



An Roinn Fiontar,
Trádála agus Fostaíochta
Department of Enterprise,
Trade and Employment

Initial Assessment by the Ireland National Contact Point for the OECD Guidelines for Multinational Enterprises

Specific Instance Complaint from
Building and Woodworkers International
Union Federation and Unite the Union
against Cathexis PR IV LLC and Jones
Engineering Group Limited

13 August 2025

The objective of the initial assessment process under the Implementation Procedures is to determine whether the issues raised in the specific instance warrant further examination. If so, the NCP will offer or facilitate access to consensual and non-adversarial procedures, such as dialogue, mediation, or conciliation (e.g., ‘good offices’) to the relevant parties. As specific instances are not legal cases and NCPs are not judicial bodies, NCPs cannot impose sanctions, directly provide compensation nor compel parties to participate in a conciliation or mediation process.

The Ireland NCP is a standalone unit and is situated in the Department of Enterprise, Tourism and Employment.

Note on Ireland NCP Rules of Procedure

The Ireland NCP will soon publish updated complaint handling procedures to align with the updated 2023 OECD Guidelines. Until the Ireland NCP’s updated complaint handling procedures are published, the Ireland NCP will continue to manage complaints consistent with the 2021 version of the [Ireland NCP complaint procedures](#).

Table of Contents

Overview of the NCP and its role	3
Summary of the Ireland NCP Decision.....	3
Object of the Complaint.....	5
Coordination among NCPs and lead NCP	9
The Initial Assessment Process	11
Ireland NCP Decision.....	14
Next Steps.....	16

Overview of the NCP and its role

1. [The OECD Guidelines for Multinational Enterprises on Responsible Business Conduct](#) (“the Guidelines”) are recommendations addressed by governments to multinational enterprises. They aim to encourage positive contributions enterprises can make to economic, environmental and social progress, and to minimise adverse impacts on matters covered by the Guidelines that may be associated with an enterprise’s operations, products and services.
2. The Guidelines cover all key areas of business responsibility, including human rights, labour rights, environment, bribery and corruption, consumer interests, disclosure, science and technology, competition, and taxation.
3. All governments adhering to the OECD Guidelines have the legal obligation to set up a National Contact Point (NCP) with the role of ‘furthering the effectiveness of the Guidelines’. The role of NCPs is:
 - a. To raise awareness and promote observance of the Guidelines, and related due diligence guidance,
 - b. To provide a non-judicial mechanism to assist in the resolution of ‘specific instances’ complaints (referred to as ‘complaints’) relating to the Guidelines,
 - c. To support efforts by their government to develop, implement, and foster coherence of policies to promote responsible business conduct.
4. The Ireland NCP is an independent, standalone unit and is part of the Department of Enterprise, Tourism and Employment.

Summary of the Ireland NCP Decision

5. The complaint was submitted to the US and UK NCPs on 5th September 2024. Upon receiving it, those NCPs shared it with the Ireland NCP. The submission was formally submitted to the Ireland NCP on 26th September 2024.
6. The complaint is made by Building and Woodworkers International Union Federation (BWI), a global trade union federation based in Geneva, together with its Irish affiliate Unite the Union (Unite), (hereinafter “the Complainants”). The complaint is against US-based Cathexis PR IV LLC (hereinafter “the Parent Company”), and its related group companies: Cathexis Holdings LP and “Group” Cathexis Ireland II Limited, Cathexis UK Holdings IV Limited (hereinafter “the Companies”), Jones Engineering Holdings Limited, H.A. O’Neil Limited, and subsidiaries operating in Ireland, (hereinafter “the Company”).
7. The Complainants allege that the acquisition by the Parent Company of the Company in 2022 has coincided with a change in industrial relations practices.

8. The complaint is made in respect of Chapter V (Employment and Industrial Relations) and Chapter II (General Policies). The Complainants have claimed that the Companies have:
 - i. Failed to observe the Guidelines' provisions concerning the right of workers to join trade unions (Chapter V, Para 1(a))
 - ii. Not respected the right of workers to have their trade unions recognised for the purposes of collective bargaining, and the obligation to engage in constructive negotiation (Chapter V, Para 1(b))
 - iii. Discriminated against employees due to their trade union activity (Chapter V, Para 1(e))
 - iv. Failed to promote consultation and cooperation with workers and their representatives (Chapter V, Para 3)
 - v. Failed to observe standards of employment, contractual arrangements and industrial relations (Chapter V, Para 4(a))
 - vi. Failed to observe the Guidelines' provisions concerning the use of reprisals (Chapter II, Para 10).
9. In response, the Company refutes all allegations made in the complaint. They stated that they have a strong focus on environment, social and governance issues, that they recognise and engage with trade unions through Collective Bargaining Agreements, that they have not discriminated against any employee because of their trade union involvement. They further stated that they have *"for decades formally recognised the role of trade unions, including their right to represent employees and their right to collective bargaining within the sector"*, and that *"shop stewards are provided with the necessary resources to perform their role including paid time off for union duties"*.
10. The Parent Company submitted no response to the complaint beyond that of its subsidiary, the Company.
11. The Company stated that they are best placed to respond to the allegations as the members of the union, who are the focus of the complaint and parallel proceedings, are employees of the Company, not the Parent Company. The Company also confirmed that the Parent Company does not have any role or responsibility for the day-to-day management of the Company.
12. The Complainants stated in their submission that it was their preference that the US NCP lead on the complaint, as the *"enterprise is controlled by an entity registered in the United States"* and that the Ireland and UK NCPs would act as supporting NCPs.

13. The NCPs coordinated from the beginning and met multiple times to discuss which NCP would be best placed to lead on this complaint. Meetings were also held separately between the Ireland NCP and the Company, and the Ireland NCP, US NCP and the Complainants. In January 2025, the US and Ireland NCPs agreed the Ireland NCP would be best placed to lead on this complaint, with support from the US NCP.
14. The primary reason for this decision is based on the Guidelines which state “*Generally, the NCP of the country in which the issues have arisen would be the lead NCP*”. As the issues raised in the complaint take place in Ireland, which is also stated in the complaint, it is appropriate for the Ireland NCP to take the lead in this instance as it is in the best position to assist the parties find a solution and promote the effective implementation of the Guidelines.
15. In light of the information received from both parties, the Ireland NCP has decided that the complaint merits further consideration and believes that the offer of good offices is an opportunity for the parties to address their differences of opinion regarding the issues raised in the complaint.
16. The Ireland NCP sets out the reasons for this decision in the interests of transparency and accountability. The decision to offer good offices does not determine whether the enterprise has acted consistently or inconsistently with the Guidelines.

Object of the Complaint

17. The Complainants allege that the acquisition by the Parent Company of the Company has resulted in changes in industrial relations, specifically in respect of treatment of three senior employees who are the workers’ elected shop stewards at the Company’s operations in Leixlip, Kildare and Clondalkin, Ireland.
18. The Complainants acknowledge that complaints are generally handled by the NCP of the country where the issues arise, and that the issues arise in Ireland. However, the Complainants request that the US NCP should lead on this case. The reasons set out by the Complainants are as follows:
 - i. the Parent Company is registered in the US
 - ii. the parent company is “*responsible for effective due diligence on consolidated company group activities*”
 - iii. the issues are ultimately controlled by the US headquartered entity.
19. The Complainants allege that workers have been denied the right to form and join trade unions; that the three shop stewards have been discriminated against due to their trade union activity, and that the Company has “*retaliated against legitimate trade union activity*” with the use of court proceedings. In addition, the complaint alleges that the Company has not promoted consultation and cooperation with the workers’ elected representative, nor has it honoured the established standards in national agreements.

20. The Company rejects the allegations made and argues that they have not discriminated against any employee because of their trade union involvement and that they *“formally recognise the role of trade unions, including their right to represent employees and their right to collective bargaining within the sector”*. They state they fully engage in collective bargaining at sectoral level.
21. They contend that the complaint doesn’t contain adequate evidence to support several claims. Further they refer to their commitment to responsible business via their dedicated Responsible Business Framework, which is aligned to the United Nations Sustainable Development Goals and is available on their website, and that they ensure *“compliance with International Labour Organisation (ILO) requirements by adhering to Irish Labour legislation through a combination of legal adherence, internal policies, monitoring, and engagement with regulatory and sectorial employment bodies”*, and list these in their response.
22. The Complainants state that *“workers are covered by a multi-employer collective bargaining agreement and negotiate with the sector employers.”* In their response, the Company emphasised that they have *“for decades recognised and engaged with Trade Unions”* and outlined their engagement with trade unions in collective bargaining as sectoral level, facilitated by the Mechanical Engineering and Building Services Contractors Association (MEBSCA) which is part of the Construction Industry Federation (CIF). The Company state that they are also a member of various other associations, including the Electric Contractors Association (ECA). As per the CIF website, MEBSCA *“represents mechanical contractors who undertake heating, ventilation and air-conditioning (HVAC) works including design, installation, inspection, testing and maintenance”*, and the ECA *“represents electrical contractors operating in the commercial and industrial sectors carrying out electrical works including design, installation, repairs, commissioning and maintenance.”*
23. The Complainants claim that *“the Enterprise refused to honour national agreements for paid travel time”*. The Company, in their response, detailed the engagement to date between Unite and the Company, from the *“2011 Agreement reached between MEBSCA of the Construction Industry Federation which represented the employers in that sector, including Jones Engineering, and the trade unions in the sector, including the Applicants”*. The Ireland NCP understands that the *“2011 Agreement provided that any entitlement to a travel allowance for the first hour of travel would be incorporated into an increased standard hourly rate of pay”*.
24. The Company states that the sectoral employment order (S.I. 2018/59) setting out the pay and pension following the 2011 Agreement was then signed by the then Minister of State at the Department of Business, Enterprise and Innovation.

25. The Company state the in 2019, Unite and Connect, “*served a claim on MEBSCA for both increases in pay and, notwithstanding the terms of the 2011 Agreement, for a separate time travel payment.*” This dispute was not resolved, and the claim was referred to the Workplace Relations Commission (WRC) where “*an agreement was reached on pay, and the parties agreed that the issue of time travel would be referred to the Labour Court for investigation and a recommendation*”. Unite members rejected the Labour Court recommendation of 8th November 2022.¹
26. The Complainants state that the court proceedings centred on workers’ industrial action in March 2023 relating to “*unilateral changes to their working conditions*”, namely the issue of paid travel time. They state that the legal action named the three elected shop stewards even though other workers participated in the industrial action.
27. Regarding the High Court proceedings, the Company argues that the rationale for including the three shop stewards as defendants was because trade unions, under Irish law, are unincorporated associations comprising of their individual members. As such, the defendants were included in the proceedings in their capacity as representatives of the wider group of employees who the company state were acting in breach of contract by participating in the industrial action.
28. However, the Company recognised the impact of the High Court proceedings on the union and its members and successfully applied to the High Court to discontinue the proceedings. The Ireland NCP received confirmation from the Company on 5th June 2025 that the proceedings have been terminated. The Company have agreed to pay the defence costs as a final order in the case, which is subject to adjudication.
29. The Complainants allege the use of intimidation against workers via court proceedings and states that one of the shop stewards “*was approached by two unknown men that appeared at his home on his day off*”. Additionally, the complaint states that one of the shop stewards was reassigned to a different position and shift, which resulted in impairing “*the possibility of negotiations with the authorised workers’ representative*”.
30. In response, the Company argues that the unidentified men were employees of a courier company used by the Company and that the reason for attending the worker’s home was to deliver correspondence relating to non-compliance by the worker with safety training (which is contractually required) and that the company did not have an email address on record for the worker..

¹ [LCR22673 - Workplace Relations Commission](#)

31. Regarding the claim that one of the shop stewards was reassigned, the Company state that workforce planning is the responsibility of site management and that employees are expected to carry out assigned duties which fall under their remit. The Company state that “in this case the Leader was asked to complete tasks that fell under his remit as a plumber/fitter” and that “this has been managed through the company grievance procedure.
32. The Complainants requests the assistance of the NCP to provide a “*cost-effective, non-judicial mediation that could simultaneously resolve the issues in this request and the court process in a manner compatible with the Guidelines*”. The Ireland NCP notes that since the submission of the complaint, the High Court proceedings have been discontinued.
33. The Complainants seek the following outcomes:
- The withdrawal of the court proceedings against the union and the three workers
 - The reimbursement of legal costs for workers
 - The restoration of worker shifts and job duties to what they were before the industrial action
 - Compliance with national construction sector agreements
 - Establishment of a framework to secure workers’ rights in relation to trade union activity
 - The NCP will inform and update other government officials, including other relevant NCPs in Denmark, Sweden, Finland, Germany, Belgium, Switzerland and the Netherlands, which may have an interest in due diligence on these issues

Guidelines provisions cited by the Complainants

Chapter II: General Policies

Enterprises should take fully into account established policies in the countries in which they operate, and consider the views of other stakeholders. In this regard:

A10: Enterprises should “*Refrain from and take steps to prevent the use of reprisals, including by entities with which the enterprise has a business relationship, against any persons or groups that may seek to or do investigate or raise concerns regarding actual or potential adverse impacts associated with the enterprise’s operations, products or services. This includes promoting an environment in which individuals and groups feel safe to raise concerns and, where relevant, contributing to the remediation of adverse impacts of reprisals when they occur*”.

Chapter V: Employment and Industrial Relations

Enterprises should, within the framework of applicable law, regulations and prevailing labour relations and employment practices and applicable international labour standards, avoiding any unlawful employment and industrial relations practices, and in line with due diligence expectations described in Chapters II and IV:

1(a): *“Respect the right of workers to establish or join trade unions and representative organisations of their own choosing, including by avoiding interfering with workers’ choice to establish or join a trade union or representative organisation of their own choosing.”*

1(b): *“Respect the right of workers to have trade unions and representative organisations of their own choosing recognised for the purpose of collective bargaining, and engage in constructive negotiations, either individually or through employers’ associations, with such representatives with a view to reaching agreements on terms and conditions of employment.”*

1(e): *“Be guided throughout their operations by the principle of equality of opportunity and treatment in employment and not discriminate against their workers with respect to employment or occupation on such grounds as race, colour, sex, age, religion, political opinion, national extraction or social origin, persons with disabilities or other status, unless selectivity concerning worker characteristics furthers established governmental policies which specifically promote greater equality of employment opportunity or relates to the inherent requirements of a job.”*

3: *“Promote consultation and co-operation between employers and workers and their representatives through legitimate processes, structures or mechanisms on matters of mutual concern.”*

4(a): *“Observe standards of employment, contractual arrangements and industrial relations throughout their operations.”*

Coordination among NCPs and lead NCP

34. The complaint was submitted to the US and UK NCPs on 5th September 2024. The Ireland NCP did not receive the complaint initially but was made aware of the complaint by the US NCP, and subsequently officially received the complaint on 26th September 2024.

35. The Complainants stated in their submission that it was their preference that the US NCP lead on the complaint, as the *“enterprise is controlled by an entity registered in the United States”* and that the Ireland and UK NCPs would act as supporting NCPs.

36. The Complainants allege that the acquisition by the Parent Company of the Company in 2022 has coincided with a change in industrial relations practices, specifically relating to claims listed above. They also state that that “*parent company is responsible for effective due diligence on consolidated company group activities [...] including its Ireland and UK subsidiaries*”.
37. The NCPs coordinated from the beginning and met initially on 16th September 2024 to discuss the complaint. It was decided at that meeting that the UK NCP should not be lead NCP. This is because the issues arise in Ireland, and the complaint states that the Parent Company, a U.S. company, is understood to have “*substantial control over operations in Ireland*”. As such, either the US NCP or the Ireland NCP would be best placed to lead on the complaint.
38. In response to the complaint, the Company stated that they are best placed to respond to the allegations in the complaint as the members of Unite (who are the focus of the complaint and parallel proceedings), are employees of the Company, not the Parent Company.
39. The Company also confirmed that the Parent Company is the sole shareholder of the Company but does not have any role or responsibility for the day-to-day management of the Company, this is the responsibility of the Company’s management and their board of directors.
40. On 6th January 2025, a videoconference was held between the Complainants and the US and Ireland NCPs to hear the Complainants’ views and their rationale for requesting the US NCP take the lead.
41. On 8th January 2025, the Parent Company informed the US NCP that it is their preference for the Ireland NCP to lead the complaint process.
42. Following further discussions between the NCPs on 24th January 2025, it was agreed that the Ireland NCP would be best placed to lead on this complaint, with the US as the supporting NCP.
43. The primary reason for this decision is based on the Guidelines which state “*Generally, the NCP of the country in which the issues have arisen would be the lead NCP*”. As the issues raised in the complaint take place in Ireland, which is also stated in the complaint, it is appropriate for the Ireland NCP to take the lead in this instance as it was in the best position to assist the parties find a solution and promote the effective implementation of the Guidelines.

The Initial Assessment Process

44. The purpose of the Initial Assessment is to determine if the issues raised in the complaint merit further consideration by the Ireland NCP. It is not intended to be a detailed assessment/fact-finding analysis of the complaint, or a detailed assessment of the Company's rebuttal of the complaint. **It does not determine whether the Company has acted consistently or inconsistently with the Guidelines.**

Ireland NCP Handling Process

6 September 2024	Correspondence received from US NCP with notification of complaint
11 September 2024	The Company enquires if a complaint has been submitted to the IE NCP
16 September 2024	VC held between US, UK and IE NCPs to discuss coordination of complaint.
26 September 2024	Complaint received by IE NCP from Complainants
30 September 2024	NCP emails contact for the Company in the complaint
17 October 2024	Contact in the Company provides contact details of relevant official in HR
21 October 2024	NCP forwards complaint to the Company's Head of Human Resources
29 October 2024	VC held between the Company and IE NCP
5 November 2024	The Company submits further details to IE NCP
7 November 2024	Submission from the Company shared with US NCP
8 November 2024	VC held between US and IE NCPs
8 November 2024	IE NCP emails the Company with update following VC with US NCP, and requests further information
8 November 2024	Further submission received from the Company
12 November 2024	VC held between the Company and IE NCP. Further information requested by IE NCP
5 December 2024	Further information received from the Company and shared with US NCP

10 December 2024	VC held between US and IE NCPs
10 December 2024	IE NCP emails Complainants proposing VC with both IE and US NCPs
3 January 2025	The Company draws NCPs attention to media article regarding the specific instance. Email reply sent to Irish company to clarify queries raised. Copy of correspondence shared with US NCP. VC held between IE NCP and the Company to further clarify claims and correct misinformation in media article
6 January 2025	VC held between US NCP, IE NCP and the Complainants
6 January 2025	IE NCP emails the Company with overview of VC with Complainants and next steps
8 January 2025	IE NCP receives email from US NCP stating that US company has requested the IE NCP be the lead NCP for this case
13 January 2025	US NCP notifies IE NCP that a meeting was held with the US company and requests a meeting to decide which NCP should take the lead in this case
24 January 2025	VC held between IE and US NCP where it was agreed that the IE NCP should take the lead in this case with the US NCP in support
24 January 2025	IE NCP emails parties regarding decision on lead NCP, next steps, requesting VCs with the parties to discuss the process, and inviting submissions. Email shared US NCP who will inform US Company of the decision
27 January 2025	Email shared with UK NCP re decision on who will take the lead
5 February 2025	VC held between IE NCP and the Company
5 February 2025	VC held between IE NCP and Complainants
7 February 2025	Follow up email sent to Complainants and the Company requesting they submit their response to the complaint by 28 th February. Update provided to US NCP via email, requesting that they provide a contact in the US Company or contact them directly to request a response to the complaint. US NCP to email US Company's lawyer.

11 February 2025	Additional information submitted by the Complainants to the IE NCP
27 February 2025	Additional information submitted by the Company to the IE NCP
19 May 2025	Update received from the Company
23 May 2025	Draft Initial Assessment shared with US NCP
29 May 2025	Further update received from the Company
5 June 2025	The Company informed the IE NCP that the High Court proceedings had been terminated
20 June 2025	The IE NCP issues the draft Initial Assessment to the parties
27 June 2025	Comments regarding the draft Initial Assessment submitted by the Complainants to the IE NCP
4 July 2025	The IE NCP meets the Complainants to discuss the draft Initial Assessment and next steps
4 July 2025	Comments regarding the draft Initial Assessment submitted by the Company to the IE NCP
23 July 2025	The IE NCP meets the Company to discuss the draft Initial Assessment and next steps
23 July 2025	Updated draft Initial Assessment shared with the parties
5 August 2025	Correspondence received from parties relating to one paragraph in the updated Initial Assessment
13 August 2025	The IE NCP publishes its Initial Assessment

45. There were delays in processing this specific instance due to the need for coordination between the NCPs who originally received the complaint, and difficulties in acquiring the relevant contact points in the Parent Company to discuss the complaint.

Is the Ireland NCP the right entity to assess the Specific Instance Complaint?

46. As per section above on Coordination among NCPs and lead NCP, it has been determined that the Ireland NCP is the appropriate NCP to address the specific instance.
47. As the Parent Company registered in the US, the Ireland NCP has kept the US NCP informed of developments in the specific instance.

Ireland NCP Decision

48. The Ireland NCP is obliged to set out the reasons for this decision in some detail in the interests of transparency and accountability. The Ireland NCP took the following points into consideration in arriving at this decision:

a) The identity of the party concerned and its interest in the matter

49. The Complainants are a global union federation made up of 351 union members in the building, materials, wood, forestry and related sectors, and its national affiliate which represents the employees at the company subject to this complaint. The Ireland NCP accepts the interest of the Complainant in the matter.

b) Are the issues raised material and substantiated?

50. The Complainants have provided sufficient information to support their complaint for the Ireland NCP to consider that the issues raised are material and substantiated related to the specific provisions of Chapters V (Employment and Industrial Relations) and II (General Policies).
51. The Ireland NCP has taken into account that the Company has provided substantial information countering the claims made in the complaint. The Ireland NCP also notes that the High Court proceedings against the shop stewards have been terminated. However, given the difference of views outlined by the parties to the complaint, the Ireland NCP considers that further consideration of the complaint could contribute to a resolution of the issues raised, thereby furthering the effectiveness of the Guidelines.

c) Is the enterprise covered by the Guidelines?

52. The Parent Company operates as an investment holding company which invests in private equity, venture capital, real estate, energy, and operating companies, including in the UK and Ireland. The Company is incorporated in Ireland and employs over 4,500 people from 56 nationalities across 19 countries. The sectors in which the Company operates are data centres, semiconductors, pharmaceutical, life sciences, energy, healthcare and commercial offices, with projects delivered both in Ireland and internationally. Therefore, the Parent Company and the Company are covered by the Guidelines.

d) Is there a link between the activities of the enterprise and the issues raised?

53. The complaint concerns industrial relations with employees at the Company's facilities. There is therefore a clear link between the Company's activities and the issues raised.

e) Do applicable laws or parallel proceedings limit the NCP's ability to contribute to the resolution of the issue or the implementation of the Guidelines?

54. The Construction Industry Federation (CIF) and its Associations, namely the Mechanical Engineering & Building Services Contractors Association (MEBSCA), "*engage in collective bargaining with the construction trade unions on pay, pensions, sick pay, and general conditions of employment.*"² The Company is a member of the CIF and engages through sectoral collective bargaining procedures with the two trade unions working in the mechanical sector (Unite the Union and Connect Trade Union) through MEBSCA. As per the CIF Industrial Relations Framework in the Mechanical Engineering & Electrical Contracting Sectors, "*where direct negotiations fail to resolve an issue, the practice in the sector is for the issue to be referred to the WRC,*" (Workplace Relations Commission). The Ireland NCP is aware that Unite and the CIF are currently involved in a WRC process to attempt to resolve the dispute.
55. While the constitutional and legal position in Ireland does not oblige enterprises to engage in collective bargaining, neither does it prevent them from engaging in collective bargaining. Irish law has gone to considerable lengths to support and facilitate collective bargaining. The Industrial Relations (Amendment) Act 2015 ("the 2015 Act") enhances collective bargaining in workplaces and provides for registered employment agreements (REAs) and sectoral employment orders (SEOs).
56. The 2015 Act sets out a mechanism to allow a trade union, in the event of a claim for disparity in terms and conditions of employment, to bring a claim before the Labour Court on behalf of workers, even where the union is not recognised by the employer.
57. A trade union representing workers in a particular sector can request the Labour Court to examine the terms of their remuneration, sick pay and/or pension scheme. An SEO is made following a recommendation from the Labour Court on pay, pension or sick pay scheme for workers in a particular sector and once signed by the Minister for Enterprise, Trade and Employment, the Labour Court's recommendations become law.

² CIF Industrial Relations Framework in the Mechanical Engineering & Electrical Contracting Sectors – document submitted by the Company as part of their submission

58. S.I. No. 207/2023 - Sectoral Employment Order (Construction Sector) 2023³ commenced on the 18 September 2023. A new SEO for the Construction Sector⁴ was signed by the Minister on the 7 November 2024. This is an amendment of SI 234 of 2019 as amended by S.I. 598 of 2021 and S.I. 207 of 2023. The amendment sets new pay, pension, and sick pay rates in the sector from 1 August 2025.
59. The Ireland NCP considers that the SEOs are not an obstacle to accepting the submission for further examination, and that an offer of good offices could:
- i. make a positive contribution to the resolution of the issues raised and the implementation of the Guidelines, and
 - ii. would not create serious prejudice for either of the parties involved in these other proceedings.
- f) Whether the consideration of the Specific Instance contributes to the purpose and effectiveness of the Guidelines*
60. The Ireland NCP has considered the information provided and notes that the Company has provided substantial information countering the claims made in the complaint. Given the difference of views outlined by the parties to the complaint, the Ireland NCP considers that offering the good offices could facilitate an exchange between the parties to help come to a resolution, thereby furthering the effectiveness of the Guidelines.

Next Steps

61. The Ireland NCP accepts this complaint for further consideration and offers its good offices to the parties, i.e. the Parent Company, the Company, and the Complainants. The Ireland NCP good offices facilitate dialogue by bringing the parties together in a non-adversarial and good faith manner to discuss the issues raised and help them find an agreement on these issues.
62. The Ireland NCP will formally ask both parties whether they are willing to engage in a mediation process, with the aim of agreeing how the issues identified can be successfully addressed.

³ [S.I. No. 207/2023 - Sectoral Employment Order \(Construction Sector\) 2023](#)

⁴ [S.I. No. 620/2024 - Sectoral Employment Order \(Construction Sector\) 2024](#)

63. In any event, the Ireland NCP will publish a Final Statement. If the parties find a resolution to the issues raised, this will be reflected in the Final Statement. If no agreement can be reached as a result of the good offices or a party declines the good offices, the Ireland NCP will conduct an examination of the complaint the issues and make recommendations as appropriate in line with the Guidelines.

ENDS

**Ireland National Contact Point
OECD Guidelines for Multinational Enterprises
Department of Enterprise, Tourism and Employment**