

# **The Asia Health and Safety Training Project – Training Activists in Indonesia**

**June 2000 and February 2002**

Final Report  
(March 19, 2003)

- **Executive Summary**

**1. Background**

**2. Project Organization**

**3. Developing and Conducting the Training**

**4. Establishing Plant Health and Safety Committees**

**5. Key Obstacles and Initial Responses**

**6. Future Plans**

**7. Conclusions**

- **Appendices**

## **Executive Summary**

This report describes a health and safety training project undertaken in Indonesia, beginning in late 1999. The goal of the project was to build the capacity of local unions and non-governmental organizations (NGOs) in Indonesia to identify, evaluate and correct workplace health and safety hazards. The project was a partnership between the Maquiladora Health and Safety Support Network (MHSSN), the Labor Occupational Health Program (LOHP) at the University of California at Berkeley, and Dara O'Rourke, at that time a professor at the Massachusetts Institute of Technology (MIT) and now at UC Berkeley. All of the local work in Indonesia was developed in partnership with Lembaga Informasi Perburuhan Semarak, the Labour Information Center (LIPS). LIPS is a labor rights organization based in Bogor, Indonesia, which conducts research and training, and collects information and documentation on a variety of labor rights issues.

The project lasted over two years, and included a formal needs assessment process with stakeholders before and after the first training workshop, curriculum development, two four-day training workshops, and follow-up evaluation.

The first training took place in June 2000 in Jakarta, and involved 32 Indonesian labor and community activists from fourteen leading NGOs and trade unions. The intent was that the participating organizations themselves would decide how to use the information in the training. Participants could apply to become an "independent monitor" in one of the various monitoring systems; to become more informed and skilled "monitors of the monitors;" and/or to better integrate health and safety issues into their ongoing national organizing and international solidarity campaigns.

The training was designed to be participatory and interactive, with the goal of involving participants in an action-based learning process. Topics were presented in the classroom using a range of participatory training methods, including small group exercises, role playing, games, and visual demonstrations, that involved participants in seeing, hearing, applying and evaluating the information. The third day of the training was spent in a field exercise at the 7,800-worker Pratama sports shoe factory in Tangerang, Indonesia, which produced shoes for Nike, Inc. During the plant walk-around, participants interviewed workers and supervisors, monitored noise levels, evaluated ergonomic problems, checked electrical hazards, and used smoke tubes to evaluate ventilation systems. The five-person training team included instructors from LOHP, MHSSN, MIT, and a locally-based Australian health and safety specialist.

A follow-up survey and evaluation meeting were conducted with participants in March 2001, to whether organizations had used the information from the training, and to find out what information should be included in the follow-up training.

A second four-day workshop was held in February 2002. Twenty-four participants from nine labor unions and six NGOs attended the training. Of these, nine participants from six organizations had attended the June 2000 training, including four staff members from LIPS. This training was designed based on the input from the March 2001 survey and discussion group. The primary goal of the training was to build participants' training and campaign planning skills. The training also included some review of basic health and safety issues, both because the initial training had taken place 18 months earlier, and because several organizations indicated that they were sending new staff to the event. The schedule consisted of two days of sessions on effective training techniques, a third day in which participants conducted trainings of their own with other members of their organizations who came to the training center, and a fourth day of evaluation and action planning. In addition, during the afternoon of the third day, a seminar on Indonesian and interanational occupational safety and health resources was held, which included training participants as well as other NGOs and resource organizations.

Based on the follow-up evaluation, the majority of participants have reported that they were able to integrate health and safety information into their work in some way, even after a single four-day training. One significant example is an 80-page booklet on health and safety in Indonesian produced and distributed by the SBSI union. The booklet was an adaptation of sections of the health and safety training manual, and was printed twice for a total of 15,000 copies distributed to SBSI members.

Both the training manual and the SBSI booklet collected key workplace health and safety information and concepts in one accessible location, and placed this knowledge into the hands of leading organizations and their worker members. The training also raised the profile of workplace health and safety issues in the participating organizations and laid the basis for future activities. After both trainings, key recommendations from the group focused on the need for more frequent training, more in-depth training, and more time spent on health and safety training.

This capacity-building health and safety training and follow-up was a first in many ways. It was the first intensive health and safety training for almost all of the Indonesian participants, and, for many, the first time they were able to spend an extended period of time with activists from other, sometimes rival, labor unions and NGOs. It was the first time a group of labor activists had been given access to a production plant operating for a US-based multinational for a training exercise. The seminar held in February 2002 was the first time in Indonesia that local health and safety resource people came together to present their available resources to labor and NGO worker advocates.

This work in Indonesia has created an effective, replicable model for building the capacity of unions and NGOs in developing countries to effectively analyze and address workplace health and safety issues. The workshops confirmed that interactive, participatory training techniques are equally effective in international settings, and that NGOs and labor unions will make use of well-designed health and safety education materials, if they are made available.

Trainings of this type are also important for building relationships and links between organizations within the country and within the global economy. The partnership between the trainers from the United States and Australia and the LIPS staff and consultants in Indonesia made for a successful set of trainings, and has laid the groundwork for future activities. The shared experiences of the Indonesian organizations of this training can be a bridge for common activity around health and safety issues when these come to the fore in the future.

Finally, these trainings showed that it is possible for local unions and NGOs to gain the knowledge, skills and experience necessary for them to play a leading role in evaluating, publicizing and improving working conditions in factories operated by national and international companies.

The group of four Indonesian union activists brought a colorful map displaying the different workplace hazards they'd observed while carrying out a five hour inspection at a local shoe factory. Over the last three days, they'd been taught how to identify, evaluate and reduce workplace hazards in an action-based health and safety training. Hotlan began their report by highlighting the noise and ergonomic hazards in the hot press area where the soles of shoes are made. "The laborers don't know the limits of noise--they had never seen a noise monitor and were really interested that we could show them how much noise they were exposed to." Yanti reported on the problems with fire and evacuation "People said they are told what to do during a fire, but we asked the supervisors and there's no written plan." As they moved onto highlighting their recommendations for improving the working conditions, they demonstrated the benefits of training local union activists and community members to be health and safety advocates in a globalized economy.

## **1. Background to the Project**

In the 1990's, media attention and public concern about "sweatshop working conditions" in developing countries led to a proliferation of "codes of conduct" and related monitoring systems, both by individual companies, as well as by organizations such as the United Nations, Amnesty International, the Fair Labor Association and the Workers' Rights Consortium. These codes were designed to set standards for labor practices, including health and safety conditions, in various transnational industries, including sports shoe, toy, and garment manufacturing.

Although workplace monitoring systems have been embraced by some transnational corporations, they have been criticized by labor, human rights, and environmental groups as being incapable of generating accurate and complete audits. However, many of these same groups recognize that genuinely independent monitoring or verification of actual conditions could be an important part of efforts to enforce labor laws and improve working conditions in these factories. Many non-governmental organizations (NGOs) believe that the best "monitors" of shop-floor conditions are workers and local organizations with sufficient training and skills to evaluate these conditions themselves, directly and on an ongoing basis.

This project was conducted precisely to build the capacity of local unions and NGOs in Indonesia to identify, evaluate and correct workplace health and safety hazards. The project was a partnership between the Maquiladora Health and Safety Support Network (MHSSN), the Labor Occupational Health Program (LOHP) at the University of California at Berkeley, and Dara O'Rourke, at that time a professor at the Massachusetts Institute of Technology (MIT) and now at UC Berkeley.

At the time this project started, Indonesia was in the middle of the biggest economic crisis in decades. Thirty-five years of military dictatorship had been brought to an end just the year before when a popular mass movement, including both students and

workers, drove longtime dictator Suharto from power. Many labor unions, worker advocates, and even NGOs previously had to work secretly, in fear of being arrested or killed. Under the new regime, labor unions were just beginning to organize more openly, if not completely without risk. New labor unions and NGOs had formed to advocate for workers, civil rights, women's rights, human rights. It was both an opportune and a challenging time to begin to work with local organizations in Indonesia to build their capacity to address workplace health and safety issues.

## **2. Project Organization**

The Indonesian component of this project was developed in partnership with a local labor information center, Lembaga Informasi Perburuhan Semarang, the Labour Information Center (LIPS). LIPS is a labor rights organization based in Bogor, Indonesia, which conducts research and training, and collects information and documentation on a variety of labor rights issues. Initial needs assessment activities were conducted with support from the International Labor Rights Fund (ILRF), which was also working with LIPS at the time, to conduct a series of training workshops on a variety of labor rights issues.

LIPS consultant Suziani was the local coordinator for the training, and LIPS staff members Iman Rahmana and Achmad Dian all worked as a team to organize recruitment of participants and training logistics. Special recognition and thanks go to Fauzi Abdullah, the head of LIPS and a veteran labor activist, without whom this project would not have gone forward.

Garrett Brown of MHSSN provided the overall coordination of the project, as well as technical health and safety expertise. LOHP health educators Betty Szudy and Diane Bush took the lead in developing needs assessment and training activities, preparing training materials, and coordinating training workshops in June 2000 and February 2002. Dara O'Rourke provided technical expertise in environmental health and other monitoring issues.

The principal funding for the project came from a \$93,000 grant from the MacArthur Foundation to Dara O'Rourke and Garrett Brown to conduct capacity-building trainings on occupational health and safety in Indonesia and China. (A description of the work in southern China is posted on the MHSSN's website at: [www.igc.org/mhssn](http://www.igc.org/mhssn) ).

## **3. Developing and Conducting the June 2000 Training**

### Training Participants

Thirty-two Indonesian labor and community activists from 14 leading non-governmental organizations and trade unions participated in the four-day training. Listed below are the six trade unions and eight NGOs, including groups working on labor, women's and human rights as well as legal service organizations, which attended the training. The Asia

Monitor Resource Center (AMRC) in Hong Kong also sent a staff member to attend the event.

**Labor Unions**

PKU: Paguyuban Karyo Utomo  
SBJ: Serikat Buruh Jabotabek  
SBSI: Serikat Buruh Sejahtera Indonesia  
ABGETeks: Assosiasi Buruh Garment dan Tekstile  
SPSI: Reformasi Serikat Pekerja Seluruh Indonesia  
GSBI: Gabungan Serikat Buruah Indonesia Depok

**Labor Rights NGOs**

LIPS: Lembaga Informasi Perburuhan Semarak  
PMBB: Pelayanan Masyarakat Buruh Banten  
SISBIKUM: Yayasan Saluran Informasi Sosial dan Bimbingan Hukum  
ISJ: Institute Sosial Jakarta  
LEC: Labor Education Center  
AMRC: Asia Monitor Resource Center (Hong Kong)  
YBP: Yayasan Bakti Pertiwi

**Legal Services NGOs**

LBH Jakarta: Lembaga Bantuan Kukum  
LBH-APIK: Lembaga Bantaun Hukum Asosiasi Perempuan Indonesia untuk Keadilan

Needs Assessment

In September 1999, ILRF Deputy Director Bama Athreya and Garrett Brown met with staff from eight different trade unions and labor rights NGOs in Jakarta, including LIPS, to discuss the proposed project, to assess their interest in participating, and to identify potential local partners. LIPS agreed to serve as the local coordinator. Betty Szudy and Garrett Brown returned to Jakarta in February 2000, to meet with other local NGO and union staff, to find out more about their current work in health and safety, and what information and skills they would most like to have included in the training. Seventeen people from twelve organizations participated in the two-hour meeting. Participants were interested in strengthening their training programs for workers or labor advocates. There were particularly interested in learning how to do health and safety walkthroughs and effective interviews with workers, as well as in increasing their knowledge on specific health and safety issues, including chemical exposure, noise, and ergonomics.

Training Schedule and Approach

The results of the focus group meeting and written needs assessment were incorporated into the design and development of the four-day (32 hour) training and curriculum. (See Appendix 1 for training agenda.)

The intent of the training was that the participating organizations themselves would decide how to use the information in the training. Participants could apply to become an “independent monitor” in one of the various monitoring systems; to become more informed and skilled “monitors of the monitors;” and/or to better integrate health and

safety issues into their ongoing national organizing and international solidarity campaigns.

The training was designed to be participatory and interactive, with the goal of involving participants in an action-based learning process. Topics were presented in the classroom using a range of participatory training methods, including small group exercises, role playing, games, and visual demonstrations, that involved participants in seeing, hearing, applying and evaluating the information. Training exercises over the first two days included a “hazard hunt” to practice using industrial hygiene equipment, learning about specific chemical hazards by deciphering “Material Safety Data Sheets” and by marking T-shirts with drawings of target organs (liver, lungs, kidneys, etc.) to show the short-term and long-term effects of chemical exposures.

The third day of the training was spent in a field exercise at the 7,800-worker Pratama sports shoe factory in Tangerang, Indonesia. Pratama is operated by a Korean corporation and, at the time of the training, produced more than 600,000 pairs of shoes a month for Nike, Inc. During the plant walk-around, participants interviewed workers and supervisors, monitored noise levels, evaluated ergonomic problems, checked electrical hazards, and used smoke tubes to evaluate ventilation systems. Later, participants drew “risk maps” of the plant showing the location of the hazards, and offered their assessment of the hazards and what control measures should be implemented.

Fifteen managers from Pratama (the Korean contractor) and four other Jakarta-area plants producing for Nike took advantage of the opportunity to participate in the field-day exercises. They formed their own inspection group, in addition to the three groups of NGO/union participants, which rotated through four departments of the huge shoe factory during the day.

Special recognition and thanks goes to the managements of Pratama and Nike for granting training participants access to the facility.

The five-person training team included Betty Szudy and Diane Bush from LOHP, Garrett Brown from MHSSN, Dara O’Rourke from MIT, and Melody Kemp, an Australian health and safety specialist who lived in Indonesia at the time of the training.

The language of instruction was Bahasa Indonesia. Instructors speaking in English were translated by a rotating team of three Indonesian interpreters while making presentations. The training was held at the PKBI family planning education center in Jakarta, where participants and trainers also stayed and took their meals throughout the training.

### Training Curriculum

The training outline and accompanying training manual were developed by LOHP and MHSSN and drew on a number of existing health and safety publications including the International Labor Organization series “*Your Health and Safety at Work.*” The training manual was designed to be easy to read, with simple definitions of key health and safety

topics, and numerous pictures that helped illustrate the text. The 225-page training manual was first developed in English and then translated into Bahasa Indonesia. It included a table of contents and 12 sections on different health and safety topics:

- Identifying and Controlling Hazards
- Chemical Hazards
- Noise
- Ergonomics (the design of work)
- Personal Protective Equipment
- Safety Hazards and Emergency Response
- Reproductive Hazards
- Stress/Harassment
- Workers' Rights
- Tools for Collecting Information
- Problem Solving and Taking Action
- Taking It Back: Teaching Others

#### Self-Assessment Survey and Evaluation

Training participants were asked to fill out a short self-assessment tool at the end of the four-day workshop, in which they were asked to assess their knowledge or skill-level in nine areas, and also whether they had acquired this information or skill at this particular training (see Appendix 2 for a copy of the assessment tool).

Participants expressed the greatest confidence in the following areas: where to get health and safety information; describing instruments that can be used to measure health and safety problems; knowing what questions to ask workers and supervisors to find out about health and safety problems at a shoe factory; and describing approaches or steps to take in working to solve a health and safety problem.

Participants expressed the least confidence about their knowledge of specific health and safety hazards. However, for most participants, this was the first training they had had on health and safety.

Training participants were also asked to give feedback about the topics, activities, methods and usefulness of the training itself. They found the factory inspection and on-site practice to be the most useful part of the training, followed by the demonstration of a variety of different training techniques which they could use to share this information with their members and communities.

The field day at the Pratama plant was the source of an hour-long debate on the morning of the fourth day, facilitated by Fauzi Abdullah, over whether participants were politically compromised by making a pre-arranged visit to a Nike facility. There was agreement, however, that the visit was a very useful learning exercise.



Participants were uniformly enthusiastic about the participatory training methods, and the opportunities to talk with instructors (through translators) at lunch and during breaks. Ninety percent of the participants said in their written evaluations that they definitely would like to participate in a follow-up training, especially if it provided more overall health and safety information.

Follow-up Assessment -- January - March 2001

Six months after training, participants were asked to complete a written survey in January 2001, and, if possible, attend a focus group discussion to assess whether and how the information from the June 2000 training was used, and what participants would like to see covered in a follow-up training.

Nineteen participants completed the written survey. (See Appendix 3 for a copy of the survey.) When asked “Which of the following have ended up being most useful to you?” participants most frequently chose the factory visit (13 participants), the hands-on practice with monitoring equipment (13 participants), and learning about health and safety laws and standards (12 participants). All but one respondent reported having at least held informal discussions with workers or community members about a health and safety problem, and the majority reported studying health and safety issues further; almost a third had actively tried to solve a health and safety problem.

The most common reason respondents gave for not having used the health and safety information more actively was that they needed more training or information, or that they were doing different work where workplace health and safety was no longer directly relevant. Participants wanted the follow-up training to cover techniques for training, approaches to controlling or eliminating hazards, reproductive hazards, and planning a campaign to solve a health and safety problem.

The following two tables summarize the January 2001 survey results regarding how participants have used information from the training.

<b>Since the Training, respondents had the opportunity to:</b>	<b>Number</b>
• Hold informal discussion with workers or community members about a health and safety problem	18
• Study health and safety issues further	11
• Try to solve a health and safety problem	6
• Share written health and safety materials with others	6
• Conduct a training session about a health and safety topic (topics: Labor accident at the factory; introduction to health and safety)	5

<b>Reasons I haven't used the health and safety information:</b>	<b>Number</b>
• I need more training or information	9
• I'm doing different work now	5
• There hasn't been an opportunity yet, but I plan to use it in the future	4
• For labor, health and safety is a new issue. Wages are still most	2

important.	
• There are no opportunities.	1
• It's difficult to plan activities outside of the factory	1
• The main goal of our organization is legal aid.	1

In March 2001, Garrett Brown and Betty Szudy returned to Indonesia to meet with participants and discuss the survey results. The focus group discussion included 19 individuals from 10 organizations, 12 of whom had attended the June 2000 training.

Participants confirmed and clarified the results of the written survey. In particular, participants emphasized that health and safety issues are always overshadowed by wage issues, which makes it difficult to make health and safety a priority in labor rights and labor organizing work. They were particularly interested in further developing their training skills, and their ability to plan a campaign around health and safety issues.

#### 4. Conducting the Follow-up Training in February 2002

##### Training Participants

Twenty-four participants from nine labor unions and six NGOs attended the four-day training, from February 4-7, 2002. Of these, nine participants from six organizations had attended the June 2000 training, including four staff members from LIPS, although initially 16 participants from the June training had signed up to attend. At the time of the training, Jakarta was experiencing the worst flooding in more than a decade, and 10 of the registered participants were unable to attend because of this. Nonetheless, participants came from the cities of Bandung, Bogor, Serang and Tangerang, as well as Jakarta, and the two staff from AMRC came from Hong Kong.

The table below lists the organizations which participated in the February 2002 training.

<p><b>Labor Unions</b>          PKU: Paguyuban Karyo Utomo          SBJ: Serikat Buruh Jabotabek          SBSI: Serikat Buruh Sejahtera Indonesia          ABGETeks: Assosiasi Buruh Garment dan Tekstile          SPSI Reformasi: Serikat Pekerja Seluruh Indonesia          GSBI: Gabungan Serikat Buruuh Indonesia Depok          PBI: Perstuan Buruh Indonesia          SPTSK: Garment workers union          GSBM</p> <p><b>Labor Rights NGOs</b>          LIPS: Lembaga Informasi Perburuhan Semarak          IPJ: Institut Perburuhan Jakarta          LEC: Labor Education Center          AMRC: Asia Monitor Resource Center (Hong Kong)          ACILS: American Center for International Labor Solidarity</p>
--

## **Legal Services NGOs**

LBH-APIK: Lembaga Bantaun Hukum Asosiasi Perempuan Indonesia untuk Keadilan

### Training Schedule

A four-day follow-up training was designed based on the input from the written survey and the discussion group described above. The training was designed as a follow-up for participants in the June 2000 training, but with some review of basic health and safety issues, both because the initial training had taken place 18 months earlier, and because several organizations indicated that they were sending new staff to the event. Since the training was designed in particular to build participants' training skills, the schedule did not include another factory walkthrough. (See Appendix 4 for a copy of the goals and training agenda.)

The schedule consisted of two days of sessions on effective training techniques, a third day in which participants conducted trainings of their own with members of their organizations who came to the training center, and a fourth day of evaluation and action planning.

During the second day, participants from SBSI, IPJ and SPSI-Reformasi each prepared a two-hour training, with help from other participants and technical assistance from the training team, to be presented to members of their organizations who were to come on the third day for a morning session. Because of the widespread flooding in Jakarta, only a small number of outside participants were able to make it to the PKBI family planning education center where the training was again held. Nonetheless, two-hour sessions were conducted on reproductive health by the IPJ participants, on chemical hazards by SPSI-Reformasi participants, and general health and safety concepts by the SBSI participants.

During the afternoon of the third day, a seminar on Indonesian and international occupational safety and health resources was held, which included training participants as well as other NGOs and resource organizations. The goal of the seminar was to help training participants make contacts with local and regional organizations that could provide human and technical resources for occupational safety and health activities by unions and community-based organizations throughout Indonesia.

Speakers at the seminar included Fauzi Abdullah of LIPS; Verdi Yusuf and Indah Susanti of the Jakarta office of the International Labor Organization (ILO); Willy Leba of the American Center for International Labor Solidarity (ACILS); Dr. F Handoyo of the Indonesian Association of Occupational Health and Safety; Sanjiv Pandita of the Asia Monitor Resource Center (AMRC); Betty Szudy of LOHP, who presented slides of the August 2001 training in China; and Agatha Schmaedick of the Workers Rights Consortium (WRC), a U.S. organization which was conducting an investigation of a factory in the Jakarta area which produced clothing for U.S. universities.

The fourth day was devoted to evaluation and action planning for activities to follow-up the 2000 and 2002 trainings. One proposal emerging from the discussion was to form an

ongoing “forum” on occupational safety and health which would periodically bring together the participants of the two trainings, and other interested organizations, to exchange experiences, materials and resources, and to explore the possibilities of joint trainings and other activities. Also suggested was the creation of an electronic list serve of participants and others to share experiences and suggestions on occupational safety and health activities in Indonesia.

February 2002 participants also received an updated version of the training manual in Bahasa Indonesia developed for the June 2000 training.

The event was again coordinated locally by LIPS. The training team included lead trainers Betty Szudy and Diane Bush of LOHP, and MHSSN Coordinator Garrett Brown. Several participants from the June 2000 training and Sanjiv Pandita of AMRC also assisted in presenting several of the review activities, including hazard mapping and presenting information using “target organ T-shirts.”

As in the June 2000 training, the language of instruction was Bahasa Indonesia. Instructors speaking in English were translated by a rotating team of three Indonesian interpreters while making presentations.

### Evaluation

Training participants were asked to fill out the same knowledge assessment worksheet on the first day of the four-day training, and again at the end of the training (15 participants filled out the “pre” survey, and 19 filled out the “post” survey). The surveys showed a significant increase in knowledge and problem-solving skills as a result of the training.

Prior to the training, 33% of participants (and only 20% of the “new” participants) felt sure that they could name at least six types of workplace health and safety hazards. By the end of the training this had doubled to 68%. Prior to the training, only 6% felt sure that they could plan and lead a one-hour health and safety workshop, using participatory methods. By the end of the training, 47% felt sure that they could conduct such a training.

Training participants were also asked to give feedback about the activities and usefulness of the training, from their perspectives. Participants felt that the demonstration and practice of different training methods was by the far the most useful. “New” participants were frustrated at how quickly the basic health and safety information was reviewed, and participants from the June 2000 training wished there had been another factory walkthrough as part of the training. Several commented that they would like more of this type of training (every year, or more often). Many felt that much more time per training was needed.

## **5. Summary of Results**

No systematic survey of participants has been done since the project ended in February 2002. But it was clear from the March 2001 survey, and from discussions with the February 2002 participants, that the majority of participants have been able to integrate health and safety information into their work in some way, even after a single four-day training.

One significant example of the immediate returns of the training is an 80-page booklet on health and safety in Indonesian produced and distributed by the SBSI union. The booklet was an adaptation of sections of the health and safety training manual, and was printed twice for a total of 15,000 copies distributed to SBSI members. The Jakarta office of the International Labor Organization (ILO) also utilized the training materials in their work with local health department staff and outreach to employers.

Both the training manual and the SBSI booklet collected key workplace health and safety information and concepts in one accessible location, and placed this knowledge into the hands of leading organizations and their worker members. The training also raised the profile of workplace health and safety issues in the participating organizations and laid the basis for future activities.

There were several challenges in conducting the two trainings. Collecting information on Indonesia's sparse health and safety laws and evaluating how to use them in the context of near-total non-enforcement was difficult.

It was also challenging to work in translation. Although many of the participants spoke English, and one of the trainers spoke Indonesian, much of the training took longer because of the need for translation, and it was harder to have follow-up conversations with participants. It took longer to build trust between the trainers and participants. Differing political perspectives combined with the new political situation in Indonesia contributed to a certain wariness between participants, and between participants and trainers, as reflected in the debate about the Pratama plant visit.

Despite these challenges, or perhaps in part because of them, participants were enthusiastic about the training, especially after the first training. Most were quite clear, both after the first training and during the nine-month follow-up discussion, that it would be difficult for them to make health and safety the top priority in their work. Earning a livable wage is still not a reality for many Indonesia workers, and that issue will continue to be the top priority for labor advocates.

Nonetheless, participants were anxious to get more training, so that they could feel more competent on health and safety issues, and felt that they could find ways to integrate health and safety information into their work, even if it didn't become the top priority. After both trainings, key recommendations from the group focused on the need for more frequent training, more in-depth training, and more time spent on health and safety training.

## 6. Conclusions and Lessons Learned

This capacity-building health and safety training and follow-up was a first in many ways.

It was the first intensive health and safety training for almost all of the Indonesian participants, and, for many, the first time they were able to spend an extended period of time with activists from other, sometimes rival, labor unions and NGOs.

It was the first time a group of labor activists had been given access to a production plant operating for a U.S.-based multinational for a training exercise.

The seminar held in February 2002 was the first time in Indonesia that local health and safety resource people came together to present their available resources to labor and NGO worker advocates.

As one participant noted, these trainings were “like planting seeds for the future.” Given the deepening economic and political crisis in Indonesia, workplace health and safety issues are not the top priority for any of the participating organizations, nor for workers facing layoffs and loss of family income. But seeds for future work on occupational safety and health issues took root with many of the participating organizations.

What were the lessons learned, that can help shape future capacity-building training internationally?

1. **Having a well-respected, competent local partner is key.** LIPS is well-respected across a broad spectrum of labor unions and labor-related NGOs and did an excellent job organizing all of the local logistics.
2. **Having adequate funding to conduct a thorough needs assessment, including meeting with people in advance is very important.**
3. **Having skilled translators is essential.** Neither workshop would have been the success it was without the skill and flexibility of the excellent interpreters.
4. **Staying on site was key to the success of the training workshop.** It allowed trainers and participants to spend time and socialize together, which helped build the trust that was necessary to make the training successful. It also provided more time and flexibility as trainers could provide extra help in the evening or discuss issues in more detail.
5. **The training methods demonstrated and practiced were often as important as the content presented.** Participants were very eager to learn new games and participatory activities that they could use with their own members or communities.

6. **Participants were able to learn and use technical information, even after a short, four-day training.** Although most participants had little or no health and safety background, they were able to learn how to use and demonstrate the use of monitoring equipment such as noise monitors, electrical current detectors, and ventilation testing equipment.
7. **It is critical to be flexible with the schedule and the activities.** During the June 2000 training, the entire agenda for the fourth day was changed, given the need to have a discussion of the politics of visiting the Pratama plant. The training could not have proceeded without that discussion. During the February training, once it became clear that many of the participants were new, the training agenda should have been shifted even more, to provide more basic health and safety background.

This work in Indonesia, even with its challenges, has created an effective, replicable model for building the capacity of unions and NGOS in developing countries to effectively analyze and address workplace health and safety issues. The workshops confirmed that interactive, participatory training techniques are equally effective in international settings, and that NGOs and labor unions will make use of well-designed health and safety education materials, if they are made available. Efforts like this are worth the time and energy put into organizing them.

Trainings of this type are also important for building relationships and links between organizations within the country and within the global economy. The partnership between the trainers from the United States and Australia and the LIPS staff and consultants in Indonesia made for a successful set of trainings, and has laid the groundwork for future activities. The shared experiences of the Indonesian organizations of this training can be a bridge for common activity around health and safety issues when these come to the fore in the future.

Finally, these trainings showed that it is possible for local unions and NGOs to gain the knowledge, skills and experience necessary for them to play a leading role in evaluating, publicizing and improving working conditions in factories operated by national and international companies.

#### **- Appendices to the report**

1. Training Agenda (June 2000)
2. Evaluation tool: Self-Assessment Worksheet (pre and post)
3. Follow-up Survey (January 2001)
4. Training Goals and Agenda (February 2002)