, but the company declined to participate. Pluspetrol nevertheless provided information to the NCP and corresponded with it, but did not agree to engage in dialogue with the complainants and generally refused to share with them the information it had provided. The NCP ultimately conducted a further examination of the substance of the case and prepared a detailed final statement.

It is here that the institutional strength of the NCP is especially clear. The company's refusal to participate in mediation did not halt the procedure or deprive the mechanism of meaning. The NCP could not compel the company to enter into dialogue or award compensation, but it was able to carry out a substantive assessment and formulate detailed recommendations. This makes the Pluspetrol case a key example of the NCP acting not only as a mediator, but also as a public interpreter of RBC standards.

4.3. Main Findings of the NCP

With regard to disclosure, the NCP assessed that the company had not made basic information on its corporate structure, operations, annual reporting and ownership structure available through freely accessible public sources, either at the level of the parent company or at the level of its Peruvian and Dutch subsidiaries. The NCP therefore concluded that the company had not acted in accordance with the expectations of the Disclosure chapter.

With regard to taxation, the NCP stated that the company had failed to demonstrate - either through publicly available information or before the NCP during the procedure - that it was acting in the spirit of tax legislation. The NCP specifically noted the insufficiency of publicly available tax information and recommended that the company disclose its tax policy and tax payments by corporate entity and by country, including through country-by-country reporting.

With regard to the rights of Indigenous Peoples and meaningful stakeholder engagement, the NCP concluded that the company had not fully acted in accordance with expectations concerning the building of relationships of trust with communities and respect for human rights. An important element of the analysis was the need to take into account Free, Prior and Informed Consent (FPIC), the right to self-determination, and the effective participation of representatives chosen by the Indigenous Peoples themselves.

With regard to the environment and the right to health, the NCP assessed that the company had not done enough to prevent and address adverse environmental impacts. With respect to remediation, relying on data from the United Nations Development Programme (UNDP), the NCP pointed to the partial inadequacy of the remediation techniques used and the incomplete removal of pollution. The NCP also recommended that the company assess which areas had been insufficiently remediated, which impacts had been inherited from a predecessor but continued to be sustained by the company's activities, and how the fullest possible remediation should be ensured with the participation of affected communities.

4.4. Strength and Significance of the Case

The Pluspetrol case is the strongest example of a substantive assessment on the merits in the absence of the company's consent to dialogue. Its significance lies in the NCP's integration of disclosure, taxation, the rights of Indigenous Peoples, the environment, health and remediation into a single due diligence framework. This demonstrates that, in the extractive sector, corporate responsibility is not limited to technical compliance with local permits. A company must ensure transparency, take the rights of Indigenous Peoples into account, prevent environmental harm, respect the right to health, and participate in effective remediation of adverse impacts.

The conclusion from this case can be formulated as follows: in high-risk sectors, due diligence is not a document or a policy, but a continuing obligation to know, prevent, disclose, engage and remedy. If a company does not participate in dialogue, this does not release it from the expectations of the Guidelines; on the contrary, refusal to engage meaningfully itself becomes part of the assessment of the company's conduct.

5. IUF v. Perfetti Van Melle: Labour Rights in Subsidiaries

5.1. Bangladesh Case: Child Labour, Freedom of Association and Collective Bargaining

The first IUF case against Perfetti Van Melle was filed on 9 August 2019 and concerned the operations of the company's subsidiary in Gazipur, Bangladesh. IUF alleged that the company had failed to respect workers' rights to collective bargaining and freedom of association and had also permitted the use of child labour through a labour provider. Perfetti Van Melle denied the allegations and stated that it supported the establishment of a local trade union and had mechanisms in place to monitor the minimum age of workers.

The NCP found that the complaint merited further consideration because the issues were material, prima facie substantiated, and linked to the company's activities. However, the procedure did not follow the conventional route of full mediation. PVM did not accept the NCP's good offices on freedom of association and collective bargaining, but was willing to discuss child labour if evidence was provided. The NCP organized a meeting between the parties on child labour; following the meeting, the parties agreed that there was no child labour at the factory at that time, while retaining different views on the past circumstances.

In its recommendations, the NCP emphasized that companies operating in complex and high-risk contexts should exercise particular care in human rights due diligence. The NCP also specifically stated that the parent company in the Netherlands is responsible for ensuring that policies are implemented at factory level and that this implementation is monitored.

5.2. Türkiye Case: Trade Union Rights and the Effect of the Procedure Without Formal Mediation

The second case against Perfetti Van Melle was filed by IUF on 13 August 2024 and concerned the operations of PVM Türkiye. The complainant alleged that the company's operations in Türkiye systematically obstructed workers from freely joining a trade union and participating in collective bargaining through their union. The case concerned the chapters of the OECD Guidelines on General Policies, Human Rights, and Employment and Industrial Relations.

The NCP initially concluded that the complaint merited further consideration on the merits. However, the initial assessment dated 21 March 2025 was not published: the parties agreed that publication could affect ongoing negotiations between the Turkish Tekgıda-İş Union and the company. The NCP paused the process before offering good offices because the parties had already begun dialogue outside the NCP procedure. As a result, the parties reached an agreement on the issues raised in the complaint, and the NCP did not proceed to examine whether the company had complied with the OECD Guidelines.

5.3. Strength and Significance of the PVM Cases

The strength of the Perfetti Van Melle cases lies in demonstrating that labour rights in subsidiaries and at local factory level remain a matter of parent-company responsibility. The NCP does not reduce the issue to local management: where the parent company is registered in the Netherlands and exercises control over the group, it is expected to manage due diligence across the entire corporate structure.

At the same time, the Bangladesh and Türkiye cases demonstrate different effects of the NCP mechanism. In the first case, the NCP helped establish the situation regarding child labour and formulated recommendations on group-wide oversight. In the second case, the procedure itself played a catalytic role: formal good offices were not required because the parties reached an agreement outside the NCP. This does not make the case less significant; on the contrary, it demonstrates the preventive function of the NCP as a forum that can accelerate direct dialogue between the parties.

6. Italian NGOs v. Stellantis/FCA Italy: Disclosure, Traceability and Systemic Risks in the Cobalt Supply Chain

6.1. Background of the Case

On 21 July 2022, lawyers Veronica Dini and Luca Saltalamacchia, acting on behalf of 22 Italian associations and NGOs, filed a complaint against Stellantis N.V. and FCA Italy S.p.A. The complainants alleged that the companies did not disclose sufficiently transparent and detailed information on the activities of suppliers in cobalt and other mineral mines in the Democratic Republic of the Congo (hereinafter, the DRC), and did not clearly enough explain how risk assessment was conducted and traceability of critical materials was ensured.

In response, Stellantis argued that it had no direct operations in the DRC and that any potential link arose through indirect suppliers at several tiers of the supply chain. The company also referred to its disclosures, due diligence practices, compliance with conflict minerals regulation, participation in industry initiatives, and partnership with RCS Global to map the battery value chain down to mine level.

6.2. Procedural Developments

The complaint was initially filed with the Italian NCP, but the Italian NCP stated that, given Stellantis's registration in the Netherlands, the case should be handled by the Dutch NCP. The Dutch and Italian NCPs agreed that the Dutch NCP would act as lead NCP and the Italian NCP as supporting NCP. The NCP found that the complaint merited further consideration and offered its good offices. Mediation took place in 2023-2024, including an expert session on disclosure under the OECD Guidelines, but the parties did not reach an agreement. In May 2025, the NCP discontinued its good offices and proceeded to further examination of the substance of the case.

6.3. Findings and Recommendations

The NCP's conclusion in the Stellantis case is more nuanced than a simple formula of "violation/no violation." The NCP concluded that, on the basis of the information provided and otherwise available, Stellantis had acted in accordance with the requirements of the Disclosure chapter of the 2011 edition of the OECD Guidelines, which was applicable at the time the complaint was filed. The NCP also noted that the additional disclosure requirements in the OECD Due Diligence Guidance and the OECD Minerals Guidance were covered by Stellantis's disclosures.

However, the analysis did not end there. The NCP separately established that there is a systemic problem in the cobalt mines of the DRC that increases the risks of human rights abuses, including child labour. Such a systemic risk does not automatically mean that a company has breached the Guidelines, but it raises the expected scope and depth of due diligence. The NCP therefore issued forward-looking recommendations: continue improving policies and practices; update the human rights policy annually; pay particular attention to tracking the effectiveness of measures; conduct extended due diligence through cross-sectoral cooperation and relevant initiatives; strengthen stakeholder engagement; include local stakeholders from the DRC in the dialogue; and examine whether the supply chain includes mines where human rights abuses have been suspected.

6.4. Strength and Significance of the Case

The Stellantis case is important precisely because the NCP did not replace legal assessment with a political accusation. It recognized compliance with the applicable 2011 edition of the OECD Guidelines on disclosure, while at the same time articulating a higher standard of conduct in the presence of systemic risk. This demonstrates the maturity of the NCP's approach: a company may formally comply with one set of requirements and still need deeper due diligence if its supply chain is linked to a high-risk sector and region.

The practical conclusion is that, in complex mineral supply chains, disclosure should be not only a periodic public report but also part of a broader system of continuous due diligence. The gap between what a company discloses as policy and what stakeholders want to know about actual conditions on the ground should be bridged through meaningful stakeholder engagement and verification of the effectiveness of measures.

7. General Analytical Conclusions

7.1. The Dutch NCP as a Mechanism Linking Procedure and Substantive Examination

The cases reviewed show that the strength of the Dutch NCP lies not only in mediation. Under the classic model, an NCP is expected to help the parties reach agreement, but in practice many cases do not lead to a full settlement: Uber - because the parties could not agree on the terms of the procedure; Pluspetrol - because the company refused the NCP's good offices; Stellantis - because mediation was unsuccessful; and Bangladesh PVM - because consent was limited to discussion of only one issue. Nevertheless, the NCP remains significant when it publishes a structured final statement containing findings and recommendations.

7.2. Due Diligence Becomes a Cross-Cutting Standard

Across all of the cases, due diligence appears not as a formal compliance process, but as a practical obligation to identify and address risks. For Uber, these are risks related to platform work, algorithmic deactivation, income and grievance mechanisms. For Pluspetrol, they are environmental and human rights risks, including inherited and ongoing harm. For PVM, they concern labour rights in subsidiaries. For Stellantis, they arise in a high-risk cobalt supply chain, where systemic risks require extended due diligence.

7.3. Stakeholders Are Not External Noise, but Part of the Standard Itself

Meaningful stakeholder engagement is particularly prominent across all of the cases. In practice, the NCP shows that a company cannot regard its due diligence as complete if it does not listen to those affected by its activities: drivers and their representatives, Indigenous communities, factory workers, local NGOs, and rights-holders/affected persons in extractive regions. Stakeholder engagement must be two-way, meaningful, and capable of influencing company decisions.

7.4. Transparency Becomes an Independent Element of Responsibility

Disclosure takes different forms in these cases. In Pluspetrol, it concerns disclosure of the corporate structure, operations, ownership structure, reporting and tax information. In Stellantis, it concerns supplier disclosure, traceability, risk assessment and due diligence in the cobalt supply chain. In Uber, it concerns transparency of deactivation rules, communication with drivers, and grievance mechanisms. In every case, transparency matters not for reporting as such, but because without information stakeholders cannot assess risks, seek remediation, or participate in dialogue.

7.5. Remediation Is a Weak Point, but Also a Key Benchmark

The NCP cannot award compensation, and this is a structural limitation of the mechanism. However, the Pluspetrol and Uber cases in particular show that the NCP treats access to remedy and remediation as part of due diligence. For platform drivers, this means grievance mechanisms in cases of deactivation; for Indigenous communities, it means restoration of polluted areas and community participation in the design of remedial measures. In NCP practice, remediation is therefore not a judicial outcome, but an expectation that companies establish legitimate, accessible, predictable, equitable and transparent remediation mechanisms.

8. Experience of the Dutch NCP: Relevance for Kazakhstan

The experience of the Dutch NCP is useful for Kazakhstan primarily as a set of practical reference points for future cases. Each Dutch case reviewed demonstrates a particular standard of corporate conduct and a possible procedural outcome: Uber - how to assess risks related to platform work, algorithmic deactivation and dialogue with workers; Pluspetrol - how to consider environmental, human rights, tax and reputational risks in the extractive sector; Perfetti Van Melle - how a parent company should oversee labour standards in subsidiaries and how the NCP procedure itself can encourage the parties to reach agreement; Stellantis - how to disclose information and build traceability in supply chains for strategic raw materials. For Kazakhstan, this is important not only as foreign practice, but also as a ready-made analytical framework: future complaints can be assessed not formally, but through the existence of due diligence, genuine engagement with affected stakeholders, transparency and remediation mechanisms.

The public nature of the Dutch NCP's outcomes also creates greater predictability for business: companies can understand in advance which actions the NCP considers appropriate, which gaps may lead to reputational consequences, and what outcome may follow from consideration of a complaint even without a court decision. This strengthens the preventive function of the NCP: companies begin correcting processes before a conflict arises, investors receive a clearer assessment of non-financial risks, and the state demonstrates that it has a functioning responsible business conduct mechanism. For Kazakhstan, such an approach may have a positive impact on the investment climate: transparent NCP practice reduces uncertainty for foreign investors, strengthens trust in institutions, and shows that disputes concerning labour rights, the environment, disclosure and supply chains can be addressed in a constructive and professional manner.

9. Current Status of RBC Implementation in Kazakhstan and Key Challenges

Kazakhstan has already established a basic institutional framework for promoting responsible business conduct: the country has adhered to the OECD Declaration on International Investment and Multinational Enterprises, an NCP is in place, and awareness-raising activities, consultations, business training and work to support the handling of complaints are being carried out. According to the latest data, the practice of the Kazakhstan NCP includes 9 registered complaints. The subject matter of Kazakhstan's complaints shows that the mechanism is already beginning to function as a practical forum for issues related to labour relations, workers' rights, consumer disputes, disclosure, cross-border situations and alleged breaches of OECD standards. Kazakhstan is therefore at the stage of moving from a predominantly informational NCP function toward building its own body of case-handling practice.

Compared with the Netherlands, Kazakhstan's practice is still at an earlier stage. The Dutch NCP has already developed a strong practice of public final statements, detailed substantive analysis, and recommendations to companies even where mediation has not taken place. Kazakhstan is also beginning to work with cases, but the key challenges remain concentrated in three areas: raising awareness of the NCP among businesses, workers and NGOs; improving the quality of procedures and the public availability of final documents; and developing a clear practice regarding the outcomes of complaints so that complainants and companies can see not only that a complaint has been closed, but also its practical result.

10. Final Conclusion and Recommendations

The experience of the Dutch NCP shows that the value of an NCP lies not only in mediation, but also in shaping clear standards of conduct for companies. Even though the mechanism is not a court and cannot award compensation, its final statements may have significant reputational, investment and managerial effects. This is particularly relevant for Kazakhstan, which attracts foreign investment, develops its extractive and infrastructure sectors, and seeks to strengthen alignment with OECD standards. The accumulation of practice from 9 registered complaints already provides a foundation for further development of the NCP, but the next stage should focus on greater transparency, stronger analytical quality, and the practical usefulness of case outcomes.

10.1. Recommendations for Business

Kazakhstani businesses, especially companies in the extractive sector, logistics, infrastructure, digital platforms and supply chains, should view the NCP not as a formal risk, but as a signal to establish an RBC system in advance. In practical terms, this means embedding due diligence in internal policies and supplier contracts; regularly identifying labour, environmental and human rights risks; documenting the measures taken; creating clear grievance channels for workers, contractors and local communities; and disclosing material information on risks and response measures. The Dutch experience shows that, in the event of a dispute, a company is assessed not by the existence of a well-crafted code, but by its ability to demonstrate genuine risk management and a readiness to engage in dialogue.

10.2. Recommendations for Government Authorities

Government authorities should strengthen practical cooperation with the Secretariat of the Kazakhstan NCP, because the effectiveness of the mechanism depends not only on the work of the NCP itself, but also on timely support from the relevant government bodies. In particular, it is important to ensure prompt provision of information in response to NCP requests, facilitate the dissemination of methodological and informational materials among businesses, industry associations and stakeholders, and participate in awareness-raising work on responsible business conduct. Such support will help increase awareness of the NCP, better inform companies about its role and procedures, and gradually develop a clearer practice for applying RBC principles in Kazakhstan. It will also help build trust in the NCP mechanism, strengthen Kazakhstan’s investment reputation, and demonstrate to OECD partners that the country is not merely formally endorsing RBC principles, but is gradually implementing them in practice.

11. Sources Used

- Final Statement, *International Alliance of App-Based Transport Workers vs Uber Technologies, Inc.*, Dutch NCP, 21 May 2025.
- Initial Assessment, *International Alliance of App-Based Transport Workers vs Uber Technologies, Inc.*, Dutch NCP, 15 June 2022.
- Initial Assessment, *Indigenous Federations from Peru et al. vs Pluspetrol Resources Corporation B.V.,* Dutch NCP, 20 April 2021.
- Final Statement, *Indigenous Federations from Peru et al. vs Pluspetrol Resources Corporation B.V.,* Dutch NCP, 3 September 2025.
- Final Statement, *IUF vs Perfetti Van Melle*, Dutch NCP, 15 June 2020.
- Final Statement, *IUF vs Perfetti Van Melle B.V.*, Dutch NCP, 12 November 2025.
- Initial Assessment, *Italian associations and NGOs vs Stellantis N.V. and FCA Italy S.p.A.,* Dutch NCP, 13 February 2023.
- Final Statement, *Italian associations and NGOs vs Stellantis N.V. and FCA Italy S.p.A.,* Dutch NCP, 22 April 2026.
- Sander van ’t Foort and Joseph Wilde-Ramsing, *A comparative analysis of the Dutch specific instance procedure.*
- OECD. *National Contact Point for Responsible Business Conduct Peer Reviews: Kazakhstan*. OECD, 2024.
- OECD. *Responsible Business Conduct in Kazakhstan.* OECD, 2014.