

GoodElectronics 2017 Annual Conference Report

Batam, Indonesia 7-9 October, 2017



Contents

GoodElectronics 2017 Annual Conference	7
Introduction to the Report	7
Opening by GoodElectronics and local hosts FSPMI, Lomenik and LIPS	8
A discussion of the situation in the Indonesian electronics industry	8
Coming together to create a global strategy.....	8
Global trends in Electronics Supply Chain and its implication to workers, unions, communities and environment	9
The growing power and influence of contract manufacturers	9
The consolidation and diversification of contract manufacturers.....	9
What contract manufacturers say about challenges from civil society.	9
The consequences for workers.	11
‘Economic downgrading’ suggests mainstream theories are not working.	11
Country by country trends in the industry, and how workers and civil society actors are responding	12
Country Report Indonesia.....	12
Malaysia Country Report.	12
Thailand Country Report.	13
Philippines Country Report.....	14
Vietnam Country Report.	16
India Country Report.	17
Country Report China.....	17
Country Report Taiwan.....	18
South Korea Country Report.	19
Mexico country report.....	19
USA country report.....	20

Questions and Answers	21
Reflections on the sustainable electronics movement’s strategies for change	23
Organising workers.....	23
The strike.....	24
Cross border campaigns.	24
NGOs negotiating with brands in an environment without democratic unions.....	25
Investor strategies.	25
Public Procurement strategies.....	25
Offering technical support to grassroots groups.....	26
Questions and Answers.	27
GoodElectronics current 5 year programme (2014 – 2018).	28
GoodElectronics Network history and achievements	28
Challenge to the Electronics Industry on Chemicals.	28
Sub granting scheme.....	28
Research achievements during the programme.	29
Reports published.....	29
Round table on mining.....	29
Engagement in MSIs and other initiatives.	29
Successes in organising workers during the programme.....	29
Capacity building and training achievements during the programme so far.	30
Mapping the sustainable electronics landscape.....	31
Questions and Answers	33\
Mid Term Review	34
Introduction to the Mid Term Review	34
Proposals for prioritised demands for the Network	35

Demand Proposal 1 Transparency, accountability and disclosure within supply chains.	35
Demand Proposal 2. Mining and the impact on workers' rights, communities and health.....	36
Demand Proposal 3. Freedom of Association & Precarious work.....	37
Demand proposal 4. Chemical use and its impact on workers/ the environment.....	37
Demand Proposal 5. Living wage.....	38
Demand Proposal 6. Just Transition for workers (after automation)	39
Voting and decisions made.	39
Proposals for prioritised tactics	40
Tactic Proposal 1 Engage with the Clean Electronics Production Network MSI to create industry-wide change on chemicals.....	40
Tactic Proposal 2. Create a Labour Rights Defenders Network - a network to provide solidarity support for labour rights defenders under attack by increasingly authoritarian authorities.....	40
Tactic Proposal 3 A big global public campaign on Olympics 2020, sponsored by Samsung.	41
Tactic Proposal 4 A concerted international campaign, to put pressure on the industry on a certain theme. e.g. chemicals or living wage.....	42
Tactic Proposal 5 Setting up an urgent appeals infrastructure amongst our members, to collectively support workers and member orgs bringing up cases.	42
Tactic Proposal 6 Promoting home country law reform towards the French law model	43
Tactic Proposal 7. Coordinate organising, brand damage and public procurement leverage tools to target brands more effectively.....	43
Tactic Proposal 8 Support a Global Brand Union across key production sites of a brand (like The League for Brand Responsibility)	43
Tactic Proposal 9 Capacity sharing across the Network for grassroots organisations - e.g. on technical chemicals related issues	44
Tactic Proposal 10. Engaging with EICC for cross-industry engagement	44
Tactic Proposal 11. Demonstrating the links between brand business models and factory floor conditions.....	45

Questions and Answers.	46
Voting and decisions made.	46
Structure, sustainability and ways of organising ourselves as a Network	48
Proposal 1. Secretariat Structure..	48
Proposal 2. GE has the same structure and continues to be hosted by SOMO.....	49
Proposal 3. Asian Network hosts. GE moves to being hosted by one of the main Asian Networks.....	50
Questions and Answers.	50
Voting and decisions made.	51
Ways of Organising Proposals	52
Organising Proposal 1 Thematic Working Groups..	52
Organising Proposal 2: Regional Councils.	52
Organising Proposal 3: Functional Working Groups.	52
Organising Proposal 4: Ad-hoc WGs.....	53
Questions and Answers.	53
Ways of Organising Decision.	54
Summary and conclusions	54
Appendix 1 Demands and tactics proposals in full	55
Appendix 2 Votes for Demands Proposals.....	70
Appendix 3 Votes for strategies proposals	71
Appendix 4 Votes for Structure	71
Appendix 5 Structure and ways of organising proposals.....	73
Colophon	76

Abbreviations

AEC ASEAN Economic Community
ASEAN Association of Southeast Asian Nations
CBA Collective Bargaining Agreement
CEPN Clean Electronics Production Network
CoC Code of Conduct
CM Contract Manufacturers
CSO Community Service Organisation
CSR Corporate Social Responsibility
EE Electronics/Electrical goods
EICC Electronics Industry Citizenship Coalition (post-conference changed name to Responsible Business Alliance)
EPZ Economic Processing Zone
FLA Fair Labour Association
FOA Freedom of Association
GE GoodElectronics
GFA Global Framework Agreement
ILO International Labour Organisation
LRDN Labour Rights Defenders Network
MNCs Multinational Corporations
MSI Multi Stakeholder Initiative
OECD Organisations of Economic Cooperation and Development
OHS Occupational Health and Safety
PCB Printed Circuit Boards
FCB Flexible circuits
SEZ Special Economic Zone
TCE Trichloroethylene
TNCs Transnational Corporations
TPP Trans Pacific Partnership
WTO World Trade Organisation

Key:

Q: Question from audience

A: Answer

GoodElectronics 2017 Annual Conference

Introduction to the Report

This is the report on the GoodElectronics Annual Meeting held in Batam, Indonesia on October 7 – 9, 2017. The conference was held at a critical time for the global electronics movement. As the industry experiences enormous growth, it is increasingly to globalising production, using just in time supply chains, and practicing ‘employee free’ forms of precarious labour. Meanwhile, some production countries in the industry face ‘economic downgrading’, with little of the benefits accruing to the country and even less to workers. A rise in authoritarian government, crackdowns on NGOs and unions, and attacks on labour rights defenders is also a part of the current context.

The conference brought together 67 people from unions, NGOs and research institutions, from 14 countries and 45 different organisations, in order to create a strategy as a global network operating in this context. The GoodElectronics network has a vision of a global electronics industry characterised by adherence to the highest international human rights and sustainability standards. The Network is currently more than mid-way through an EC funded five-year programme and has achieved many successes. Yet, in order to develop the Networks influence, and a strategy capable of achieving our vision, the Network commissioned a Mid Term Review. The Review started at the end of July, and was a participatory process which aimed to undertake a participatory process in order to answer the following strategic questions on the future of the Network.

Research Question 1. *Update on what was done and what is still to be done to bring the Action to a good end.*

Research Question 2. *Assess whether GE needs to prioritize specific demands to companies and the electronic industry. (Maintain its broad focus or prioritize specific topics or a specific life-cycle phase).*

Research Question 3. *Prioritize specific activities as a Network? (e.g. research, organizing, capacity building, campaign, urgent appeals, multi-stakeholder initiatives, working with other Networks)*

Research Question 4. *Open up the discussion for Sustainability of the Network: Prioritise the financial sustainability of the project, discuss options for the structure and legal status of the network and possibilities for the creation of a network Secretariat, as well as consider the development of a multi-annual strategic plan.*

This paper is a record for the Network of the conference, the discussions and decisions made collectively there. It also discusses the answers the Network came to on those four key questions. It includes all the proposals that were made to our Mid Term Review, and the proposals that were chosen. Finally, it includes lists of which organisations in our Network are interested in taking different proposals forwards.

Opening by GoodElectronics and local hosts FSPMI, Lomenik and LIPS

A discussion of the situation in the Indonesian electronics industry. Judy Winarno (chair of the Electronics Sector of FSPMI: Federation of Indonesia Metalworker's Union) welcomed participants to the event – on the industrial island of Batam. The workers are facing struggles here. He talked through the FSPMI strategy, including both lobbying government and organising. He discussed the demonstrations happening across Indonesia on the same day – including Batam, for the UN Day of Decent Work.

Eduard P. Marpaung (Lomenik Central Board) also introduced the event, saying: ‘for the coming 3 days we will discuss the global electronics situation. We welcome participants to Indonesia. It’s a very rich country. We have 17,000 islands, Batam was a small isolated island, with only a population of 10,000. Now there are 3 million people living here! Since 1990 we’ve had a great deal of investment globally, the majority from Singapore. The island was created by the neighbouring countries as one with great potential. Before 1990 Indonesia was relying on crude oil, gas, and agriculture. Since 1990 the country started experiencing a decline in oil reserves. The country moved to automotive and electronics. The country used to be mainly an exporter of crude oil, now we are both an importer and exporter.’ He explained that ‘in the Indonesian electronics sector the welfare of the workers is a serious problem. The unions in metalwork and electronics are all coming together to try and address this. For example, electronics doesn’t have a sectoral minimum wage. The manufacturers are now seeing electronics full employment, and we are trying to find ways we can negotiate a sectoral minimum wage.’

The issues workers face in Indonesia, he said, are: contractualised workers – taken from Java and other islands for 2 years and then they go back. There is no plan for a better future for them. We need to find ways of negotiating fixed contracts. Women’s issues are also a concern for us. We are also taking action for maternity protections for women.’

Coming together to create a global strategy. Syarif Arifin Executive Director at LIPS also welcomed participants: He said we will discuss the trends, and the situation of workers globally. Said ‘we all use electronics. We need to think of a movement, a strategy, to fight for the rights of workers. Batam has been created as a free trade zone. It’s on the Malacca Straights line. A great deal of capital has been accumulated here. Batam is created between 3 countries like a triangle – Singapore, Malaysia, Indonesia. We are like a kitchen. We just cook, but we don’t enjoy the food. The TNCs are eating the food.’ He said that workers have to work in situations in which they face threats to their life every day. Alejandro Gonzalez, the GoodElectronics Coordinator thanked all speakers, saying that GoodElectronics exists to support the highest standards of human and environmental rights. ‘This is an important time for the network. We have brought together a great mix of trade unionists, NGOs and academics. We hope this meeting can contribute to making a difference for workers. This is an important meeting for our Network. We want to reflect on strategy, and together reflect on our goals for the coming years. We will prioritise specific demands, specific strategies, and then decide on the structure, sustainability and ways of organising for the Network.’

Global trends in Electronics Supply Chain and its implication to workers, unions, communities and environment

Our first contributor was Dr. Gale Raj-Reichart of Queen Mary University London, who has been studying the rise of contract manufacturers, and wider issues in labour governance. She presented a paper called **'the changing role of contract manufacturers in the electronics industry global production network: implications for labour conditions and governance'**, based on over 100 interviews with brands, contract manufactures, unions and others. Contract manufacturers in the electronics industry are becoming more important players, she said. They are large, employ the largest amount of workers, and are 'global supply chain facilitators'. She outlined some of the implications that changing business landscape is having on labour conditions and governance. Labour violations are increasingly being exposed amongst contract manufacturers and contract manufacturers are increasingly held responsible for governing labour conditions down supply chains, she said.

Brands now source 80% of their production to contract manufacturers that now sometimes equal them in size. Competition in the industry is fierce. Prices of final products declined 92.3% from 1995 to 2010 and decline at an annual rate of 16% (MAPI Foundation 2012). The global financial crisis also led to further restructuring. Sales of PCs are falling, and profit margins for brands are declining slightly too, leading to brands consolidating their supplier base and outsourcing more, including some design, to first tier manufacturers. In terms of profit margins, Apple, as ever, is the exception to this rule. Profit margins, as has been the case for some years, are declining for contract manufacturers, though their revenues are increasing due to expanding production.

The growing power and influence of contract manufacturers. Contract manufacturers are doing more design, and Gale's interviewees said that they were moving towards more "peer relationships" and "partnerships" with them. Some hinted at contract manufacturers moving into brand space, with one saying, 'It is not a customer-supplier relationship where the brand hands them a contract and says sign it or not. They will come back and say no to certain things. They say they cannot meet orders on the date specified. They have also negotiated on the price. Some of the increased costs have had to do with labour related costs such as recruitment fees.'

The consolidation and diversification of contract manufacturers. These companies, she said, are growing through mergers & acquisitions, and through diversification into automobiles, health, aerospace, footwear and clothing (and in some cases moving out of smartphones & PCs, e.g. Celestica and Flex). Some even talk of getting out of labour-intensive work. They now provide innovative manufacturing, product design, and services, automation and robotics.

What contract manufacturers say about challenges from civil society. Contract manufacturers she interviewed told her that some of the main threats they faced were the forced labour scandal in Malaysia, campaigns targeting government procurement

(particularly in Nordic countries), a range of issues being highlighted in their Chinese production locations: working hours, labour shortage, rising wages, student workers, dispatch workers, worker unrest/rising worker awareness, social insurance payments, and high turn-over. They were also concerned about increasing regulations, NGO and media campaigns, and an increasing trend for reports and campaigns to specifically target contract manufacturers. She noted a number of responses CMs are making, from traditional CSR, to audits, to asking brands for higher payments to pay for violations highlighted by reports.

She highlighted some of the **ongoing contradictions in brand approaches**. CSR department in brands continue to be separated from purchasing/Business Units, leading to contradictory demands – calling on their suppliers to improve, but not paying them enough to do so. CMs are starting to ask brands to pay for labour costs. CMs are the subject of pressures from workers and civil society, and recognise that they are being asked for the impossible by brands. But so far they are failing to realise their collective power/voice, for example through the EICC, which is still largely controlled by brands. She said there is growing disruption and contestation by CMs in the EICC: the dismantling of the working hours group was one example. But brands are still ultimately in control.

At the EICC brands share information on suppliers' labour conditions, e.g. working hours, which of course contradicts their claims to campaigners that supplier confidentiality precludes them from disclosing supplier locations. "Customer/brand is ultimately responsible... to change consumer processes and how products are made" "Brands don't pay CMs to police the supply chain. They own the supply chain. CMs only control 20% of their vendors." (CM3D1, HQ, 2013)

She concluded with some questions. External pressure (from regulations, campaigns, institutional & public consumers) are the most important drivers for labour governance changes she said. But as CMs diversify, and their working conditions become the focus of companies such as Ford and Nike – will there be different outcomes for labour conditions? Finally, as brands diversify away from first generation CMs, will they push second generation of CMs towards better working conditions? Can there be an industry/scalar effect?

Our second contributor was Dr. Rajah Rasiah, from the University of Malaya, who presented a talk entitled '**Failure to Upgrade in the Electronics Industry: Consequences for Labour in Southeast Asia**'. He explained that electronics/electrical (EE) production arrived almost like "manna from heaven" in Southeast Asia in the 1960s and 1970s as export processing zones mushroomed in Singapore, Malaysia and the Philippines, which reduced unemployment and poverty. Electronics exports have remained important in these countries with the industry's importance in Vietnam displacing its significance in Malaysia, Philippines and Thailand. Considerable exports are still generated from these countries and Indonesia and Cambodia. However, his main focus was on the implications of the failure to upgrade in the EE industry on workers.

Mainstream arguments posited that specialization on the basis of factor endowments will offer firms comparative advantage to generate the most optimal output against the most efficient use of inputs (Helleiner, 1973). Hence, TNCs' differentiation of production

organization and its global spread is seen as achieving the above. Governments have, for decades been encouraged to liberalise trade and investment flows, and to guarantee free repatriation of profits so that capital would relocate to offer employment and welfare for labour. Ultimately, according to mainstream economic theory, this process was supposed to lead to 'convergence' between developed and developing economies. As East Asia is so central to the global EE industry, this should have occurred.

However, whether this has occurred he said, was highly dependent on the developmental policy of the governments concerned, leading to considerable differences in outcomes for the East Asian countries concerned. Through effective leveraging Singapore has managed upgrade to the high value added activities: designing, R&D and wafer fabrication. Although wafer fabrication has arrived in Malaysia, production has largely downgraded to shift from ICs to PCBs, FCBs and other low end activities despite government initiatives taken to stimulate upgrading. Vietnam is rapidly expanding production, particularly in telecommunications and chip assembly industries. Lower wages has attracted relocation from Japan, South Korea, Malaysia, Philippines and China. Indonesian exports have remained in consumer electronics and low end PCB and FCB assemblies. And Cambodia has begun exports of EE appliances but in low wage activities. So the countries are facing increasingly varied outcomes.

The consequences for workers. Again, Rajah said, it depends very much on the country and on the policies of their governments in particular. A heavy shift towards capital-intensive production and robotization has reduced employment numbers in the EE industry overall. Remaining workers have continued to enjoy high wages in Singapore (real wages grew by 5.1% on average per annum in 2010-15). Tripartism has been successful in Singapore – NTUC/PAP/MNCs/Nfirms. But in the remaining countries he studied, real wages have grown slowly (from 2.1% in Vietnam to 0.3% in Malaysia over the period 2010-15 on average per annum) in the remaining countries owing to a combination of low value added operations and weak unions (see Rasiah, McFarlane and Kuruvilla, 2015) There are large reserves of labour in Vietnam, Philippines, Indonesia, Myanmar and Cambodia, and in Malaysia there are imports of low skilled foreign labour (around 50-70% of workforce in 2016). In these countries a combination of the low technical capabilities of labour, low minimum wage legislations, and the transient nature of production have undermined working conditions and job permanence.

'Economic downgrading' suggests mainstream theories are not working. The EE industry has remained a major export earner in most Southeast Asian countries. However, only Singapore has managed to stimulate tangible upgrading in the industry to ensure that real wages continues to rise significantly over the period 2010-15. Real wages have virtually stagnated in the remaining countries over the period 2010-15. A combination of rising robotization, and increasing knowledge intensity has reduced demand for low skilled labour-intensive in several segments of EE industry. Consequently, countries that have failed to upgrade have stagnated or downgraded to remain in low value added operations, which has resulted in a stagnation in wages. While foreign labour has substituted for national labour to support EE exports from Malaysia and Thailand, large labour reserves have kept wages low to support EE exports from Indonesia, Vietnam, Philippines and Cambodia. Specialization in low value added operations has also increased the vulnerability of workers to cyclical and structural unemployment. Weak unions have not

helped either. Rajah concluded his presentation calling on East Asian governments to address skills, training and education issues to ensure that the slide faced by labour in most Southeast Asian countries can be checked.

Country by country trends in the industry, and how workers and civil society actors are responding

The next session of the first day was made up of the first of two country reports sessions. These country reports were presented by one organization from each country, but with input from other member organisations in that country. Each country report focused on four key questions.

1. *What issues and trends electronics workers and communities are seeing in the country.*
2. *Which key challenges the labour movement is facing.*
3. *What the responses the movement is employing.*
4. *What the role of GE is in supporting that response.*

Not every presentation in the end followed this formula, but most were largely structured along those lines.

Country Report Indonesia. Eduard P. Marpaung (Lomenik Central Board, FSPMI) presented a mixed picture of considerable advances and considerable retreats in Indonesia. He presented a picture of organising and lobbying for regulation. Most electronics companies, he said, are located in Jakarta, Bekasi and Batam. Previously there were about 200 companies, mostly electronics companies. The focus of FSPMI between 2010 and 2017 has been 2010: securing a minimum wage, 2011: organising contract workers, and 2015-2017: minimum wage, the availability of employment social securities, illegal workers and the development of the industrial court.

He said that, in Batam when we have problems, we try to solve them through the Industrial Court which is very difficult. OHS, for example, is a hidden issue that workers may be unaware of. The main issues they face are the availability of employment (high criminality), union busting (and a consequent weak bargaining power) and minimum wages (low buying power). He outlined that industrial diseases are a key problem for workers. Even before hiring workers have to undergo a medical test; many people have illnesses and so they are not hired. Workers face annual medical tests, and workers, largely on contracts, rather than full time employment, are terminated if they fail the medical test. OHS audit results are manipulated to satisfy brands and the government.

He outlined some key challenges to taking action: 1. The education of workers in the need to organise, 2. The need to prohibit killer chemicals, and substitute them for green chemicals, 3. Reform of working practices and 4. Companies not disclosing information.

Malaysia Country Report. Saharuddin Adnan (EIEU Western Region) discussed the key issues that workers are currently facing in the country, again focusing on organising and collective bargaining as key concerns. Precarity is also a problem. Around 30% of the

workforce is composed of precarious workers, he said, including local and migrant workers. They are not directly employed and therefore not eligible to join the union. Wages are kept low and working hours are long. The overtime hours that are allowed by law is 104 hours a month, which is the highest in the world. Day care facilities are not available, preventing women's participation in the labour force (women's participation rate is 52%). Finally he said that other challenges include a lack of motivation, the absence of skills and knowledge in building a strong union, and government and employer repression.

Saharuddin also introduced unions' current action plan. This focuses on education in union building, collective bargaining where possible, lobbying for labour law reform, a campaign to eliminate the labour contracting system, and mass actions to highlight all of these issues. He said that civil society plays an important role in this plan, especially the building of relationships with NGOs, academics and parliamentarians. However NGOs are facing a shrinking political space, he said.

Thailand Country Report. Lek Kumnak (GoodElectronics Thailand) introduced the GoodElectronics Thailand network that has been formed during the current EC funded programme. It's members now include Eastern Labor Relation Group (67 union members affiliated such as Sony Labour Union, General Motor Labour Union, Suzuki Labour Union), NXP Manufacturing Workers Union Thailand, Thai Asahi Glass Labour Union, Labour activist (former Thai Labour Campaign), Suthila Luenkam from AROM PONGPA-NGAN Foundation, and a representative from the Workers' Rights Consortium, constituting a powerful alliance. The Network is a coordination centre for members in case of workers' rights violations in the electronics and automotive industries, an education and training centre on labour standards, a connecting centre with international and national organizations, and a network that provides information on electronics labour issues and the electronics movement.

The challenges workers face in Thailand, she said, are considerably worsened by recent political and economic changes under the military rules affecting freedom of assembly, collective bargaining and workers' democracy, giving a recent example of a Suzuki case, which resulted in the dismissal of Bunyuen Sukmai, a GET member. Like others she highlighted the growing amount of precarious work such as student interns/workers, and the outsourcing of workers. Another set of challenges have been recent employment changes, such as longer working hours, and a floating minimum wage rate policy (a change from the flat minimum wage rate of the previous government. Chemicals are also a concern, and the expansion of a Chinese battery production factory in the Eastern Region has affected both workers' health and the community's environment through lead and tin poisoning.

The electronics industry is still a significant source of exports, accounting for 8362.33 million USD in 2017. The ASEAN region is the largest market (18.49%). The second is the US (18.15%) and third is Europe (14.01%). There are, in total, 2342 enterprises in the overall electronics and appliances sector in 2017, 557 of which are electronics enterprises. It is still a major source of employment with a workforce of 745530 in the sector as of December 2016.

Under the military government's 20-year national strategy (2017-2036), the 2017 Constitution and according to 20-year Thai industry development strategy, the Ministry of Industry is planning to reform industrial structure and is planning to develop smart electronics for Thailand 4.0 (an initiative called Innovative Drive Economy). Emphasising, as other members have done throughout the conference, the importance of 'industry 4.0', Lek said that the Thai government views TechSmart devices and robotics mechatronics as a competitive advantage for Thailand 4.0. This presents serious challenges for workers and their conditions. Whereas on the one hand the government aims to re-skill and enhance higher labour skills to support industry 4.0, they also plan more special economic zones and the deregulation of labour protection rules. They want to intensify cooperation with big businesses.

Additional challenges that Thai workers face are: strengthening competency of the labour movement to cope with these new national trends in terms of political and economic knowledge, communications skills, and union administration in a context of economic and political instability. Chemical and environment knowledge is weak among unions. The living wage is the most important demand at the national level. Finally, the justice system and the bureaucratic system/agencies do not respond to labour issues/cases. For example, she said, in the case of General Motors the union could not assemble when going on strike in the industrial estate area. They could not then win by using justice system channels after the strike.

The responses that the GET network are making to these multiple challenges, Lek went on to say, are taking urgent appeals to the wider international Network on behalf of union members. GET has also supported capacity-building for union members in media and communication skills and technical environmental and health issues. The network also aims at the restoration of weakened unions. Union members are now extending the results of previous trainings and struggles by creating new projects for next year such as a research study on precarious work, for example, she said.

Philippines Country Report. Then we heard from the Philippines, and the presenter, Roben Casalda (Center for Trade Union and Human Rights) shared that the country's electronics industry is characterized by the manufacturing of semiconductors (chips, parts) or component parts for both the ICT and automotive sectors, and largely placed at the bottom of the supply chain. It supplies for some of the world's biggest brands, for example Apple, who have chips and components that are manufactured in the Philippines, but then are exported to China for assembly of complete products for exports to other countries.

As the number one product export, the industry has been expanding in terms of number of companies that are based in Special Economic Zones. This means that the industry enjoys the perks and privileges accorded by Philippines Economic Zone Authority and even local government. Primarily, this means serious restrictions on the right to freedom of association. Mining in the Philippines is extractive, export-oriented and TNC dominated, and extracted ore is exported to other countries for processing, while the Philippines imports processed materials and components, etc, he said.

In 2017, a Mining Audit report was released, ordering the closure of 23 mining sites and the

suspension of 5 others by the DENR Sec. Gina Lopez. Additionally, Sec Lopez ordered the cancellation of 75 Mineral Production and Sharing Agreements (MPSA) permits that were located on watershed areas. A nationwide ban on the prospective open-pit was also ordered by DENR. However, she was not in the end confirmed into post, and was swiftly replaced by Roy Cimatu who has a track record of protecting logging companies, the presenter said. 23 environmental activists have been killed. Mostly they are activists who criticize the environmental impacts of large-scale mining operations

The presenter shared serious problems with e-waste. Philippines has become, he said, a legal dumping ground of e-waste from developed countries as they maximized the Administrative order of Dept. of Environment and Natural Resources issued in 2013 allowing for the importation of e-waste from other countries. It also allows other, potentially toxic materials including mobile phones, tablets, TVs etc. Currently, Philippines lacks an e-waste management system. Positively though, he said, governmental bills have recently passed, establishing environmentally sound management of e-waste, banning e-waste importation, and extending the producers legal responsibilities.

Like other country reports, the presenter highlighted serious issues with contractualisation, saying that 70-75% of the workers, particularly women, in the electronics and semiconductor industry are contractuales. This leaves them in a precarious situation, with no job security and dismissed quite easily, and working extended hours, with an average of 3.1 hours overtime, and often without a day off in a week. There are also low levels of unionisation in the industry, partly because of this contractualised workforce, and partly the unwritten “no union, no strike” policy: strictly enforced by both state and corporate sector, especially inside of Special Economic Zones (SEZs) where most of the electronics and semiconductor factories are. Some workers also report cases of forced labour, he added. Finally, the average wage of the workers ranges between Php315-450 depending on the region in which they work, an amount that is around a third to a half of a living wage. A challenge now is that currently, the Philippine Congress is moving towards institutionalizing or legalizing flexible work, in order for business to become more competitive.

The presenter also highlighted serious environmental issues, including that mining companies have caused water contamination in communities which use water for drinking and for their livelihood; biodiversity loss, land grabbing from indigenous people, open-pit mining and the terrible fact that with 23 activists murdered, Philippines is the most dangerous in Asia for environmental defenders.

Responses by trade unions, NGOs, advocates and workers themselves, he said, included organising and capacitating workers in the industry, building and strengthening their unity and sustaining these efforts. This included, practically speaking, education and training of workers, and also mass actions. The role of the GoodElectronics network, he said, was to share information, knowledge and best practices within the Network, but also to provide a venue for coordinated, joint campaigns on local, national, and international levels. This is supplemented by another role, that of pressuring and advocacy at the global level, supplemented by exposing the double standards of brands, and supporting new research on electronics. He also highlighted the need to increase capacity building amongst members, a theme that recurred later in the conference.

Then Jasmine from the Keyrin Struggle made an urgent appeal for financial support. Please consider supporting their appeal in whatever way you can.

Vietnam Country Report. We then heard a fascinating presentation on Vietnam, a crucial country in the evolution of the industry, and a country feted by some to be the 'next China'. Thi Thu Ha Kim (CDI) presented some of the key contextual issues facing the country. Vietnam, she said, has some advantages in terms of labour rights policies: The Constitution (2013), The Labour Law (2012), The Law on Social Insurance (2014), and The Law on OSH (2015), though they are not always enforced. The country has recently 'opened up' and has been actively seeking economic integration into the global and region economy joining the WTO, TPP, AEC and other agreements. FDI is welcome and favoured in Vietnam, especial multi-national corporations, or joint ventures with government. That can mean, she said, that 'big players set the rules' – the biggest of which being Samsung. Vietnam is an unstable economy she said, with economic crisis, public debt, weak management of the government, poverty and inequality. Rapid industrialisation + urbanisation have caused lots of issues: an urban poor; the growth of informal sector; reductions in social protection for some workers and families, etc, and an increasing number of emigrating migrants.

Electronics is a central industry for the country, she reported, growing from 3% of exports in 2002 to 29% in 2015, with an export value of 45.79 billion USD of which 70% is mobile phones and parts. The industry employs a large workforce: 1,088 electronics companies in Vietnam employ 325,583 workers. The majority of these are domestic migrant workers, 70-80% of whom female workers, and mainly located around Hanoi and HCM city. The biggest export market is Europe, at 31% with Saudi Arabia alone accounting for another 13%. Key players in Vietnam's electronics industry include global brands: Samsung, Canon, Panasonic, Intel. The top 20 largest enterprises: Japan (11), South Korea (4), Taiwan (3), U.S. (1) account for 49.4% of the total workers in the sector. The presenter focussed heavily on Samsung, the second largest enterprise in Vietnam. Alone its workforce: 104,574 workers/staff. She said that the average age of a Samsung worker was 22 years old, and the average working time of a worker only 1.2 years. The company's revenue was USD 37 billion in 2016, 21% of which was Vietnam exports.

In terms of **key challenges for workers**, the electronics industry in Vietnam, she said, tends to have better conditions than its other light industries, but still suffers from long overtime working hours, from 60 hours to more than 100 hours per month. Companies regularly double bookkeep to obscure this to auditors. This overtime is expected from workers, and overtime is worse in the electronics industry than in other light industries. Gender-based discrimination, OSH related issues, and industrial relations and social dialogues are other key issues. The government controlled union is not trusted by workers at all. In terms of challenges to NGOs and worker supporting organisations, they range from limited research available on the electronics industry in Vietnam; difficulties in accessing victims, a lack of technical capacity and resources in NGOs; and a limited space; there are very few NGOs working on labour issues in Vietnam she said. Trade Unions are not really independent from the factories' managers. There is a lack of social dialogue and collective bargaining; workers themselves lack knowledge on their rights; and there is a lack of available and efficient grievance systems/channels.

In response CDI aims to build capacity for workers, provide legal support, support Trade Union officers and active workers to raise their voices through social dialogues, conducting research and collecting cases of issues faced by workers in the industry. CDI advocates for improvements of working conditions for workers in the industry through policy dialogues, consultation meetings, and workshop, she added. They also collaborate with the media to raise public awareness of labour issues in the industry, and network with other organisations and networks: ANROEV, SACOM, AMRC, etc.

India Country Report. The conference then heard a report on the latest developments in India. Gopinath Parakuni (CIVIDEP) discussed key trends, focussing a lot on the former central player – Nokia. Nokia’s biggest plan for production in India started in 2006, he said, and since then Cividep has been working on that, alongside trade unions. Yet in 2010 Nokia shut down and this resulted in fewer companies to work with and factories to work in. Manufacturing output and capacity is much less in India than it is in China – India must import parts whereas China can produce them. But having said that, the financial year 2015-2016 saw mobile production increase by 186%. The first quarter of 2017 saw mobile production in India cross the 100 million unit mark, and it is set to touch 500 in the next two years. India is seeing a major influx of foreign investment in mobile phone manufacturing, primarily because labour costs in China have risen by 20% over the past 3-4 years. Whereas China has a labour shortage in manual and low-paying jobs as it moves up the value chain, there is a large supply of skilled and unskilled labour in India, he added. It also has a large domestic market, and as a result many electronics manufacturers are increasing capacity. Meanwhile the government is focussing on increasing the value added in India from around 6% to 21% over the next 3 years.

Gopi talked through the brands that have facilities in India, including Wistron, Flex and Foxconn, manufacturing for Apple, and also for Samsung. The main developments are in mobile phones. Most workers are young and come from within the same state as the plant – there is a preference for female workers among employers.

Challenges that workers are facing include an increasing percentage of worker growth made up by contract workers – with less job security. This is combined with the subversion of legal provisions by labour agencies. In terms of working conditions, there are serious problems with large manufacturers (Samsung) in the harassment and overworking of employees – this went so far as the recruitment of ex-police officers in plants to enforce targets. CIVIDEP themselves were also targeted, he said. Workers are expected to work overtime if targets not met, and at any sign of protest workers are pressured and harassed and can lose their jobs. There is a lack of worker representation.

The responses from CIVIDEP and allied organisations include conducting outreach, training (legal help) and skills upgrades (English/IT). This can be used as a rallying point, Gopi said, and as a way to increase solidarity. Another response is expanding contact with CSOs at the community level – collaborating and conducting research in tandem with these groups. On a global level CIVIDEP focus on pressuring brands and learning, and on knowledge-sharing with partners.

Country Report China. China’s country report was authored jointly by Globalization

Monitor (GM), Labour Action China (LAC), Labor Education and Service Network (LESN), Students and Scholars against Corporate Misbehaviour (SACOM), Worker Empowerment (WE). The first crucial issue that Michael Ma (SACOM) highlighted was the new foreign NGO law, which has had a chilling effect on the labour movement. Effective from 1st Jan 2017, any foreign NGOs/ entities now have to register for any direct/ indirect activities taking place in China. This applies whenever funding from foreign NGOs comes in, and the detailed reporting of financial and practical status is required. There are approximately 7000 NGOs in China concerning labour, environmental, gender etc, and by 8th July on only 139 NGOs have successfully registered, he said.

A key issue on the corporate level is wages growing in the existing manufacturing areas, and the impact that is having on the industry. The Pearl River Delta used to be the core manufacturing centre, but now manufacturers have been moving to Central and Western Part of China, where many migrant workers are from, we were told. A key challenge that workers are currently facing, he said, was the increase in precarious forms of work, as mentioned by previous speakers. Electronics manufacturing has obvious peak and low seasons in China, and it is difficult for factories to find enough labour at peak times, whereas they face what they see as a high cost of residual labour at low points. Workers are therefore forced to have non-paid leave, and agency workers and student workers are widely used. The speaker coined the phrase that 'this is the labour version of Zero Inventory'.

A final focus of the presentation was on OHS issues, specifically chemical poisoning, as previous participants had mentioned. The onus of proof for causation rests on the victims, and workers obtaining official diagnosis of occupational disease is decreasing, the speaker said. Perpetrators often hide behind this legal process, and when factories relocate, workers stand even less chance of compensation or recognition of their occupational injury or illness.

Country Report Taiwan. Han-Lin Li introduced Citizen of the Earth, his organisation. A key trend that he brought to the audience attention was Taiwan's focus on large domestic electronics firms – these are vital for the Taiwanese economy (and make up 50% of GDP). However, industrial expansion is increasingly conflicting with rural/agricultural land – there are problems revolving around land acquisition and the use of space within factories. This has led, he said, to serious environmental issues – toxic chemicals released into river water by electronics manufacturers for example (Indium, gallium, molybdenum and PHOS pollution affecting agriculture). He also highlighted issues of precarious work and health problems for workers and communities. To these problems there tends to be a lack of regulation or governmental response, he added. However, in 2014 the opportunity arose to push for social and political change through the International Network (a network of NGOs, environmental lawyers, scholars and others). There have been some success cases in the courts in Taiwan, he added, where large firms have been sued for environmental/health damages for dumping toxins.

However, Han Li said that Taiwanese workers and communities also face considerable challenges. One of these, he said, was chemical management – especially when chemicals are changed/altered. These are hard to monitor or regulate due to the fast pace of change.

Another key problem is energy use and the associated pollution and indeed the fossil fuel use.

In response, workers and environmental organisations have had considerable successes, he said, in using the courts. For example he highlighted the recent ASE factory, which was shut down by the city government for 126 days. The factory manager and engineer operating the wastewater system were found guilty by the court. A 'green bond' of 300 million was levied to upgrade equipment and establish wastewater recycling station, and recruit three times of environment protection staffs (contract to full-time).

Another case he highlighted was the Radio Corporation of America (RCA) which established its first factory in Taiwan in 1969. The factory had not provided a safe working environment, and discharged the waste organic solvents into the wells near the plant. In 2004, he said, RCA victims sued the RCA and its shareholder (GE, Technicolor USA, and Thomson) for occupational disease compensation. In 2015, a court ruling awarded US\$18.2 million in damages for workplace health and safety violations to 445 employees.

South Korea Country Report. Jongchul Kim, (APIL) then followed up on the theme of legal approaches, by presenting the South Korea Country Report. One of the most important issues in South Korea at the present time, he said, includes the business and political ties revealed by the recent Samsung scandal. In addition, large firms like Samsung are associated with over 300 victims of precarious work and the exposure of workers to toxic chemicals in semi-conductor production. SHARPS have been protesting this issue for some time.

In another case 6 employees who were involved in the production of both LG and Samsung products were exposed to methanol during long shifts, without protective clothing – causing damage to optic nerves and blindness. Large firms refuse to accept responsibility, he said, instead always blaming their suppliers.

APIL recently undertook an investigation into Samsung activity in Mexico alongside CEREAL and supported by the GoodElectronics Network. The findings of this investigation, he said, included long working hours (and the avoidance of payment of overtime), poor treatment and the ongoing repression of worker organisations. This is a failure of the Korean government in protecting extra-terrestrial workers' rights, he added, introducing a potential new approach for the labour movement to consider.

Mexico country report. Miguel Angel Alvarez from CEREAL then introduced the Mexico country report. Trends he highlighted included that there are now half a million workers in the Mexican electronics industry – which is now becoming the main focus of national economy. The government is aiming to fortify the electronics industry, therefore. Unfortunately wages are poor, and workers face long working hours just to meet basic living standards. There are rarely or never interventions from government on workers' rights, working standards or environmental quality, and there are very low levels of unionisation, he added. Mexico produced a lot of Samsung products, as the South Korean presenter mentioned, and is the second largest exporter of electronics in the Americas.

In terms of the challenges workers are facing, large brands make up a large proportion of electronics production but have a tendency to treat workers poorly and to repress them, Miguel added – workers receive on average 20 pesos an hour, which is not enough to maintain a good quality of life. At this point Miguel handed the stage to Amapola Lopez from CETIEN. She added that most workers are female – vulnerable workers who often have to accept a low income and a poor working environment. High ranking officials, on the other hand, are male – and there is a great deal of intimidation and (sexual and physical) harassment. Women have very little security – she said, and there is a lack of research and solid evidence to tackle misconduct. This treatment becomes a part of daily life. Furthermore, there is a lack of protection against hazardous working environment – leading to sickness.

In terms of responding to the challenges, this can be difficult, because there is often a lack of education and understanding of workers' rights, union organisation, or OHS. The role of CETIEN, is to tackle these issues by educating and engaging with workers. The Mexican government, the presenter said, do not provide this service and in fact target NGOs or activists who try to improve treatment of workers repressing communities and workers.

USA country report. Ted Smith from IRCT then gave a country report on the USA. During the 1980's, he said the IRCT tried to ban the chemical TCE in the electronics industry – which had been having major environmental and health impacts, particularly in the Silicon Valley area. They aimed to organise workers to combat IBM and force them to address the issues associated with TCE. They did this, and a movement was born. Unfortunately TCE is still used in many parts of the world in the electronics industry, he added.

US corporations still dominate the international economy, Ted said, and many of these are tech firms and electronics manufacturers. The relationship between brand and suppliers is well established in recent work on supply chains – it should be noted that chemical/metal suppliers are involved in this too. A trend that is encouraging, he said, is that there has been much progress in the disclosure of supply chains of the main brands – see slides for links. Another interesting trend he highlighted was that there has been a recent example of 'reshoring': a Foxconn/US project to build 10bn USD production site in US – this is, however heavily dependent on government subsidies, he added.

The main problem in the industry is that the profit margin of tech products (iPhones, for example) is huge compared to the labour costs (less than 1% of total cost). Ted introduced work from his book, *Challenging the Chip*, in which him and his co-author found that: 1. There is little or no effective, enforced government regulation, courts – though now there is some push back in the courts as shown by Korea and Taiwan, 2. There is a need to develop and push for regulation – media and advocacy are an important part of this. 3. The way to ensure workers' rights is to be transparent, guarantee participation, protect communities, environment and workers, and compensate victims, and 4. Brands know very little about what is going on in their supply chains – or who is monitoring them. The more that this can be exposed and highlighted in the media – the greater the impacts.

Questions and Answers

These country cases were then discussed by participants, and questions and answers taken.

Q: What about the Sony Case? A: It had about 2,000 student workers. Student workers first appeared in the automotive sector, then it was also introduced in the electronics sector. In total about 500,000 workers.

Q: Why was there only 1,2 years average duration of employment of Samsung worker in Vietnam? A: Because they are going back home after a year (they are coming from other regions in Vietnam) or go to another company with better payment. It is hard work in the factory and therefore it is hard to work longer than one year. (However, a participant added a different perspective: Samsung biggest factory is only into operation in the last two years (so automatically there are no long employments yet). Samsung pays a little more than other electronics companies and they offer young workers an education (general education - not focused on the factory work). If the workers get educated and receive a diploma they can also work elsewhere. He calls this a win-win situation, Samsung gets the young workers (it is hard to find workers) for their factories and the young workers get educated and improve their chances for the labour market.

Q: Does Samsung set the tone in Vietnam for the rest of the industry regarding their position towards unions? Q: Is it very hard to get access to victims of labour rights violations in Vietnam - what is your suggestion for better monitoring and better investigations undertaken by Korean investigators? A: Make sure that before you go have contacted relevant organisations and made appointments, and also with independent auditors doing audits in Vietnam because they are a good source of information.

Remark from Eduard Indonesia: Economic Processing Zones (EPZs) are no longer a particular problem for us (except for companies not having to pay tax), as there are no possibilities to strike outside the EPZ either.

Q: How to deal with electronics waste from the companies? A: Bruno Malaysia: what we did is focus on the waste coming out from the companies, and everything coming out of the factory is clean. The waste water went into a pond with fish, and when the fish dies the water is clean. Another focus was to make sure that the chips that are failing are sold to a company that has the right technology to dismantle and collect the precious metals again.

Q: Regarding Thailand and the student workers, what about their health issues? A: the students are seasonal, so they do not get a medical check-up. So there is no knowledge about their health. There is the 'Early retirement project'. Workers in Thailand can stop after ten years of work in the factory. They go without a medical check, they often go back to the province where they came from and therefore it is unknown what their health situation is (sometimes they get cancer and nobody knows or can prove that the cancer is work related).

Q: How greedy is Samsung? Most country reports mention Samsung. Is it possible to network among ourselves and other NGOs to combat Samsung? A: There is a

report recently produced by the International Trade Union Confederation on this issue – yet greedy is not a productive word to focus on. Instead we should be concerned about the non-compliance of Samsung with human rights law.

Samsung has tried a number of tactics to subdue workers organisations in India – including being sued, bribed, pressured by police etc. What has helped us is the solidarity of workers and Samsung are aware that we are part of a global network, we also work with civil society and communities to educate and support workers, share information and best practices – this also extends to the international level through the GoodElectronics network.

Q: Sheung So: I have a disagreement with comments made on the weakness of women in the workplace - this is not a problem of the women themselves but down to a lack of organisation/regulation etc. Women have to fight and make progress to increase capacity and knowledge.

A: Amapola from CETIEN: We have a problem in Mexico in terms of education – we are not well protected. We have to empower women so that they know their rights. Women in particular, often fall behind because of a lack of education, equality and empowerment – strong solidarity and education is needed to improve the condition for women. This is not because women are weak but they are shaped by the culture and social structure – women sometimes accept poor working conditions and pay because of this.

Q: Samsung CEO not protected by corporate law – do you know how they were personally responsible?

A: Korean corporate law is quite strict – yet with close ties between government and companies this often means that punishment falls short.

Q: Samsung is a key firm today – but do you think it will be an effective strategy to put more pressure on the national pension fund in South Korea?

A: I believe it is very important to exploit the pressure points to which Samsung are most sensitive, and this includes investors, consumers, government, and the international community. Building momentum to reform the national pension fund is certainly a good objective as it would have a big influence on Samsung.

Q: It would be interesting to know what the labour conditions will be in the Foxconn US plant. Will things look differently in this case and will this create leverage for improving conditions in other parts of the world?

A: This kind of subsidy based deal for Foxconn will likely have many negative consequences on the local rural area. Wisconsin has recently changed its labour laws – currently it is a very low wage and low tax state – it will be interesting to see how Foxconn's plant, if built, will impact this.

Reflections on the sustainable electronics movement's strategies for change

In the fourth session conference participants discussed some of the key tactics and strategies that they or others have employed towards the industry, their success or failure, and their reflections on whether they are useful approaches for addressing the human rights and environmental standards of the industry.

Organising workers. Slamet Riyadi (FSPMI) discussed the most commonly used approach, and reflected on the FSPMI's approach to organising workers in Indonesia. Of the 239,000 workers in the sector, around 54,000 in 210 factories are members of FSPMI. From 2012-14, he said, our strategy was called 'sweeping the factories'. We 'surround the factory' – factories with workers who are not unionised, and try and force them into a recognition agreement. e.g. for Samsung alone 12 of their suppliers became unionised this way. The strategy only lasted till 2014 though, he said. A new legal framework came in which said no protests were allowed in the Special Economic Zone. In 2015, all the unions in SEZs were then dismissed. So we don't have the unions there anymore. So we changed the strategy. Now we undertake 4 steps: **1. Data collection**, then **2. Calling a national meeting**. We agree the targets of additional new members, how many factories, expansion in different regions, and what the distribution will be for members. In 2017 we have met most of our targets, except one or two, **3. Training workers**, including in how to undertake strategy themselves, We work through each company, understand how many suppliers we have. We train leaders, and call them Community Leaders. Without this voluntary capacity it would be impossible. **4. Advocacy**. Assistance with the recording process to the Labour Service for the registration of the trade union.

Following on with this theme, Kan Matsuzaki (IndustriALL) discussed their **work organising workers globally across supply chains**. IndustriALL Global Union was founded in June 2012, he said, and it represents 50 million workers, in 140 countries, through over 400 unions, across supply chains in mining, energy and manufacturing sectors at the global level. Most of the top 20 electronics companies in the EICC come from USA, South Korea, Japan, China. 10 of the biggest electronics companies in the world are from the USA, Taiwan-China, and South Korea. These are the only countries that have not ratified the ILO convention on FOA, he said! In these countries, he said that there is almost no unionisation (whereas in the other countries there is). Secondly, he highlighted a now common theme at the conference, automation, showing on the chart that the major biggest companies, Apple, Foxconn etc, have grown in revenue but reduced their numbers of employees hugely. That's because of robotization, he said, and argued that our movement needs to urgently address what happens to workers as they are displaced by automation and 'Industry 4.0.'

IndustriALL have focussed a lot, he said, on trying to **negotiate Global Framework Agreements (GFAs)** with companies. These require that ILO standards are applied throughout a company's supply chain. At IndustriALL we have 45 GFAs with companies. But we hardly have any with the biggest electronics companies. Why? Because the biggest ones are in the EICC. And that's what the companies are saying: we do not need GFAs

because we are in EICC. They want to use EICC Code of Conduct as an escape route. We have to look at this as a movement, he added. More than 60% of companies are in the EICC, and they come from the USA. We need to address the differences between EICC code and our better codes.

The strike. Julius Carandang (Metal Workers Alliance of the Philippines) then reflected on the tactic of a strike to secure change for workers. He outlined, based on his union's recent experience, what he saw as the conditions for a successful strike. Before workers could mount a strike and assemble picket lines, he said, they must have the unity in their belief in using the strike as a strategy. Strikes are very powerful but they can also be costly for both workers and employers. Thus, the use of strikes must be carefully studied and democratically decided by majority of workers, he said. Workers should only use strike as a tactic, when they are sure that their chances of winning are high. Finally, he said every strike should have a measurable gain for striking workers, and should be maximized to organize workers from other factories. He argued that 'strikes [when used well] should be a school to educate workers in a factory on the issues they want to be addressed.' Another feature of successful strikes he said, was that workers link to other sectors and the local community, as well as reaching out for international solidarity from workers in the same company, or the supply chain of that company.

The ILO, he said, has clarified that using a strike is the right of all workers, and the curtailment of that right can only be used in highly limited circumstances. However, the exercise of the right to strike is often curtailed by employers or governments). With our last NXP strike, he said, it got a great deal of support but it was broken by the connivance of the government and the companies.

Cross border campaigns. Karin Mader (Bread for All) and Michael Ma (SACOM) presented how they use cooperative international strategies by working with partner organisations who can bring different functional specialisms to a campaign. Michael explained how the collaboration worked, hoping the concept will inspire others in the network. It's the 10 years anniversary of the release of the iPhone, he said and GE organisations are linking up the consuming countries with the production countries. SACOM in Hong Kong & EILER from the Philippines are researching use of student intern labour by Apple by going into the factories to investigate. SACOM then turns this into reports, and reaches out to international media, he said. This is already putting pressure on Apple, he added.

Alongside EILER he said a global action day has been called for the November. UK, Austria, US, and different parts of the world are going to protest against Apple on the student interns issue and the living wages issue. As a result of the campaign Apple have terminated their plan to move their production to that specific factory that is using student labour, but that's really not enough, and we are keeping the pressure on, he said. Karin added that Bread for All is based in Switzerland and a part of GoodElectronics. They are doing political lobbying work and promoting laws that regulate the supply chains of international businesses. They also rank the biggest brands selling in Switzerland, and bring the results to the media, the universities and to the student public. Electronics Watch then works to get public buyer affiliates to put pressure on the company too by engaging

with them on the student interns issue - especially universities (but also all relevant public sector affiliates buying Apple). So overall, she explained, the groups are using the shared identity of students to link up the countries in the campaign. GoodElectronics financially supported the production of videos, materials, for the campaign, they concluded.

NGOs negotiating with brands in an environment without democratic unions. Miguel (CEREAL) discussed how they as a CSO operate in a country largely without real democratic unions, Mexico. Therefore, CEREAL supports workers to negotiate with brands directly in order to affect change at the supplier level. Most of the main contract manufacturers are producing in Mexico he said, and CEREAL have long monitored conditions in each, and also engages directly with the brands they supply, and the EICC. CEREAL, he said, operates its own escalation procedure in the absence of functional unions: workers approach them, they email the factory management, and it is resolved, or it get escalated into legal claims through the justice system, and engagement with brands, and if this or the legal route does not result in a payment for damages, CEREAL writes a public report, starts press conferences, calls on social networks, and disseminates the report internationally. With these reports, Miguel said, we can demonstrate legal issues that are genuinely worrying for the company.

Investor strategies. Irene (SOMO) then reflected on the use of investor strategies as an approach. She explained that first SOMO would undertake research: who is financing the company and who is benefiting from it? Understanding corporate structures/ownership structures is crucial, she said. Non-publicly listed companies can be less easy to understand - e.g. Samsung. They then research investors and shareholders, institutional and individual, and lenders: finance capital, like commercial banks, financial services, insurances. Development banks, national development agencies also provide guarantees for loans, development finance institutions, she added.

Strategies that flow from this research, she said include: shareholder action - buying shares and attending AGMs, informing 'responsible investors' – for example SOMO did research for them on FOA in the electronics sector and agency work in the electronics sector. Responsible investors want to know the issues, what laws the company has violated, and what they should ask from the companies in their dialogue with the sector. They also set up benchmarks and rankings for their investments, and companies want to be high in those rankings, she added. She also outlined other investor related targets for engagement: intermediaries for big institutional investors, pension funds especially public pension funds which are under direct public control; grievance mechanisms of development banks; national agencies of the development finance institutions - are they giving a guarantee to a company that is violating the OECD guidelines and UNGP? You can use this, she said, to raise parliamentary questions or go to the media. A final investor group she mentioned was commercial banks, recommending using non-judicial complaints, or media pressure.

Public Procurement strategies. Bjorn (Electronics Watch) reflected on the use of public procurement leverage to require change from companies. Public procurers can be on our side, he said. Electronics Watch is an independent monitoring organisation that helps public sector buyers work together to demand respect for labour rights and health and

safety in their supply chains. It works with labour rights groups to monitor the industry. Electronics Watch has 80 public sector affiliates who collectively represent £1bn worth of ICT spending per year, and this number is growing. So when EW engages with the industry they have public sector entities that can engage, that care, and can ultimately cut the contracts if companies refuse to change, he added.

Public procurement can achieve a number of things as a strategy he said: 1. Supply chain transparency. Dell have now revealed their whole list of factories because of pressure from Electronics Watch affiliates in Switzerland, UK and Sweden, and they revealed which products they were making in that factory, 2. Specific cases: For example one in Eastern Europe. Workers were working 6 days a week, 12 hours a day. They were migrants. Then when there was low demand, they were unpaid, sitting in their dorms waiting, and could get sacked and sent back to their own countries at any time. Through Electronics Watch monitoring, and through collective public sector affiliate pressure, the company agreed to give the workers an income even when they are not working, and the contract manufacturer has now got better conditions from the brand. The migrant workers were previously not even getting notified of their terms and conditions of contract and now they are. He finished by saying, however that these factory level investigations ultimately take too long and are too slow. So now Electronics Watch are looking into how we can move from a factory by factory basis to a brand level and then an industry level approach.

Offering technical support to grassroots groups. Garrett (MHSSN) talked through how his network of OHS experts offer technical support to grassroots groups. There are now more OHS specialists than ever, he said, and this can bring considerable benefits to workers and unions: 1. OHS helps workers understand what is happening and what their rights are, 2. OHS can be a means of organising for workers, and 3. It helps governments and others to bring wider pressure on the industry.

MHSSN started in 1993, he said. It is a network of 300 OHS professionals. MHSSN started at the US Mexico border. MHSSN does training of trainers, so they organise and build capacity. They also train organisations and build their capacity to help workers on OHS issues. They also provide research and information for grassroots organisations -e.g. effective control methods that could be used and that are used elsewhere. They provide information about legal requirements too, as there are usually laws that are not being obeyed by the government, by the factory and by the brand, he said.

MHSSN also filed many worker complaints under the NAFTA agreement, he added, but more for the purposes of record and political education than expecting that process to help workers directly. There are other trade agreements that also allow workers to file complaints. They also file complaints with the ILO related to their conventions, he said. Lastly they use OHS as a way of building campaigns and publicity. There's nothing that affects public opinion more than OHS, e.g. Rana Plaza and other issues. 1000 people have died in electronics factories this year, he said. If we can make this a big issue then we can benefit the profile of all of our issues. There are many more organisations now working with grassroots organisations, he added. Occupational Knowledge International. Hesperian Health Guides – they put out 'Workers Guide to H&S'. There is a new organisation called Workplace Health Without Borders. Garrett offered his own organisation as a conduit to put

members of GoodElectronics in touch with those other organisations.

Questions and Answers.

Omana George (AMRC) the facilitator asked an additional question. **1. How do you all think the GE Network can support your strategy?** Garrett: GE has been a conduit of information. It has helped connect grassroots organisations with each other. One thing we could benefit from is sharing materials. E.g. We have various languages resources and we'd like to spread them out amongst the Network.

Kan (IndustriALL): GoodElectronics has been quite a good network already. Now we want to upgrade the quality of the information. Which kind of organisation can do what, and which organisation can provide which types of information? E.g. because the biggest companies are in the union-unfriendly countries we do not have that information. We need friends in those countries and can help us understand what is going on.

One more thing: we need to develop a white-collar workers strategy. We have until now focussed on blue collar workers. But the industry is changing to a white-collar industry. This is because of technological change. It takes us a year or two to gain 500 blue collar workers, and we can lose 2000 of them in a moment due to technological change. We need to work out an approach to the growing white-collar workforce.

Karin: Bread For All (BFA) is a tiny organisation. We can't make a lot of difference on our own. When we told the brands, however, that we were part of GoodElectronics, Samsung, Apple and other brands have come to our office. That's because we are part of an international network and that greatly increases our leverage.

Michael (SACOM): Last year we used reports published by BFA and we created reports which were used by BFA. I think we can work together more. We know each other's work now. E.g the investors campaign that SOMO does we could learn from. GoodElectronics should be a way of avoiding redundant work. It should be a way of understanding what everyone is doing and working together more. I think we should form working groups in the coming days.

Bjorn (EW): We can and need to work together. Electronics Watch can be led by the initiatives of GoodElectronics members or GE network. We can coordinate with your campaigns by doing monitoring on that brand. We can also do the same if you take a particular focus on chemicals or another theme.

Irene (SOMO). I think we should agree on key demands to the industry together as a Network.

Hector (WH4C). There is an issue with CNR union currently. and it's going on for the last 6-7 months. Why don't the people on the panel get involved?

GoodElectronics current 5 year programme (2014 – 2018).

GoodElectronics Network history and achievements.

The partners funded by the current EC programme talked through the achievements so far of the programme. Alejandro (GoodElectronics Coordinator) started the session, by giving some history. GoodElectronics network was founded in 2006, he said. Now it has 100 members. The GoodElectronics network envisions a supply chain complying with highest sustainability and human rights standards, and works together to demand improvements from the industry, he said. We work towards stronger regulations and we have formulated a set of Common Demands which collectively express our goals for the industry.

GoodElectronics has members from key manufacturing locations and in key countries for advocacy, he said. Members bring different skillsets and capacities, strengthening each other. We take a full life cycle approach: including mining, manufacturing to recycling and disposal. All stages of the industry need good conditions.

We are currently funded by a 5 year EC project, going from 2014-2018, he said, and he talked through the expected results from the current programme (which are detailed in the Mid Term Review Report). Alejandro then shared the overall results that have been achieved already: 488 CSO's informed; 99 CSO's and TUs supported, building the capacity of 39 organisations through workshops; the training of workers (by CEREAL, IndustriALL, CIVIDEP, for example). He did say that no GFA's have been signed, in contrast to the aims of the programme, but there is one that is being negotiated at the moment. 11 companies have addressed issues after engagement, he added. Another recent example is that the EICC has updated their code after engagement with GoodElectronics and the ICRT on chemicals.

Challenge to the Electronics Industry on Chemicals. A particular success in this period, he said, was our launch of the Challenge to the Electronics Industry on Chemicals. We engaged with industry and brands on this matter, and there is an ongoing process of structured engagement through the EICC Chemicals Management Task force and the Clean Electronics Production Network that are making some progress. He then listed some other successes: 21 publications have been published by GE since 2014, and some communication highlights are: 22,470 unique visitors, an improved and relaunched website which is easier to navigate. He said feedback is welcomed on the website. The newsletter has gone up to 1500 subscribers receiving it every 2 weeks.

Sub granting scheme. There has been a sub-granting scheme yearly, he added, and three rounds were held. So far 25 grants have been given. One will follow this year. He finished by saying that GoodElectronics is at an exciting point in its development. Membership is consolidating and the work is gaining momentum and achieving greater impact. There is still much to be done, but the GoodElectronics Network remains passionate about continuing its support to efforts that seek to achieve a sustainable global electronics industry that protects human rights.

Research achievements during the programme.

Reports published. Pauline Overeem (SOMO) said that SOMO is the host of the network, is part of the Steering Committee. She said Researchers on electronics issues at SOMO are Irene Schipper, Esther de Haan and Pauline herself. SOMO is the lead of the EC project – and that includes undertaking reporting tasks. SOMO is a research organization, specifically research on multinational corporations, she added, and in this project SOMO's role is researching and publishing reports. Some are authored by SOMO, some are authored by others and all are published under the GoodElectronics logo. We've released reports on mining and linked it to the electronics sector, she said. We've produced a series of fact sheets on minerals. We've done research in collaboration with other GE members. The mining phase was covered quite well in the GoodElectronics program, she said. Another report has been the comparison between Fairphone and TCO certification (2016). Pauline also discussed a report they had released on the financialisation of Apple. This was not a typical company profile focusing on labour issues, but on the financial activities of Apple, presented with video and cartoons. We've released a paper on Brazil, she said, a number of company profiles, NXP, ASML, Philips, for example. This has enabled SOMO to engage with these companies. All action oriented reports and research that they produced aimed to make changes in corporate practice and policy, she added. Upcoming publications are: Follow the Money, report on Brazil, Company Profile of Foxconn.

Round table on mining. Pauline also discussed the launch of a Round Table on Responsible Minerals co-organised with other organisations in the Netherlands. (his enabled us to engage with the industry and governmental stakeholders, she said. SOMO have also collaborated with GoodElectronics Thailand in order to engage with NXP and start a process with NCP in the Netherlands. She added that it was important to note that not all dialogue leads to positive results. Engagement with Philips did however, on their monitoring and auditing. Philips then responded by doing its own research on the effectiveness of their auditing.

Engagement in MSIs and other initiatives. Pauline then discussed SOMO's involvement with Fairphone – the company aiming to produce environmentally and socially sound phones. SOMO was on the Advisory Group of Fairphone (Made with Care Working Group). SOMO also engaged with the Fair Labour Association (FLA), with the now finished IDH, (Sustainable Trade Initiative), and SOMO is an active Trustee of Electronics Watch.

Successes in organising workers during the programme.

Kan Matsuzaki (IndustriALL) discussed the achievements made in organising workers during the programme so far. After establishing a union, he said, we try to gain a Collective Bargaining Agreement (CBA). We have targeted South East Asia in particular in this project. Why? Because 90% of electronics production is done in South East Asia. Each country has a different character he said, in terms of politics, language, etc. Therefore, IndustriALL relies on local unions. In Indonesia there are already two strong unions, for example. Our key focus is to have a CBA in SME's where there is a union but no CBA.

Kan discussed the current situation in both Indonesia and Malaysia [minute taker missed

these points]. In Thailand, he said, there is a very low union density, and very basic trainings are the best approach. Workers even ask: why have unions? It's essential that workers recognize the importance of having unions, which we try to work towards in the trainings. In Vietnam, because of the political history of the country, workers are highly organized already, but the challenge is to make the unions independent from the management, thereby democratizing the unions. In Thailand there is a politically divided movement, he said, echoing comments from Lek, above. We are trying to motivate unions in Thailand to organise precarious workers, he added. In the Philippines there are 5 unions in electronics sector, and they are divided, rather than acting coherently.

There have been 12,000 newly organized workers under this project, Kan said. The number of CBAs has increased due to the project too, in line with our targets. GFAs - an agreement covering all workplaces of companies in a global supply chain has turned out to be difficult to achieve. Many people ask what the difference is between a GFA and a CoC, he said. With a CoC the management decides, not the workers. Monitoring is fully controlled by the management. A GFA is negotiated between union and management, a GFA will always recognize all ILO labour standards, and unions get involved in the monitoring process. A GFA also tends to include suppliers.

Capacity building and training achievements during the programme so far. Gopi Parakuni (CIVIDEP, **India**) said that his organization started in the Indian garment industry in 2000, specifically working with women workers in the garment industry and came into contact with the Clean Clothes Campaign this way. Unions are the right organisations to negotiate with the industry and represent workers, he said. As a NGO we promote trade unions, and we do capacity building. We undertook research with SOMO on the electronics industry in 2006, as part of this programme, he said. Nokia established its plant at that time in India. CIVIDEP's work on electronics can be characterized as Pre-Nokia and Post-Nokia, he added.

CIVIDEP are part of a broad movement including different movements (community rights, farmers' rights, workers' rights etc.). They also do research on Special Economic Zones. Nokia profited from the EPZ, he said. Farmers were displaced from the EPZ where Nokia was located. This did not only violate workers' rights but also the rights of the people that were displaced. Our focus was to build up organising, he said. A partnership with FinnWatch was important. Nokia eventually recognised the union, and as Nokia was the leader in the region others had to follow. Nokia at first paid the same wages as garment workers got, but later this improved. Things have changed - all the electronics companies in the region now have unions except for Sanmina. There is need to create employment, he concluded by saying. However, what is often sacrificed is the right of workers and the rights of farmers. What we gained from GoodElectronics is the ability to engage with companies and get results. Worker outreach, worker education, building up community engagement, and research are our key tools.

Miguel Angel Alvarez (CEREAL, **Mexico**) agreed, saying that his work in Mexico has functioned well through working as part of the GoodElectronics network. CEREAL has been working in Guadalajara for 20 years. They do workshops on workers' rights and on chemical contamination, and engagement with companies, he said. They are also a

research center getting information through from workers. Network collaborations are important, he thought. For example, CEREAL negotiated with Samsung with the help of Korean organisations during this funding period. Samsung is very large in Mexico. Also CEREAL collaborates with Electronics Watch. They work with Green Electronics Production Network on contaminations, but most of all with CETIEM. CETIEM give workshops and training to empower women workers in the electronics industry. CEREAL saw collaborations with different organisations in the GoodElectronics network as a powerful tool, enabling CEREAL to be 'the motor' in the engagement with big companies in Mexico. This collaboration and funding has enabled CEREAL to work on the ground, and also internationally. This makes the negotiations much more effective, he said. He said also that in the last days of this conference it is clear that workers in the other countries experience the same problems. We share the same issues, and therefore we need to work together. The EICC have a code (saying that everywhere there are the same good conditions), but this is just a promotional device for the companies. At CEREAL we deliver evidence that the code is not complied with. The code is just to sell more products, he said. This network enables us to do our work better, he finished by saying. And GoodElectronics can also help organisations in other countries to do their work better.

Mapping the sustainable electronics landscape

To prepare participants for the later strategic decision making sessions, Ted Smith of ICRT gave an overview of the history and the current strategic questions facing our movement. There is no road map for how we deal with issues in electronics he said– just as there are no currently effective governance mechanisms. To tackle this, we are trying to incorporate labour rights and environmental justice in electronics.

He gave some examples, such as that ICRT held a global strategy meeting in Korea in 2012 (with SHARPS). The outcomes were that we should develop this dual approach (with SHARPS) to confront large firms like Samsung. There has been an adoption of the precautionary principle within organisations like SHARPS – which should be a growing trend into the future. Ted introduced some recent coordinated actions the movement has undertaken: 1. AMRC, ANROEV, GE, ICRT, IPEN coordinated to send a message to support Samsung workers. This is an important part of the strategy of GoodElectronics affiliates in areas like Korea, he said. 2. The RCA case in Taiwan has seen some successes made in Taiwanese courts regarding workers' rights and occupational health. 3. The Round Table on Mining was very important, particularly for groups in Africa.

As other members noted previously, another key example of a successful approach has been 'The Challenge' to the Industry on chemicals, he said. This was taken up by groups all around the world, including IndustriALL. Ted added that his proposals to our Mid Term Review were around pushing this process further forwards. It is important to understand the breadth and the depth of the movement that has been created, he said. In trying to map all of it, there are many global institutions and networks involved in initiatives in the electronics industry. This raises some important questions, he said - how do we coordinate

best to maximise benefits to our common cause? He outlined some key points that would improve the success of the movement. 1. We will certainly benefit if more communication and strategy is shared between organisations, 2. Local organisations are important – they form the backbone of activity. However, we could also include human rights organisations more, socially responsible investors and other initiatives. (It is a rich and complex field, he stated). Ted then set out some key questions for the movement moving forwards, which are listed below. What could we do to make movement more effective/powerful, he asked?

1. Identifying key opportunities and threats
 - a. SWOT (Strengths, Weaknesses, Opportunities, Threats) is a good framework to develop common strategies.
 - b. Fostering discussion is vital for info sharing and coordination.
 - c. We need to develop our own strategy as we cannot rely on government, We need to work out how much energy to put into multi-stakeholder initiatives with government and industry. This should be assessed on a case-by-case basis.
2. We need to improve internal communication – perhaps investing in some sort of communications department or platform – websites, social media, list sites, etc.
3. Look for opportunities to build coordinated actions – to be able to develop opportunities where we bring together multiple groups is important to develop policy and increase impact
4. Pooling resources and undertaking joint trainings – this has been very successful and certain increasing opportunities in the future.
5. Developing research capacity – use resources within network to increase research and increase research coordination. Develop a GoodElectronics research team to consolidate and develop links to researchers and understand the needs on the ground, as well as linking these. Incorporating academics, institutions and local organisations.
6. Building capacity for strategic discussion.
7. Exploring sharing resources for joint work – pooling power and expertise within individual groups in the network.
8. Creativity needed in fund raising efforts – another effort that could be done in a coordinated and pooled manner. Using expertise within organisations and pulling together fund raising experts in the network and targeting potential funders. There is a clear opportunity here but we need a defined strategy to build significant funding.
9. Should we move towards a secretariat model?
 - a. This might lead to better coordination and communication, more efficient use of resources, the strengthening of local groups, and an increase in the likelihood of further funding.
 - b. This requires significant trust as well as regional resources.

Questions and Answers

Q: Lomenik (FSPMI): I am going to talk about smartphone in Indonesia. Almost 90% of people are smartphone users. This has various risks for health but also socially. Research we are going to do (perhaps jointly) will be very important – we should investigate not only the production but also understand the risks and implications of the finished product. Education is also important to highlight the dangers of smartphones – as part of a solution rather than just research.

Kids and technology is a huge issue – it would be good to support campaigning around this. GoodElectronics could combine with groups who do this.

Q: Hector (WH4C): How effective has the network been in terms of bringing about desired changes? While it has been vocal about standards and targeting companies for violations – yet has it been able to influence governments/companies/supply chain which has led to changes among workers/local level/addressing problems? If it is not effective then there is a serious need to understand why – as well as how to best use resources, what strategy/structure of the network should be employed? One indicator of how effective the GoodElectronics network is, would be how much presence it gets in the media – other NGOs get much more coverage. This coverage is important as it gives the opportunity to get the message across to public, governments and companies. It is important to talk about success but also what doesn't work and addressing these to improve the network

A: Response from Karin: There has been a lot of local victories – the problem is we are dealing with the most powerful industry on the planet. No surprising that we haven't been able to overhaul the industry given the political ties and finance surrounding the large firms. Yet we have an opportunity now to really look for allies to coordinate with – many organisations which have a similar agenda to the Network at all levels of the supply chain. The main issue here is resources – what is our capacity and what will happen after the EU money ends? It makes sense to have strategic discussions with other organisations so that we can coordinate, unite and increase success rates at the local level.

The second function would be to have a communication officer within a secretariat – the aim would be to gather information and understand what works. This would include how to engage with partners and companies as well as the maximising of publications and impact with media on a global scale. We need to develop a 'big tent' to take up opportunities – the only way we will have any success is to take on as many groups as possible – uniting around a common interest and taking a life cycle approach. A liaison officer makes a lot of sense – we have not done a good job in terms of branding and getting the information/issues out. Improving PR would be very important for this.

Sheung: What we are forgetting is the workers – we should ask them directly whether change is really happening on the ground. One focus that GE can do is look into trade unions – not that many unions are here and we should be asking if they are really benefiting. Our focus should be on all aspects of the supply chain. In addition, very few workers are actually organised - we should be looking into this.

We need to be sure that we connect policy developments with issues on the ground – if it doesn't then the policy itself is problematic. There needs to be a constant back and forth between the development of initiatives and those who are at the local level to determine whether there has been any benefit.

Mid Term Review

Introduction to the Mid Term Review

The following sessions of the conference were the Mid Term Review sessions, and Jim Cranshaw, the Mid Term Review Coordinator, facilitated attendees to make democratic decisions about the future of the Network over the next few years. The review covers big strategic questions, he said, which were:

1. Update on what was done and what is still to be done to bring the currently funded programme to a good end.
2. Assessing (and prioritizing) the focus of the Network in terms of specific demands or topics.
3. Assessing (and prioritizing) the focus of the Network in terms of specific activities and strategies (e.g. research, organizing, capacity building, campaign, urgent appeals, multi-stakeholder initiatives, working with other Networks)
4. Opening up the discussion for Sustainability of the Network: Prioritise the financial sustainability of the project, discuss options for the structure and legal status of the network, as well as considering the ways we organise ourselves, and the development of a multi-annual strategic plan.

Jim explained that the values behind the Review process were that it should be participatory, democratic and broad. We used One to one interviews, Focus Groups, a Short Online Survey, and a Longer Online Survey to support Network members to evaluate the progress that the Network has made so far, and to make proposals to answer the four questions above, he said.

Jim added that over half of our Network's members have taken part in at least one of these ways. He explained that through these processes, members of the Network submitted proposals and they are in the Strategic Options Pack that has been submitted to delegates (a copy of which is in the Appendix 1). He then explained how the process of democratic decision making would work. The aim was for the 65 attendees of the conference to democratically decide on the proposals that they believed the Network should prioritise over the next few years. The aim, he explained, was to decide the Network's 3 top priorities for both prioritised demands and prioritised tactics/strategies, which also helps to answer research question 1. After that, he added, the group will make decisions on what we want for the future Structure of the Network, as well as the Ways of Organising we want to adopt. Jim made clear that only some of the proposals could be adopted within the limits of the currently funded EC programme. Others would need more funding or different funding, and others would need other actors to agree.

The group engaged in the discussion and amendment of the proposals via small group breakouts, enabling people who are less confident to get their voices heard, and saving time because so many more people can discuss things at once. Then at the end they all

voted for the proposals they thought their organisation would be most likely to engage in. This feature meant that it was not an abstract discussion, but a concrete way of preparing the ground for working together closely on these issues over the next few years. Jim explained that, after the conference, the GE Coordinator, supported by the Steering committee and interested members, will try to implement the decisions made here today as soon as is possible.

Proposals for prioritised demands for the Network

One of the Mid Term Review aims was ‘assessing (and prioritizing) the focus of the Network in terms of specific demands or topics.’ In order to answer this question, Network members were given various means by which to submit proposals. Then in the session itself the proposals were articulated by those who had developed them, and then amended and discussed in small groups. After which the amended proposals were voted on by all participants. The following sections list the proposals, and the discussions that were made in small groups or plenary sessions by conference participants about each one. The final section of this chapter highlights which demands the Network chose to prioritise.

Demand Proposal 1 Transparency, accountability and disclosure within supply chains.

Group facilitator(s) Alejandro González (GoodElectronics Network coordinator), Olga Martin-Ortega, Business, Human Rights and the Environment Research Group, University of Greenwich

Discussion in small groups on the transparency proposal.

Aspects of supply chain disclosure and due diligence. Garrett Brown from MHSSN suggested that transparency and disclosure requirements should include sourcing, and what brands do with e-waste – the whole life cycle. Micheal Ma from SACOM suggested that brands own due diligence efforts should also be disclosed, so that stakeholders know concretely the extent to which brands are implementing their due diligence requirements. This would include the disclosure of compliance reports standardly, but also disclosure of progress made after violations of rights have been found or highlighted from elsewhere. A task that was suggested for the working group formed around this demand was to pick CSR reports and analyse them. Another part of disclosure it would be good to see, the group said, was contract information between buyer and supplier, and sales information, which could be made available to trade union representatives. The emphasis throughout this would be that companies are responsible for their whole supply chain.

Transparency overlaps with the chemicals demand. The group said that this demand overlaps with the chemicals demand. Gaining more rigorous transparency requires companies to stop hiding behind ‘trade secrets’ as a reason not to be open about chemicals. Another aspect that is desperately needed is corporate honesty and disclosure about chemical impacts on workers, as many workers are fighting legal battles around this currently.

Tactics to win the demand: Electronics Watch and Wiki-database. The small group emphasised that the work of Electronics Watch will be very important to the achievement of this demand. They suggested that public sector affiliates of Electronics Watch could start to make the stated transparency requirements of their contractors. Requirements could be reflected in an updated version of the Electronics Watch Guidance for Contractors, which all affiliates then use to make this case to their contractors. These requirements could include disclosure of locations, compliance report disclosure, chemicals disclosure and also clarity on how brand purchasing practices may be influencing the cutting of corners on safety. This would have a strong impact on 'raising the bar' of transparency requirements more generally. Another tactic proposed to win this demand included **setting up a wiki-database** (maybe even encouraging anonymous whistleblowing to it).

Promoting effective regulation of supply chain transparency. The group said that, whilst the demand proposal above primarily focuses on calling on companies to take action now, the working group set up should also push for more meaningful regulation on disclosure and transparency. For example, a proposed law in California, Proposition 6S, would be a model for effective legislation on this.

Keeping workers informed. The group then discussed how to keep workers informed if new information becomes available. Information can be confusing to workers who are working for a factory supplying multiple brands. A way through this maze of information would be important.

Demand Proposal 2. Mining and the impact on workers' rights, communities and health

Group facilitator(s) Jona Rodriguez (AGHAM), Gia Glarino (KALIKASAN)

Discussion in small groups on the mining proposal.

Strengthening the proposal through bringing new stakeholders into a campaign.

They suggested that GE research on mining could start in East Asia, working with indigenous peoples. Campaigns could target mining companies. There would be cross sectoral support for this, going beyond the members of GoodElectronics, as many organisations work on these issues, from environmental to human rights and indigenous support groups.

Overlaps between the mining proposal and other themes. The proposal overlaps with the transparency demand, and with labour issues too, particularly child labour and women workers. An important component of mining is also the OHS and EHS impacts on workers and communities. Environmental Impact Management Services could be strengthened.

Mining is relevant to various countries. In China a focus on mining would be a way of linking issues of environmental protection which are growing, and labour issues. Though it would be a challenge as it is controlled by the state. This would help hold mining companies accountable. In Indonesia the use of coal from Papua is a serious issue, and also links to existing environmental campaigns, as does gold mining, a relative blind spot, as NGOs do not know where Indonesian gold produced by SSMS Indonesia goes to. In

Taiwan there are issues with mining and indigenous peoples. In Uganda there are serious concerns with mining and child labour, not the only country in which children work in artisanal mining. In India local people and workers pushed a mining company out, after serious concerns about their conduct. There was also a suggestion for an environmental investigation mission to investigate Oceana Gold.

Demand Proposal 3. Freedom of Association & Precarious work

Group facilitator(s) Chris Jarvis, People & Planet, Rochelle Porras (EILER), Radziah Jantan (EIEUSR)

Discussion in small groups on the FOA and precarious work proposal.

FOA as an enabling right. The group reiterated that FOA and regularised employment enable most other things that workers need. They outlined the challenges on the ground that workers face in exercising their rights to FOA. These were anti-union policies at company level, and companies' drive for absolute control, communication difficulties and the challenges of organising migrant workers, and that organisers lack support from international solidarity networks.

Recommendations on what would need to change. The group recommended that this demand could benefit from 1. A campaign to abolish Special Economic Zones (SEZs), where workers' rights are suspended, 2. Promoting direct hires, rather than exploitative agencies in which the ultimate employer is unclear, 3. The introduction of legislation or better enforcement of compliance with labour laws or standards, 4. A mechanism for sharing best practices, 5. That workers should be represented at the ASEAN Ministry level, 6. A ban on contractualisation and the promotion of decent jobs, 7. The organisation of precarious workers, and the need to link them with regular workers, 8. Challenging the company unions that are not democratic and do not represent workers' interests, and 9. More representation of women and gender issues in unions.

Demand proposal 4. Chemical use and its impact on workers/ the environment

Group facilitator(s) Ted Smith

Discussion in small group of the chemicals proposal.

Building on progress of the Clean Electronics Production Network. The small group emphasised need to build on the CEPN MSI, as this is making progress. It includes brands and contract manufacturers, which is positive, and takes a whole life cycle approach. The proposal links to mining and disposal of e-waste, and the concerning uses of chemicals in those stages. Although the group thought that the production stage is the most hazardous one in terms of chemical risk to workers' health. The proposal is also linked to transparency demands above, in that workers and civil society need companies to be more transparent about the chemicals they use, and the risks that workers face. For CEPN to set up effective mechanisms of chemical control, a significant participation of grassroots groups, trusted by workers, is necessary, rather than creating a new system of failing self-regulation.

The pilots that have been set up by CEPN so far:

1. **Worker empowerment** – the training of workers in their rights, and the setting up of grievance mechanisms.
2. **Monitoring of chemical use** including in the air, the workplace, in waste water, and in workers' bodies. The group emphasised the need to link this monitoring to Electronics Watch's monitoring, thereby helping public bodies monitor against high, up to date standards. The problem with current methodologies is that workers are often exposed to multiple chemicals at low rates, below legally required limits, but are still harmed because of combination effects.
3. **The introduction of safer alternative chemicals into** industrial use, toluene/benzene/hexane.
4. **Reporting.** Ensuring that mechanisms are set up through which suppliers can report to brands.

The group felt that this proposal would enable stronger coalitions with environmental networks and communities resisting chemical dangers.

Demand Proposal 5. Living wage

Group facilitator(s) Ms.Patchanee Kumnak

Small group discussion on the living wage proposal.

Powerful research is needed to set an agenda on living wage in the industry. The small group emphasised that more research is required on living wage levels in different countries, and a formula is needed to make this simple for different stakeholders to use. This would need to include how much money per day is required to live decently, enabling a new definition of the living wage to be proposed that is based on recognised international labour standards.

An agenda for research on value creation in the industry and the distribution of reward. The research would also need to cover current living conditions for workers and should compare them to the levels of profits being made by brands, in order to highlight the disparity. Electronics firms are incredibly wealthy yet workers are among the poorest. It would also be useful for the research to investigate value creation in different industries and compare them to the electronics industry, as well as comparing value creation at different stages of the electronics supply chain. We need a better understanding of how much value is kept by suppliers, brands and workers. We need research to help us understand the wage levels of different types of workers – regular, precarious, student intern labour, etc. Research is also required on the relationship between living wages being paid, working hours, and OHS issues. Finally we need to research the impacts of raising minimum wages on different related industries. As the labour share of the final product is so small, it may be negligible.

Coordinating campaigns with other industrial sectors. Campaigning on this should be a collective campaign alongside unions and NGOs active in other industries, and should call for a living wage for all workers. The campaign should demand that brands take responsibility for wage levels in their supply chains, rather than blaming their suppliers, whilst paying them low prices. To contribute to this campaign, Electronics Watch could

support a group of public sector buyers to engage with their suppliers and ask for living wage produced products. This project could serve as a clear indicator that it is perfectly possible and, indeed, inexpensive to give workers better wages.

Demand Proposal 6. Just Transition for workers (after automation)

Group facilitator(s) Kan Mutsuzaki (IndustriALL)

Small group discussion on the just transition proposal

A new research agenda is needed on the impacts of automation. Research is needed on the impacts of what has been dubbed the 'new industrial revolution' – automation, robotization, AI, the Internet of Things, etc. This should include predicted job losses, sectors most affected, locations and countries most affected, how industrial relations are changing because of these factors, how supply chains are changing, impacts on investment, and on productivity.

Issues and challenges of the transition for workers. We need more research to understand how companies, governments, workers, unions and the overall industry are likely to be affected. Who controls this industrial change? What role do investors play?

Using the research to drive policy change. Our Network and others need to discuss how to change our strategy and how to make relevant policy demands for a sustainable future. This is likely to include the introduction of standards and new national/international law. This information can be used to set up training – specifically helping to develop working policy and new collective bargaining agreements for unions.

Voting and decisions made.

The members presented then voted on which demands they believed the Network should prioritise at this time. For Demand Proposals, each person got up to 3 votes. The first vote was worth 3 points, the second 2 points and the third 1 point. That way we were able to get a very detailed and rich understanding of participant's preferences. The three highest rated proposals will now be taken forwards. The groups voted for the proposal they felt that their group would be most likely to be involved in and were able to write on their voting slip the ways in which they can be involved. Therefore those proposals that were not selected in the top 3 can still be peer to peer organised by Network members. Here were the voting results.

- Demand Proposal 1 Transparency, accountability and disclosure within supply chains **52 votes**
- Demand Proposal 2 Mining and the impact on workers' rights, communities and health **26 votes**
- Demand Proposal 3 Freedom of Association & Precarious work **58 votes**
- Demand proposal 4 Chemical use and its impact on workers/ the **environment 49 votes**
- Demand Proposal 5 Living wage **37 votes**
- Demand Proposal 6 Just Transition for workers (after automation) **26 votes**

The most popular three proposals to be taken forwards were:

1. **Demand Proposal 3** Freedom of Association & Precarious work
2. **Demand Proposal 1** Transparency, accountability and disclosure within supply chains
3. **Demand proposal 4** Chemical use and its impact on workers/ the environment

For the facilitation of peer to peer organising of both successful, and unsuccessful proposals, the list of which members voted for each, is in Appendix 2.

Proposals for prioritised tactics

The third of the Mid Term Review research questions was *Assessing (and prioritizing) the focus of the Network in terms of specific activities and strategies (e.g. research, organizing, capacity building, campaign, urgent appeals, multi-stakeholder initiatives, working with other Networks)* In order to answer this question, Network members were given various means by which to submit proposals. Then in the session itself the proposals were articulated by those who had developed them, and then amended and discussed in small groups. After which the amended proposals were voted on by all participants. The following presents each prioritised tactic proposal, and then the discussion that follows. The proposals themselves can be found in Appendix 1.

Tactic Proposal 1 Engage with the Clean Electronics Production Network MSI to create industry-wide change on chemicals.

Group facilitator(s) Ted Smith, ICRT

Small group discussion on the CPEN proposal. The group said that reports from the CEPN on chemical exposure could be widely disseminated, and evidence could be collected for campaign materials. CIVIDEP and Toxic Link suggested that they could engage in a chemical study in India. Focusing on chemical hazards is good way to bridge occupational and environmental health within a whole life cycle process, and this also strengthen coalitions. A tool that could be useful, one member said, was GIS mapping, to highlight issue areas and NGOs locations – a good way of linking up issues with organisations including mapping the global chemical trade. The IPEN network would make a good partner organisation, it was said.

Tactic Proposal 2. Create a Labour Rights Defenders Network - a network to provide solidarity support for labour rights defenders under attack by increasingly authoritarian authorities.

Group facilitator(s) Kevin Lin and Andy Shen from ILRF

Small group discussion of the LRDN proposal.

How the proposed Labour Rights Defenders Network could work. The small group suggested that GE could create a sub-committee for the creation of the new network. The features of the LRDN would be that it 1. Operated a hotline or crisis centre line, that is operable 24/7, 2. A website or app was proposed for easing reporting of repression of labour rights defenders, and also for facilitating swift campaigns in response, 3. An education campaign on labour rights standards could be rolled out to workers and

associated groups, 4. There could be a strong partnership with parts of the mainstream media for announcements. 5. The LRDN would help to identify larger, country level issues and concerns. 6. The LRDN would build a database of issues, and what progression has been made with them.

Campaigns flowing out of the Labour Rights Defenders Network. As cases are discovered, linkages could be made with many groups, such as civil society, students, academics, religious groups, to campaign for labour rights. We could identify global days of action and specific events (including the 2020 Olympics). The LRDN could engage with brands and governments, reflecting the fact that the closure of civil society space is often a collusion between the two, as well as international bodies like the ILO and the UN. The international bodies need to be called on to speak up on human rights violations of labour rights defenders and workers.

New funding would be required for this to happen. In addition to the points above the LRDN would need managerial capacity and thinking about systems that have adequate protection of privacy, and protection against hacking, for example.

Linkages with bigger human rights networks. HR Watch, Amnesty, Oxfam, the Business and HR Resource Centre in London, IPEN were all suggested. The Asian Human Rights Network also already has a substantial urgent HR defence system with 600 members – our system could link to their existing infrastructure, but bring to it the increasing attacks on labour rights defenders and workers in particular.

Tactic Proposal 3 A big global public campaign on Olympics 2020, sponsored by Samsung.

Group facilitator(s): Sheung So, LESN

Small group discussion on the Olympics 2020 proposal

The specifics of a 2020 campaign. The group discussed the specifics of the proposed campaign, and suggested that, even in the run up to Olympics 2020, the 2018 Winter Olympics in Korea could be an important set piece moment for the campaign. Samsung and Panasonic are sponsors, and the group mentioned the need to map out other electronics sponsors. Potential campaign partners include Development Korea, and Development Japan. Research and case study reports each year between now and 2020, particularly if linked to the products that are advertised by the sponsorship, could galvanise public support. These do not only have to be about the manufacturing stage, but could equally be on the mining or e-waste issues related to the products.

Goals of the campaign. The demands of the campaign could link to the FOA demand in particular, calling on brands sponsoring the Olympics to ensure FOA rights are respected in their supplier factories. Alternately an ambitious goal could be adopted, which aims to recreate the huge success of the 2008 Indonesian protocol on FOA. Groups involved in the campaign could design such a protocol, or at least statements of support for FOA in principle, and campaign for their adoption by the sponsors. A particularly egregious problem is Samsung's explicit 'no union policy', which should not exist in any company.

Another alternative, or supplementary goal could be around health and safety issues – specifically around the disclosure of chemicals, preventative measures against chemical poisoning, and proposed remedies. Union busting cases could be used to galvanise support for the campaign.

Campaign coordination. LESN offered to coordinate a project on this and is interested in recruiting participant organisations. Sheung So from LESN offered a space later in the conference agenda to plan out the start of the campaign.

Tactic Proposal 4 A concerted international campaign, to put pressure on the industry on a certain theme. e.g. chemicals or living wage.

Group facilitator(s) Esther de Haan, SOMO, Karin Mader, Bread for All, Chris Jarvis, People & Planet,

Small group discussion of the concerted campaign approach.

Chemicals, transparency or a living wage potential aims of a concerted international campaign. The group suggested that, to be adopted, this proposal would need to be more specific. Some focusses that such a concerted campaign could take were suggested.

Transparency was one suggestion, and this has been outlined in more detail in Demand Proposal 1 above. Another clear issues is **chemicals**. A campaign could publicise the most dangerous chemicals and call for their substitution – a winnable goal. An alternative would be to promote governmental adoption of a regulatory standard – the California Proposition 65 would be a blue print here. One suggestion was the promotion of **a Living Wage Challenge**, to match the Chemicals Challenge which has had some substantive success so far. A final suggestion was around Freedom of Association and Precarious Work, an issue that is discussed in Demand proposal 3 above. Any of these issues could be endorsed by GE, and campaigned upon jointly by a large group of members concurrently, across the world, enabling a greater use of collective coordination between members.

Targeting a brand to bring up the whole class of brands. Another approach would be to target a particular brand, for example Samsung or Panasonic, particularly using the opportunity for media pressure occasioned by the forthcoming Olympics 2020. This idea is outlined in detail in the discussion on proposal 3, above. This would be a way of making clear to brands that their actions have consequences, and would incentivise other brands to improve their standards too. EICC could be another target, and the discussion around proposal 10 below outlines what our goals could be there.

Tactic Proposal 5 Setting up an urgent appeals infrastructure amongst our members, to collectively support workers and member orgs bringing up cases.

This proposal was withdrawn, with the support of its proposers, and amalgamated, with Proposal 2.

Tactic Proposal 6 Promoting home country law reform towards the French law model

Group facilitator(s) Mark Anner, Center for Global Workers' Rights

Small group discussion on Proposal 6. There was a distinct lack of engagement or enthusiasm about this proposal. This may simply reflect that the proposer was not there to explain it, but in the end few engaged with it. One comment that was made was that legislation in home nations could be effective compared to legislation in production nations. Yet such policy on business may have potential implication for businesses who have no obligations to home nations – if it was adopted we would need to find a way to overcome this issue.

Tactic Proposal 7. Coordinate organising, brand damage and public procurement leverage tools to target brands more effectively.

Group facilitator(s) Fahmi Panimbang, LIPS.

Small group discussion of the combined leverage proposal

Working together with different forms of leverage. The group discussed the need to decide which firms to target, and suggested that Apple would be a good target for this approach. The approach, it was said, benefits from being able to incorporate groups with multi-stakeholder strategy (such as Electronics Watch, or the Make Electronics Fair campaign). Any campaigns applying this approach would aim to work with and provide information to these groups. A combination of grassroots organising and public procurement approaches could be very powerful. The aim would be, it was said, to combine capital receiving nations (in SE Asia) through campaigning and pressuring brands based in capital sending nations (USA, Europe), a powerful global pincer movement that has not been fully realised to date.

How multi actor leverage strategies can work. The group discussed how a multi actor strategy could be used. This could encompass groups including social investors and pension funds, and could provide information to such funds. Media could also be brought to bear at the same time as these other approaches. These linkages could outlast individual campaigns, and could build sustainable power over time as relationships between different kinds of leverage holders strengthen, and systems of long term cooperation could be set up. Finally the group discussed a particular case, and explored how such an approach could have been used, spanning different levels of the supply chain and different types of leverage.

Tactic Proposal 8 Support a Global Brand Union across key production sites of a brand (like The League for Brand Responsibility)

Group facilitator(s) Ashok Kumar, Queen Mary University

Small group discussion of Proposal 8. This was another proposal that got very little engagement from members present, perhaps reflecting again that there was no proposer present at the meeting to explain it, or perhaps reflecting members not liking it. One member commented that the proposal is not that dissimilar to IndustriALL's existing attempts at brand wide union networks.

Tactic Proposal 9 Capacity sharing across the Network for grassroots organisations - e.g. on technical chemicals related issues

Facilitators. Roben Casalda, CTUHR, Rochelle Porras (EILER)

Small group discussion of the capacity building proposal

Peer to peer technical knowledge sharing. The small group saw this proposal as implying the use of both new and existing methodologies. A key benefit that the group saw from this proposal was the use of the GE central office to facilitate a programme of peer to peer sharing of technical capacity, particularly with regards to OHS issues. Some of our members, and associated groups outside the Network have high level technical skills which could help other members to identify, understand and redress issues around, for example, chemical poisoning, or other issues which require professional knowledge to identify. We could also use our links to university institutes and scholars who study the global supply chain to build the capacity of our members. The Global Labour University was mentioned in particular, with its scientists and health scholars. This could lead to a two way information exchange which could benefit both parties, from the experts who gain research data, to the grassroots who gain technical capacity building and access to expertise.

Resources required for Network-wide capacity building. The group suggested that an external liaison officer in the GE Network could facilitate this process, alongside an internal communications officer. The materials that would be required for this proposal were said to include the sharing or training resources on, for example, OHS hazards, the sharing of methods used to detect issues on an ongoing basis, a common curriculum, written materials, and instruction manuals for trade union representatives, workers and NGO officers. It's essential that the system that is set up ultimately increases the amount of training going on at plant or factory level – for example on how to spot and report chemical hazards.

Challenges to capacity building. To ensure that this proposal is not too broad it was proposed that a thematic focus could be adopted, at least in the pilot stages. But this theme should be reasonably broad, and not too limited in scope. One crucial aspect of the system that is set up is that it should not create a system requiring a great deal of administration – for example requirements on GE staff to update resources themselves, or to intermediate too much in the peer to peer sharing process. Some of the process could be automated.

Tactic Proposal 10. Engaging with EICC for cross-industry engagement

Group facilitator(s) Radziah Jantan (EIEUSR)

Small group comments on the EICC proposal

A collective approach to moving beyond existing social auditing. The small group suggested the inclusion of the ILO, UN and other related organisations like the FLA in this process of engagement. It was suggested that OECD countries could be called upon to promote this process. GE's role would be to campaign, lobby and put pressure on brands and the EICC to engage with unions directly in social auditing. The group suggested that, before GE has a dialogue with the EICC, GE members should be consulted first.

GE could create Guidance for Social Auditing that clarifies that social auditing cannot and will not make a difference for workers unless unions are engaged with, as unions and workers monitor their own conditions far better than a paid monitoring organisation ever could. This reflects a longstanding criticism of social auditing as ‘the fox guarding the hen house’. The guidance should make clear that real and effective auditing should be primarily based on a company engaging with the relevant regional and national unions concerned. Equally audit reports should be submitted to the regional and national unions, rather than kept private by companies. Another approach could simply ‘cut out the middle man’. Factory unions could engage their national union federation to do the audits themselves and submit the reports to the company and the union concerned. If companies heeded this advice, it would be a way of them finally meeting their long heralded goal of moving ‘beyond audit’. This proposal being made would test companies’ genuine commitment to that concept.

Tactic Proposal 11. Demonstrating the links between brand business models and factory floor conditions.

Group facilitator(s) Karin Mader, Bread For All, Mark Anner, Center for Global Workers’ Rights

Small group discussion on linking brands to their impacts through research

How research into brands’ responsibility could proceed. The group discussed how this proposal would work, and one suggestion was working with whistle-blowers who can see the deals that are being made by brands with their suppliers, and whether they facilitate or prevent labour rights compliance by suppliers. However it was pointed out that this is a challenging thing to get any information on or to research, as it is all subject to commercial secrecy. One indicator that could be used is working hours. We have a great deal of anecdotal evidence that working hours are affected by sudden orders with short lead times. Some MSIs, it was said, make this connection already.

Campaigning on brand responsibility – creating a pincer movement. One of the group asked whether this proposal could be merged with proposal 4, for a concerted internationally coordinated campaign. Either way, it was said that to avoid the ‘top-down’ nature of this tactic, the research that is done should lead to lobbying and advocacy. Another way this concern could be addressed would be to introduce elements of this proposal into Proposal 9, on capacity building and sharing expertise across the Network. So whilst Proposal 9 facilitates the sharing of information, technical expertise and knowledge between grassroots organisations, this knowledge is captured and used to ensure that brands are held responsible, rather than shifting blame to their suppliers. This combines a ‘top down’ with a ‘bottom up’ approach.

Someone from the audience asked ‘How would this be done and what are main criteria to examine working conditions across wide ranging regions?’, highlighting some food for thought around this proposal.

Questions and Answers.

The audience discussed all the proposals, and the following discussion took place.

Q: Pauline: Number of proposals are similar – perhaps possible to merge some? For example, tactic proposal 3, 4 and 7? **A: Jim:** Opportunity was given for proposals to combine, down to the proposers to decide if they want to merge or not.

Q: Hector: Are the proposals with lowest votes abandoned? Clearly demonstrates interest among members to carry out proposal. **A: Jim:** no, we will let members know the names of everyone who wanted to get engaged in each proposal so that those that are not chosen as Network priorities can be organised peer to peer if people wish.

Q: Sheung: I think when we come to a decision we need to factor in any time constraints – it might not mean abandoning the unlucky proposals but we do need to prioritise. In addition, if we do come up with proposals, how do we move forward with this? Perhaps the secretariat could motivate and organise moving forward with proposals. **Alex:** This process of decision making is not making a permanent decision – the network will continue to be broad and to carry out broad activities throughout the supply chain. Individuals should continue to do what they should think is best with their resources – however, in writing a strategic action plan for next year it is important to designate central resources to prioritised actions – which will be democratically elected here, as unfortunately it is not possible to do all these activities immediately. This is more about trying to find the energy of the network – where interests lie and which proposals can be implemented immediately compared to those which have a more long-term outlook.

Q: Sheung: I am curious about engaging with EICC – they are a corporate orientated organisation with standards – is it productive to engage with them? **Kan:** Now proposal is not only about engaging with more than the EICC but also FLA, UN etc. Aim is to create guidelines for social auditing which could be incorporated into EICC standards, specifically about unions being involved in auditing, to make it meaningful. **Hector:** EICC is not focussing on forced labour – they need to be informed by organisations and therefore GE can have a lot of influence within EICC.

Voting and decisions made.

The members present then voted on which demands they believed the Network should prioritise at this time. For Tactics Proposals, each person got up to 3 votes. The first vote was worth 3 points, the second 2 points and the third 1 point. That way we were able to get a very detailed and rich understanding of participant's preferences. The three highest rated proposals will now be taken forwards. The groups voted for the proposal they felt that their group would be most likely to be involved in and were able to write on their voting slip the ways in which they can be involved. Therefore those proposals that were not selected in the top 3 can still be peer to peer organised by Network members. Here were the votes.

- Tactic Proposal 1 Engage with the Clean Electronics Production Network MSI to

- create industry-wide change on chemicals. **31 votes**
- Tactic Proposal 2 Create a Labour Rights Defenders Network - a network to provide solidarity support for labour rights defenders under attack by increasingly authoritarian authorities. **51 votes**
- Tactic Proposal 3 A big global public campaign on Olympics 2020, sponsored by Samsung. **38 votes**
- Tactic Proposal 4 A concerted international campaign, to put pressure on the industry on a certain theme e.g. chemicals or living wage. **33 votes**
- Tactic Proposal 5 Setting up an urgent appeals infrastructure amongst our members, to collectively support workers and member orgs bringing up cases. **0 votes**
- Tactic Proposal 6 Promoting home country law reform, to move towards the French law model. **4 votes**
- Tactic Proposal 7 Coordinate organising, brand damage and public procurement leverage tools to target brands more effectively. **10 votes**
- Tactic Proposal 8 Support a Global Brand Union across key production sites of a brand (like The League for Brand Responsibility) **0 votes**
- Tactic Proposal 9 Capacity sharing across the Network for grassroots organisations - e.g. on technical chemicals related issues **57 votes**
- Tactic Proposal 10 Engaging with EICC for cross-industry engagement **16 votes**
- Tactic Proposal 11 Demonstrating the links between brand business models and factory floor conditions. **1 vote**

Most popular three proposals to be taken forwards

1. **Tactic Proposal 9** Capacity sharing across the Network for grassroots organisations - e.g. on technical chemicals related issues
2. **Tactic Proposal 2** Create a Labour Rights Defenders Network - a network to provide solidarity support for labour rights defenders under attack by increasingly authoritarian authorities.
3. **Tactic Proposal 3** A big global public campaign on Olympics 2020, sponsored by Samsung.

For the facilitation of peer to peer organising of both successful, and unsuccessful proposals, the list of which members voted for each, is in Appendix 3.

Structure, sustainability and ways of organising ourselves as a Network

Jim explained that the final of the four Mid Term Review research questions was: Open up the discussion for Sustainability of the Network: Prioritise the financial sustainability of the project, discuss options for the structure and legal status of the network, as well as considering the ways we organise ourselves, and the development of a multi-annual strategic plan. This is a truly crucial and critical question for the Network, as we come towards the end of our funding. In order to answer those questions, Jim explained, Network members were given various means by which to submit proposals. Then a Structure and Sustainability Focus Group, which was open to all members, met. This group whittled a long list down to 3 proposals on structure and 3 proposals on ways of organising to the session, for a decision.

Jim reiterated some key caveats around these structural questions, emphasising that we do not know what funding source we will find, and we also cannot control which members wish to contribute resources to a Secretariat, for example, or the proposal around hosting from an Asian Network's office. Therefore, the Coordinator cannot promise to enact the results of this decision, but can only aim to do transition into them in good faith and in due course funding permitting. The group discussed these Structure Proposals in small groups, suggested amendments, discussed in plenary, and then voted. The following is the proposals, and the discussions that were had in small groups and in plenary. Some key amendments to the proposals came out, and they are highlighted below. For a longer articulation of the proposals, see Appendix 4.

Proposal 1. Secretariat Structure. GE becomes a Secretariat split across, for example, 6 organisations in 6 different countries, coordinated by a Coordinator. The Coordinator administrates the network and coordinates strategy setting processes, and fundraises for large international grants from EC and other large funders.

Ideal case scenario. Members in the small group emphasised that we are of course talking about an ideal circumstance, including getting the needed funding, but that it was worth exploring which of the structural options are preferable, assuming the funding can be found.

Two offices, one in North and one in South. The group did not understand why the proposal should involve so many different offices, but felt that it would be preferable to have two offices, a Global North and a Global South offices, with at least one full time staff member in each office.

Full time roles. Full time roles, rather than member organisations providing staff for half time roles, was thought to be important. This was both so that the staff members can focus wholly, and not be pulled away onto other roles, but also so that they would have the capacity to rapidly respond to things like urgent appeals from members. The group argued that each staff member would have different, complementary tasks and responsibilities. If other organisation's staff members are used, there is also a risk of pulling away resources from grassroots organisations from their prime work; grass roots orgs have to focus on

organising etc. and should not devote too many resources to coordination.

The challenges of a virtual office across borders. One member suggested a virtual office, enabling coordinators in different places to work together. CEREAL responded that, in their experience: 2 offices creates coordination challenges, and there then becomes a need to have a director, or an overall coordinator. Garrett concurred, saying that, with the Bangladesh Accord, they have 2 offices, in Amsterdam and in Dhaka. That works, but there is a great deal of flying up and down between the two countries.

A very generous offer of a funded full time officer from Citizens of the Earth, Taiwan. Taiwanese environmental NGO Citizens of the Earth (CET) could offer to fund a full- time officer and an office, if this model is chosen!

Consensus amendments: *this amendment was added to the proposal by the group. Therefore the whole conference voted on the amended proposal after this, not the original proposal.*

- a. full time staff not part time staff is preferred, so they can focus wholly on GE.**
- b. Limit to 2 offices (host organizations), a North office and a South office, each with at least 1 full time staff member.**
- c. The existing structure should remain until we are in a position to move to a new structure.**

Proposal 2. GE has the same structure and continues to be hosted by SOMO.

Strong arguments for keeping Coordinator position in Europe. The group said there were strong arguments in favour of this option: GE coordination should be located in Europe as it is safer to be away from countries in SE Asia which face problems with authoritarian governments, with an anti - international stance in some places. The group thought it would be preferable for GE to remain in Europe, for the purposes of lobbying governments and brands, engaging with the UN, engaging with other industries, and finally with funders. They argued instead that local groups should get more space, more support, more funds for more monitoring work, and more exchange, rather than needing to locate the coordinator position in production countries.

Better to have more than 1 coordinator, as it is too much for one person, if it is possible we should have two coordinators.

Greater coordination needs more (and more reliable) funding sources – better coordination may also require increased staffing.

Even with option 2 there is no certainty on funding – we need to focus on the same system to secure funding – Option 2 is most likely. With this we can build capacity and increase funding options going forwards.

People want more to be achieved with network – Option 1 model is perhaps most likely to achieve more – however I think we should maintain where we are at the moment, one member said, and take several years to transition and build up towards a sec model. If we

do this to rapidly it may have negative consequences.

Proposal 3. Asian Network hosts. GE moves to being hosted by one of the main Asian Networks.

Unpopularity of locating GE Coordination solely in an Asian country. This proposal was hardly discussed, with members not choosing to go to the flipchart and discuss it, as it was widely felt the political situation in Asia is too vulnerable to set up a GE coordination function there alone. Few countries have democratic regimes right now: South Korea, Taiwan, Hong Kong. And many countries are cracking down on civil society organisations, in particular on foreign-funded or foreign orgs. The time is not favourable to set up anything in Thailand, for example, members commented, given the military rule. However, members were open to one of two offices being located in Asia (see Secretariat proposal)

Questions and Answers.

Kan: Nowadays, it is very, very difficult to get external funding. We should be realistic. For Kan this means: maintain the existing situation at SOMO, that is more likely to get funded; and at the same time, increase the capacity of the network members.

Sheung: Maintain existing situation for now. Take time to move into a new structure. This should not be done overnight.

Ted: it seems likely that it will be easier to get funding for a network that is partly coordinated from an Asian country.

Consensus amendment: *Whatever decision is made, GE should take its time to transition slowly to a new structure.*

Discussion in plenary before the vote, including amendments. This is reproduced in full below.

Ted: Communication channels are important, we should consider locating somewhere which has access to media outlets and to an organisation which has the ability to use these connections to increase exposure for GE among public and companies.

Hector: We have differing capacities among members – this allows campaigns at one level to be taken on by organisations with expertise and resources – this gives the network strength. In addition, the network is increasing exposure to a whole range of issues within the supply chain – a broad range of concerns are tackled, this broad focus also builds network strength. This is important as companies are also building capacity, resources and joining together to combat activity from networks like GE.

Irene: If there is no funding then there is no funding for the Coordinator – if there is no funding then SOMO does not have the money to pay salaries. We should prepare for this worst case scenario too.

Hector: We are now looking at GE from a funding perspective – but something which should be seen separately is the legal structure of GE. Should we be seen as a formal entity – though if we do separate from SOMO we need to ensure that we can ensure

funding, we risk being a new entity with no experience. For the future the legal form (formal or not) is a separate concentration – at the moment we are looking at ways to secure funding but this is a different issue.

Ted: I think it is worth trying to find a consensus coming out of this meeting. There probably is a consensus that we can't do anything drastic in the near term so should look long term – we should focus on funding and look at what is the best option on how to raise funding. If we were able to do that, it might create a consensus option that a 2 tier structure (with secretariat) will be best going forwards. If we were not able to achieve that then we have the fall back of maintaining the current system. I do think that it is important to approach funders with this new strategy - I think this is more likely to attract funding.

Pauline: Model 3 deleted because of political concerns and risks in SE Asia – yet there are many organisations that do function there, so that seems incongruous. What was discussed in a small group that a few nations have a stable government but areas like Malaysia and Indonesia are less safe for international orgs – some cases of these being kicked out recently. Option 1 has option 3 within it – in option 1 it is possible to have staff located within Asia in this model. Option 3 is a more well defined and established transition to an Asian host, whereas option 1 is more of a co-hosting.

Voting and decisions made.

For the Structure Proposals, each person had one vote.

- **Structure proposal 1: Secretariat 23 votes**

Agreed Amendments to Proposal 1:

1. *Full time staff not part time staff is preferred, so they can focus wholly on GE.*
2. *Limit to 2 offices (host organizations), a North office and a South office, each with at least 1 full time staff member.*
3. *The existing structure should remain until we are in a position to move to a new structure.*

- **Structure proposal 2: Stay at SOMO 15 votes**
- **Structure proposal 3: Hosted by Asian Network 0 votes**

Most popular proposal to be taken forwards:

- **Structure proposal 1: Secretariat, with agreed amendments.**

Ways of Organising Proposals

The final decision the conference was asked to make was on the way we should organise ourselves internally as a Network. The following are the discussions in small groups and in plenary.

Organising Proposal 1 Thematic Working Groups. We could have working groups for example on chemicals, for precarious work, etc. These groups could organise research, campaigns on this topic.

The plenary session discussed the idea that this proposal was not intended to be too rigid. The working groups would depend on what that organisations' main focus is, it was said, – a member org that has an interest/desire would coordinate with other groups who have other functions (under one lead group). There would also be no official designation of groups. The idea was that the working groups will enhance and strengthen work and involve multiple organisations. The idea is not to select activities but to let them evolve organically within member orgs, it was pointed out. Another member said that it was not a question of selecting on WG or another – depending on the issue, different organisations with a focus on that area would get together on that issue. There should be no permanent structure, Garrett Brown said, as this does not function –it does not reflect the needs, expertise or capacities or members. There was a lot of agreement in the room to this last point.

The decision was then made by Jim, the Mid Term Review Coordinator, that the idea of having organically evolving and 'temporary' WGs represents a new proposal, Proposal 4. This became known as **Proposal 4 'Ad hoc working groups'**

Organising Proposal 2: Regional Councils. We could have Regional Councils, for example for South East Asia

It was explained that we could decide the structure of different regions using a regional council approach: SE Asia, N. America, Europe, etc. This would allow the Coordinator to connect with the lead regional coordinator of a region but it would also enable regional specialisation and a regional focus on particular regional concerns. There was little discussion on this proposal.

Organising Proposal 3: Functional Working Groups. We could have functional working groups, so members could choose to support the goals of the wider Network by contributing forms of expertise. So we could have a fundraising group, a capacity building group, a policy group, and perhaps a research group to liaise with external and internal researchers to forward our common agenda.

Strong coordinating role. In the plenary discussion on this proposal, it was explained that each functional working group should have a strong coordinating role – expertise can be coordinated together to increase effectiveness.

Difficulty of recruiting members to the working groups. Members seem to be more enthusiastic about thematic topics – and one member mentioned that if we set up functional

groups then it might not be easy to recruit members to them. Another member suggested that this could be dealt with by a leadership rotation with groups and that members' contributions could be flexible.

These groups could extend outside the network to interested supporters, as each group does not have to limit itself to only GE members but could extend working group membership to those outside the group like academics, journalists and partners and bring them into activity.

Demanding proposal in terms of resources – if we do not have capacity maybe it is better to have short term projects groups rather than long term structure, one member pointed out. These would create a working group for a short time while a project or campaign is in place – after its objectives are achieved they will disband and contribute to other activities.

A fund-raising functional group would be very important and useful, it was pointed out – whatever proposal is voted for, this could be a longer-term group.

Whatever structure we choose should enable coordination, activity and increase effectiveness – avoid having too many small groups with too few contributors.

Organising Proposal 4: Ad-hoc WGs

We discussed whether it was legitimate to include this proposal at this late stage. The consensus was that the group would be unhappy if 4 is removed despite it being a last minute additional proposal.

Questions and Answers.

Ron comment: In the collective action, union and activity we hope to get back the 4 workers dismissed by NXP. Without a network like this it would be too hard to achieve our goals, networking and fund raising are important but the most vital thing is the information and expertise (health & safety and research) which we get and can extend to the workers in the Philippines. National pollution: management has a trade mark on us so that even without a leader we can still commit to action. You have to assess organisation – sometimes there is weakness. As of now we have 800 contract workers who are fighting to be regular workers – management is still appealing and the support of GE is helpful and we may ask for help again in the future.

Q; Kim: The Korean Transnational Corporation Watch is putting together a complaint – we will consult with them on the possibility in joining on the complaint.

Ways of Organising Decision.

As with the Structure vote, each organisation got one vote. They were as follows

- Ways of Organising proposal 1: Thematic Working Groups **6 votes**
- Ways of Organising proposal 2: Regional Councils **4 votes**
- Ways of Organising proposal 3: Functional Working Groups **3 votes**
- Ways of Organising proposal 4: Ad hoc Working Groups: **22 votes**

Most popular proposal to be taken forwards:

1. Ways of Organising proposal 4: Ad Hoc Working Groups.

Summary and conclusions

Alex thanked all participants, the hosts, the translators, and the rest of the conference team for a crucial conference in which we did not only discuss the issues, but we came together to make strategic decisions about our future as a Network.

Jim read out the results of the final vote. Jim emphasised that the decisions made today will need to be further developed, and called on those organisations that want to get involved with the proposals to get involved in developing them into our global strategy. Jim thanked everyone for taking part in the democratic process and making these decisions.

Alex stated that, following the Mid Term Review process, he and the Steering Committee will:

- Share a report about the Conference with all participants in November.
- Create a work plan for 2018 incorporating the winning proposals as far as possible.
- Ensure that the winning proposals, together with all the decisions and discussions, are going to be the cornerstone of developing a multi annual strategic plan for a follow up program.
- This strategic plan will be developed in 2018 and it will be the basis for fundraising.
- Alex will follow up with the proponents of each winning proposal, and the people that voted for it, in order to develop a work plan and a budget for each proposal.

Alex and Kan organised various photos of the group and concluded the conference.

Appendix 1 Demands and tactics proposals in full

Demand Proposal 1 Transparency, accountability + disclosure within supply chains

Group facilitator(s) Alejandro González (GoodElectronics Network coordinator), Olga Martín-Ortega, Business, Human Rights and the Environment Research Group, University of Greenwich

1. Describe the concrete initiative that the Network could launch to get the industry to meet this demand. Form and inform a coalition of civil society actors (NGOs, Trade Unions human rights advocates) pushing for an Electronics Industry Transparency Commitment calling electronic companies for:

- Disclosure of names and addresses of suppliers. (GoodElectronics/ICRT Gap Analysis 1.1.)¹
- Disclosure of due diligence processes and outcomes. This includes disclosure of reports mandated by law.
- Full Materials Disclosure. Workers must know what substances they are handling in their daily work. This requires companies to provide “full materials disclosure” to workers, community residents and their representative organisations. (Gap Analysis 1.4.)
- Providing Health and safety information to workers: this calls for full health and safety information about all materials. (Gap Analysis 1.5.) Health and safety information on hazardous substances can't be confidential under international laws, global policy frameworks and national law.²

Steps:

1. We create the Coalition of committed NGOs, Trade Unions, human rights advocates calling for Transparency in the Electronics supply chain.
2. We make a list of electronic companies and analyse their public disclosure of supplier's information (including suppliers' names, factory addresses, HRDD policies, chemicals used, purchasing practices, etc.) These standards will include an important distinction (and addition) to current transparency criteria on other sectors (including garment) in order to include i.e. chemicals and mining of minerals.
3. Through research on transparency best practices we will develop a list of criteria to be considered “minimum standards for disclosure” in the electronics sector.
4. The Coalition endorses the Electronics Industry Transparency Commitment
5. The Coalition contacts the electronic companies asking them to adopt the Electronics Industry Transparency Commitment. We also call on the EICC to adopt the Commitment in the Code.
6. The Coalition monitors the degree of implementation by companies comparing their practices vs. the Commitment Standards.
7. Lobby and advocacy towards companies increased commitment and stricter regulation on the matter, including producing critical analysis of current mandatory disclosure and transparency requirements.

2. What are the political opportunities for us to win results from this demand?

- We can build upon and inspire by the Apparel and Footwear Supply Chain Transparency Pledge.
- Some companies have started to disclose certain information. We can incentivize a race to the top and challenge current conceptions of transparency as static, superficial and formal.
- As a coalition with a unified voice we have greater power vis a vis the brands and the EICC.

3. Who amongst the Network and outside the Network is willing to join a working

group to push this demand forwards after the conference in Batam? No answer given.

Demand 2. Mining and the impact on workers' rights, communities and health

Group facilitator(s) Jona Rodriguez (AGHAM), Gia Glarino (KALIKASAN)

1. Describe the concrete initiative that the Network could launch to get the industry to meet this demand. The Network could meet the demand on impacts of mining through various means:

- Investigate the impacts of mining through Environmental Investigative Missions on environmental and health impacts to workers and communities affected
- Training deputized worker inspectors of trade unions regarding environmental and health impacts of mining to semi-processing industries
- Eco labelling campaign can be pursued through consultations with trade unions, on site investigations, and desk research. The eco label will then be awarded to electronic companies which (1) do not source minerals from mining companies that have records of HR violations and unjust environmental destruction, (2) have occupational health and safety standards and workers' rights which are met by mining to export process zones
- Lobbying to governments to improve legislation and its implementation regarding monitoring of mining impacts

2. What are the political opportunities for us to win results from this demand at this time?

With a wide range of issues in mining, focusing on this demand would greatly help workers and communities. With the recent development of The Committee of the United Nations Covenant on Economic, Social and Cultural Rights with its adaptation of the new General Comment 24 on State Obligations under the International Covenant on Economic, Social and Cultural Rights in the Context of Business Activities, the network could build on this UN treaty to oblige corporations to address human rights

3. Who amongst the Network and outside the Network is willing to join a working group to push this demand forwards after the conference in Batam? CSOs which support the rights of workers in mining companies and those of which support rightful, just, and healthy use of environmental resources, people's organizations in communities affected by mining, and most especially trade unions in mining companies could be reached out with this particular demand

Demand Proposal 3. Freedom of Association & Precarious work
Group facilitator(s) Chris Jarvis, People & Planet, Rochelle Porras (EILER), Radziah Jantan (EIEUSR)

1. Describe the concrete initiative that the Network could launch to get the industry to meet this demand.

Freedom of association is a gateway to accessing other rights in the workplace and to end exploitative practices within the electronics industry, as with other other sectors. Good Electronics Network could contribute to improving freedom of association in a number of ways:

- Lobbying global brands, manufacturing subcontractors and other stakeholders in supply chains to adopt policies guaranteeing freedom of association and open the door to trade union recognition and collective bargaining agreements.
- Lobbying national governments and international organisations to improve legislation and enforcement of legislation regarding trade union rights and freedom of association.
- Mobilise the Network to support calls for trade union rights and access from workers and unions in production countries. For example, responding to a call-out from workers trying to unionise in a factory, taking solidarity action with an existing union calling for recognition agreements.
- Network support for raising awareness and dissemination activities on the importance of freedom of association. Instructional publications (educational modules, reports, books) in aid of promoting trade union rights may be funded for publication and mass distribution.
- We need to enhance awareness among the public and the end user of the products/brands about the stories behind it on how the workers have to deal such pressure that they have to face (i.e certain brand violated child labour to produce their products, working condition and long working hours and cheap wages).

2. What are the political opportunities for us to win results from this demand at this time?

- The increased global focus on Samsung due to the South Korean political corruption scandal, as well as the instability of the current Samsung leadership after the sentencing of Lee Jae-Yong, is a unique opportunity to push for freedom of association at Samsung supply chains and in the wider industry. particularly within South Korea.
- In addition, the late September launch of newest Apple products and software (more information on <https://www.apple.com/newsroom/>), is another favorable condition to drum-beat an international campaign in the Apple supply chain. Both opportunities can engage international organisations (i.e., the ITUC).

3. Who amongst the Network and outside the Network is willing to join a working group to push this demand forwards after the conference in Batam?

The demand can reach both broad institutions supporting trade union rights, and specific groups such as trade unions in Asia Pacific region. We need to invite more NGOs, trade union and other related parties to join the movement.

Demand proposal 4. Chemical use and its impact on workers/ the environment

Group facilitator(s) Ted Smith

1. Describe the concrete initiative that the Network could launch to get the industry to meet this demand.

- A. G. E. could be a formal participant in the Clean Electronics Production Network (CPEN) (see Tactic Proposal 1).
- B. G. E. could also work with member groups to conduct bio-monitoring with workers at various electronics factories as part of an effort to document chemical exposures and to help identify toxic chemicals being used in electronics production.

2. What are the political opportunities for us to win results from this demand at this time?

A. See answer to Tactic Proposal 1

B. If we were to engage in bio-monitoring at several factories in different countries and were able to produce meaningful results, it could have a major impact on the industry.

3. Who amongst the Network and outside the Network is willing to join a working group to push this demand forwards after the conference in Batam?

We've had discussions so far with several groups but need volunteers to participate and also to find funding for this initiative.

Demand Proposal 5. Living wage

Group facilitator(s) Ms.Patchanee Kumnak

1. Describe the concrete initiative that the Network could launch to get the industry to meet this demand.

[GET Thailand who proposed this option used examples specifically from Thailand]. Higher wage/salary can affect small enterprises in electronics supply chain and lead to resistance from capitalists and business people. Therefore, we should have a powerful study about why workers need higher wages and how it affects business in industry and agricultural sector as well as solutions proposed to governments. Unions are experienced in the raising of the minimum wage of the last government in 2011 in Thailand before. There were many problems in implementation of this policy. To ensure higher wage policies, governments need to be democratic.

This powerful study should be involved by academics, labour movement and democracy movement as well in order to ensure that the campaign for higher wage is accepted and successful.

2. What are the political opportunities for us to win results from this demand at this time?

There are no opportunities to campaign in public because under the military rules, people do not have the right to gather themselves more than 5 in public. Until the junta schedules the general elections and end its administration. When democratic space is open, we can run any campaign. At this time, we, GET, only hold trainings and meetings with members to discuss the current situations and create a project on precarious employment.

During these times, a part of labour movement has to raise the new concept of a living wage. This means that minimum wage should cover other 2 family members, according to international labour standards. Since, in the country, workers as a whole cannot live with

the current low minimum wage because of the higher cost of living and workers' debts.

Therefore, GET is planning to link with other electronics unions in other industrial areas. Networking is another strategy to build a partnership on labour issues under the military rules that labour unions need to improve their standpoints and to prepare for the next general election in two years. The government always breaks its promise to have elections.

3. Who amongst the Network and outside the Network is willing to join a working group to push this demand forwards after the conference in Batam?

There are unions demanding higher wages such as the Thai Labour Solidarity Committee (TLSC) and IndustriALL Thailand. However, GET Thailand are not their members and do not join in their activities and electronics unions affiliated with IndustriALL do not join us. There are fractions among labour movement because of different political standpoints (pro and against the military coup).

However, we agree on the higher wage demand. But we also have other labour issues in mind such as working conditions and freedom of assembly and collective bargaining according to our members' situations. Now we are focusing on our issues (wage, working conditions, urgent cases) and connection with other networks. Many electronic workers are not organized, so there are spaces of opportunity to work on the issue.

Demand Proposal 6. Just Transition for workers (after automation)

Group faciliator(s) Kan Mutsuzaki,

1. Describe the concrete initiative that the Network could launch to get the industry to meet this demand.

No answers given before meeting but verbal presentation given – see below.

2. What are the political opportunities for us to win results from this demand at this time?

3. Who amongst the Network and outside the Network is willing to join a working group to push this demand forwards after the conference in Batam.

Tactic Proposal 1 Engage with the Clean Electronics Production Network MSI to create industry-wide change on chemicals.

Group faciliator(s) Ted Smith, ICRT

1. Describe concretely how the Network could continue its engagement with CPEN to drive forward changes around chemicals.

The Clean Electronics Production Network is a multi-stakeholder initiative that was formed in response to the development of the “Challenge to the electronics industry” by GE and ICRT. Its goal is to “move towards zero exposure of workers to toxic chemicals in the electronics manufacturing process.” <http://www.centerforsustainabilitysolutions.org/clean-electronics/>

There are 4 four major Initiatives in support of the broader Network goal:

**Worker Engagement & Empowerment

**Tracking & Measuring Exposure

**Safer Substitutions

**Process Chemicals Reporting

CEPN is interested in increasing the involvement of NGOs in this effort. It would be helpful if G.E, members could participate, particularly in the first 2 initiative groups.

2. What are the political opportunities and threats for us in using this tactic?

There is a real opportunity to make changes in the industry at this time. The impact of our "Challenge to the electronics industry" has been widespread and many within the industry realize that they need to do much more to protect the workers throughout the supply chain.

3. Who amongst the Network and outside the Network is willing to join a working group to push this tactic forwards after the conference in Batam?

AMRC and CEREAL have been involved so far - it would help to have others participate.

Tactic Proposal 2. Create a Labour Rights Defenders Network - a network to provide solidarity support for labour rights defenders under attack by increasingly authoritarian authorities.

Group faciliator(s) Kevin Lin and Andy Shen from ILRF

1. Describe concretely how the Network could create and develop a Labour Rights Defenders Network.

For decades, in key manufacturing countries, the labour movement has faced increased state repression. Rights to organise, collectively bargain and strike have been curtailed and repressed. China and Vietnam are two of the worst countries for this kind of repression and denial of rights, but the same issue occurs in other countries too.

Now we are seeing the closing down of space for NGOs to organise. In China laws are cracking down on the rights of labour movement NGOs. In India NGOs have been surveilled and challenged by new laws. In other countries the right to receive foreign funding, protest or to freely associate is curtailed.

One thing was discussed at a recent Hong Kong workshop: establishing an urgent appeal protocol and Labour Rights Defenders Network to help partners that are under threat in the electronics industry because they are defending labour rights in that sector, so we could coordinate a pile on of solidarity in those cases.

This would be a network specific to the electronics industry. The network would work with on the ground China and other country groups to document those cases of repression of labour rights defenders, so we can bring these cases forwards to the brands and advocacy groups.

2. What are the political opportunities and threats for us in using this tactic?

In the garments industry, some companies are more progressive than others in terms of how they respond to repression of labour rights defenders, showing the progress can be made. ILRF are interested in exploring more whether there are funding and opportunities in this similar area in the electronics industry.

3. Who amongst the Network and outside the Network is willing to join a working group to push this tactic forwards after the conference in Batam?

ILRF. Others expressed interest at a recent Hong Kong meeting.

Tactic Proposal 3 A big global public campaign on Olympics 2020, sponsored by Samsung.

Group facilitator(s): Sheung So, LESN

1. Describe concretely how the Network could develop this collective, international campaign around Olympics 2020.

In 2008 there was a new protocol on FOA signed between the major sports brands – Adidas, Nike, Puma, etc, negotiated over two years and Indonesian unions. This required, in theory at least, that the brands would then train their local suppliers not to repress union organising, and indeed to welcome it. The unions were also enabled to come in and organise workers. This success was partly the result of an international Olympics campaign – a campaign against the games sponsors, especially Adidas, but also other brands. Adidas took the lead after this and became the moderator for the company side. Oxfam Australia and Oxfam Indonesia were major players in mediating the negotiations. Perhaps GE should be doing that, something inventive, something that can achieve a lot.

‘The ILRP campaign, Indonesian unions and international campaign and union groups sought to address this weakness. The 2009 meeting between the groups represented the beginning of a new, more deliberately collaborative way of working with brands, suppliers, and Indonesian groups, looking at the concrete problems at country level and developing practical solutions together with the aim of preventing freedom of association (FOA) violations before they occurred. That shift also involved the Indonesian trade unions being at the centre of any strategy, with Oxfam playing a supporting role both at national and international level.’

The campaign led to the agreement of an industry-wide Freedom of Association Protocol that promises significant and lasting benefits. This is only the first of three protocols scheduled for negotiation, the other two being on job security and the living wage. Following two years of support by Oxfam and others, the Freedom of Association Protocol was signed in June 2011. By November, Nike, Adidas, Puma, New Balance, Asics, and Pentland had signed, along with suppliers PT Nikomas Gemilang, PT Panarub Industry, PT Tuntex Garment, and PT Adis Dimension Footwear. In December the SPTSK KSPSI union became a signatory, bringing the total number of workers covered to more than 700,000.

By March 2013, 47 out of 51 Adidas suppliers had signed up. By September 2013, the total number of Adidas, Nike, New Balance, Puma, Asics and Pentlands' suppliers had reached 71 signatories. The ILO's Better Factories programme uses training on the protocol as one of its tools, spreading the protocol's impact to non-participating brands such as GAP and Walmart.

Do we want to take on an Olympics campaign for 2020? Samsung and Panasonic are two electronics companies who sponsor the Olympics. Samsung could be a good target. We'd need to put pressure on both the brands and the Olympics committees through doing supply chain cases and by campaigning for requirements in huge Olympic sponsorship contracts with the brands for supply chain improvements.

2. What are the political opportunities and threats for us in using this tactic?

For the Olympics it's probably easier to predict the responses of garments or sportswear companies as there is a long history of campaigning there. I don't think any electronics brands have been targeted for an Olympics campaign. I'm not sure what their responses would be. Most of the electronics brands have only faced case by case enquiries. Rather than an company wide request – we found this common issue in your whole supply chain – e.g. chemicals deaths for Samsung.

3. Who amongst the Network and outside the Network is willing to join a working group to push this tactic forwards after the conference in Batam?

Sheung So, LESN, Fahmi Paninmbang, LIPS. It is reported that other groups in the Network are already planning around this.

Tactic Proposal 4 A concerted international campaign, to put pressure on the industry on a certain theme. e.g. chemicals or living wage.

Group faciliator(s) Esther de Haan, SOMO, Karin Mader, Bread for All, Chris Jarvis, People & Planet,

1. Describe concretely how the Network could develop this collective, international campaign.

Three main common topics of interest need to be identified, for example living wages, forced labour, toxic products, others? A working group then could work to an analyse of opportunities and challenges of each of those topics as well as look at what the impact of the campaign could be. Once a consensus emerges on a certain topics, a campaign could be built.

Several national NGOs in the consuming and productions countries would engage to start a campaign within a short time period. Production countries NGOs, would contribute via research on concrete cases and participating in the campaign. Consuming (only) countries - like Switzerland - would contribute by doing research on specific swiss companies and by launching consumer campaigns. The working group will propose the campaign to the wider GE network. There is a need for a critical amount of organisations/countries to be able to start a campaign. International secretariat would coordinate the whole dynamic.

What are the political opportunities and threats for us in using this tactic?

I see mainly opportunities. Trade Unions are weak in the electronics sector and only if forces are put together in a coordinated manner more sustainable and consequent change can be achieved. Companies are organized in sector initiatives (EICC-GeSI): only if we also coordinate better can we achieve more. This does not mean that individual contacts between brands and NGOs can not take place any more. It is complementary. A focussed effort could make a change.

3. Who amongst the Network and outside the Network is willing to join a working group to push this tactic forwards after the conference in Batam? No Idea.

Tactic Proposal 6 Promoting home country law reform, to move towards the French law model.

Group facilitator(s) Mark Anner, Center for Global Workers' Rights

1. Describe concretely how the Network could support a campaign for more countries to adopt this form of regulation.

There is an increasing move amongst consumption country governments in the Global North towards passing laws which regulate the conduct of their multinational companies by requiring them to maintain standards in their international supply chains. The most exciting variant of this is the recent French Law.

'The "duty of vigilance" law requires companies to establish safeguards designed to ensure that labor rights and other human rights are respected in the production sites they source from.' [1]

These laws have different focuses – the UK Law of this type, the Modern Slavery Act, only regulates certain labour rights issues, and the French law is much better and more expansive. Some of the laws make enforceable requirements of companies. The French law is the best that has been passed to date. It gives workers the ability to get claims of misconduct enforced in French courts, facilitated by French union links to unions in the countries of production. There is some debate even about including the French unions in the evolution of the law.

The British Act is not nearly as good, and the requirements it imposes on companies are fairly minimal, mainly around reporting, and even that is limited. But it is evolving over time too and pressure could be used to make it improve [2]. Other European countries are now developing similar laws. The labour rights movement in electronics should be a key stakeholder in pushing for enforceable laws with union involvement, heavy punishments available, and redress and compensation structures built in.

'Ultimately, a global standard for human rights in supply chains is needed [3]. While this is not going to happen soon, the International Labour Organization last year decided to consider the idea of a new multinational treaty more closely.' [4]

One way that GE could be active in this area, is to contribute to this suggestion:

'If the [Modern Slavery] act is to be effective in changing corporate behaviour, statements must be scrutinised by civil society, investors, and consumers to reward leaders and expose laggards, identify areas of weakness across the board, and ultimately demand better action. As the UK government itself has said, Section 54 seeks to create a race to the top and create positive competition among businesses.' [5]

GE could seek to mobilise investor power, government procurement power, public reports, and other tools to force companies to improve on the issue of Modern Slavery, or other labour rights issues covered by the Act. It could also enter into strategic partnerships with other organisations active in this area to encourage governments to improve and adopt these laws. . What are the political opportunities and threats for us in using this tactic?

The current laws are untested, but they provide mechanisms for workers to seek redress. GE could work with its members to help workers bring cases, support workers to seek redress, and highlight publicly how well the laws are working. As versions of these laws are being debated now, GE should support its country members to advocate for laws that include enforcement, fines, worker led monitoring, and worker and union engagement in countries that have not yet adopted them yet. GE should support its members to benchmark the laws and support campaigns for workable laws. We could end up with a better legal framework for workers.

3. Who amongst the Network and outside the Network is willing to join a working group to push this tactic forwards after the conference in Batam?

Mark Anner, ILRF, otherwise not sure yet.¹

Tactic Proposal 7. Coordinate organising, brand damage and public procurement leverage tools to target brands more effectively.

Group faciliator(s) Fahmi Panimbang, LIPS.

1. Describe concretely how the Network could use these different forms of economic leverage in a more coordinated way against brand targets.

Our movement has developed various economic leverage tools to pressure companies and force them to improve standards or compensate affected workers. Are we as good as we could be at bringing those leverage tools together in a planned, coherent, strategic and coordinated way?

Procurement. Public. Electronics Watch has public sector affiliates, and helps them put in place common contract clauses, and enforcement mechanisms. It then works with civil society labour rights groups across the world to monitor factories. Electronics Watch's affiliates spend £2bn on ICT hardware per year, giving them considerable concentrated

¹ [1] <https://www.hrw.org/news/2017/02/27/france-takes-historic-step-toward-reducing-supply-chain-abuses>

[2] <https://www.opendemocracy.net/beyondslavery/patricia-carrier-joseph-bardwell/how-uk-modern-slavery-act-can-find-its-bite>

[3] <https://www.hrw.org/news/2016/05/30/make-rules-rights-binding-businesses>

[4] http://www.ilo.org/wcmsp5/groups/public/---ed_norm/---relconf/documents/meetingdocument/wcms_489115.pdf

[5] <https://www.opendemocracy.net/beyondslavery/patricia-carrier-joseph-bardwell/how-uk-modern-slavery-act-can-find-its-bite>

consumer power. Fines and contract cutting can be used under the terms of these contracts if workers rights are found to be violated. As a public sector monitor EW cannot join campaigns, but it could coordinate its monitoring focus and approach with other actors for maximum benefit to workers.

Investment: Public. Campaigns can target university endowments, pensions. Development Banks also have huge investments. NGOs target these and try to persuade them to introduce criteria incentivising better standards for workers and the environment. Private. BankWatch, ShareAction and other orgs organise private investment pressure in support of environmental or worker rights issues.

Industrial action. Unions support workers to gain recognition, bargain and take industrial action.

Consumer campaigns. Brand attack campaigns by NGOs can cost companies millions. Media reports can lead to companies being forced to change track. Academics could tie in report launch dates with these other players.

We could use these tools together better. It takes coordination and organisation mechanisms to coordinate and organise these forms of economic leverage internally. For example, we could determine the key member organisations that are able to trigger the use of these 'leverage tools', bring them together and provide conference call spaces for them to plan collective use of these tools. We can begin to be more structured in how we coordinate much greater attacks on key companies, drawing lines in the sand.

2. What are the political opportunities and threats for us in using this tactic?

As a movement we often take ad hoc action in solidarity with key worker struggles. So many organisations in our Network will come together to support a particular case. We often choose these cases in a strategic way - for example campaigns which have aimed to force brands to recognise their responsibility for compensation claims to their contract manufacturers.

However often after each campaign, our collective coordination of our leverage falls away again, without leaving us more powerful over the long term. When you look at Electronics Watch, or unions, their aims are to sustainably build power and resources over the long term. For Electronics Watch that means more public entities joining, meaning more leverage over suppliers, and paying affiliation fees, meaning more resources over time. Unions wage campaigns, and follow them up with recruitment drives, building resources and collective power over time.

This proposal would create a space in which we could coordinate these different movement resources, and secondly would enable us to design better tools for coordination, and plan strategically, together, rather than undertaking our own strategies without coordination.

We could use this form of coordination to bring in large organisations from outside our Network to coordinate their campaigns against particular companies with us, hugely increasing our collective power.

3. Who amongst the Network and outside the Network is willing to join a working group to push this tactic forwards after the conference in Batam?

Jim, Fahmi, who else?

Tactic Proposal 8 Support a Global Brand Union across key production sites of a brand (like The League for Brand Responsibility)
Group facilitator(s) Ashok Kumar, Queen Mary University

1. Describe concretely how the Network could support the development of a production country to production country coordination body like The League for Brand Responsibility.

The conventional 'urgent appeals' approach doesn't build sustainable power in the regions of production. Furthermore, in the context of increasing consolidation by CMs, we should be looking at how workers organising can apply pressure across increasingly important nodes of key brands' supply chains.

In the garments industry, The International Union League for Brand Responsibility, nicknamed The League, 'is a global organization of workers who make products for multinational brands, such as clothing, footwear and textiles.' [1] They aimed to unite different national unions in nodal CMs/countries key brands' supply chains, in order to get a brandwide collective bargaining agreement.

'Our first global campaign began in February, 2013, and is called Adidas Workers Unite! The effort unites the workers within the supply chain of the German sportswear brand Adidas to win living wages, safe factories and stable jobs. Please take a moment to read our "First International Declaration" from February 10, 2013, which explains the Adidas workers' campaign as well as the League's overall vision.' [2]

2. What are the political opportunities and threats for us in using this tactic?

Opportunities. The possibility of creating a model of change which is brand focussed, worker organising driven. A model that could improve on GFAs, which are criticised by some for not having the impacts that were intended for them. A model that uses consumer power, but is firmly led by workers. The model also takes into account the growing power of contract manufacturers.

It takes account of the growing power of suppliers and therefore makes strategic central coordination of 'backbone shops' (those areas and factories that would be financially difficult to relocate).

Threats. The League has recently suffered from financial problems. Other problems include translational issues. At times the League would have conference calls with 5 different languages spoken. Unlike, say, the Asia floor wage campaign, which is regional, the costs of having a global league is financial / coordination of travel for convention etc. Sometimes major unions would be less than supportive since they see the league as competition and deviation from their existing strategy / non-strategy.

I am not sure what this approach adds to the work of IndustriALL. That's a discussion point.

3. Who amongst the Network and outside the Network is willing to join a working group to push this tactic forwards after the conference in Batam?²

Not sure yet.

Tactic Proposal 9 Capacity sharing across the Network for grassroots organisations - e.g. on technical chemicals related issues
Facilitators. Roben Casalda, CTUHR, Rochelle Porras (EILER)

1. Describe concretely how the Network could develop and build greater sharing of technical capacity across its members.

Strengthening grassroots organizations plays an important role in monitoring the implementation of fair labour standards, upholding human rights, seeking corporate accountability, and demanding justice across the global electronic value chain.

- Good Electronics may develop a matrix of technical expertise of member organizations, which include focal persons. Member organizations may come up with a needs training assessment (i.e., what area of expertise does the organization want to improve on so it can work better towards achieving its goals?).
- From the matrix and assessment, a technical working group (TWG) or the Steering Committee may lead and devise very particular guides, trainings, and workshops aimed at strengthening/expanding particular expertise to other groups (strategic relationships).

2. What are the political opportunities and threats for us in using this tactic?

- Sustainable Development Goal Target 17.9 of the 2030 Agenda for Sustainable Development: “Enhance international support for implementing effective and targeted capacity-building in developing countries to support national plans to implement all the sustainable development goals.”
- Adherence to certain capacity building methods and techniques (i.e., monitoring, evaluation, streamlining of processes) may however limit the independence of organizations within the GE network to conduct their own strategic campaign.
- Additionally, ongoing negotiation for Regional Comprehensive Economic Partnership (RCEP) poses serious threats in mobilizing and organizing Asian grassroots movement. Political pressure through international trade sanctions increases trade liberalization, privatization and investment protections.

[1] ² <http://www.union-league.org/adidas>

[2] http://www.union-league.org/first_declaration

- Forward looking, even if this proposal is not successful within the event in Batam, this tactic remains appropriate and applicable beyond GE scope.

3. Who amongst the Network and outside the Network is willing to join a working group to push this tactic forwards after the conference in Batam?

With reference to the proposals various members have suggested so far (as listed in September 8 report by Jim), GE members that could join and push this tactic after Batam Conference may include, but are not limited to:

- Tactic #2: Labor Rights Defenders Network
- Tactic #4: A concerted international campaign, to put pressure on the industry on a certain theme.
- Tactic #10: Engaging with EICC for cross-industry engagement

Tactic Proposal 10. Engaging with EICC for cross-industry engagement
Group facilitator(s) Radziah Jantan (EIEUSR)

1. Describe concretely how the Network could gain from continued lobbying and engagement with EICC.

- We need to strengthen and enforce it with legislation and regulation to
- make it more impact to the international level.
- For a company to apply EICC, they have to go through audit but
- it must include representative from national union for the audit.

2. What are the political opportunities and threats for us in using this tactic?

-It will be more transparent for the auditing system and genuinely factually based.

3. Who amongst the Network and outside the Network is willing to join a working group to push this tactic forwards after the conference in Batam?

- It will be good if local labour centres such as MTUC in Malaysia participate in this campaign or coalition of EIEU (for Malaysia in example).

Additional notes from the verbal presentation of Proposal 10.

Would like to work with organisations like FLA and focus on OECD nations. EICC would engage directly with unions in social auditing - will set up a guide on social auditing.

Tactic Proposal 11. Demonstrating the links between brand business models and factory floor conditions.
Group facilitator(s) Karin Mader, Bread For All, Mark Anner, Center for Global Workers' Rights

1. Describe concretely how the Network could gain from researching, monitoring and

exposing links between brand business models and labour rights violations.

Reference is made to the book by Richard M. Locke: "The Promise and Limits of Private Power –

Promoting Labor Standards in a Global Economy", Cambridge University press, 2013.

The following points are based on Locke's conclusions.

- Consumers, Retailers: want quality, cheap, flexible quantities, on short notice, ...
 - Governments: seek to maintain social peace seek to create/maintain employment for citizens and receive taxes from brands/suppliers Competition is strong among Governments to attract brands and suppliers
- > "hospitable business environment"
- > "flexible interpretation" of labor laws and/or weak law enforcement -> ...
- Brands: look for quality products, that are cheap, and produced quickly/on short/flexible terms. their focus on CSR is motivated by reputational risk considerations and industry competition.
 - Brands try to strike a balance between quality/cheap/fast & flexible and CSR concerns – without having to reduce their benefits/margins and without increasing product prices for consumers, respectively.
 - Suppliers: Brands' expectations and conditions result in:
 - Even higher competition among suppliers Relatively thin benefits/margins
 - Need for high flexibility without increasing fix costs (incl. human resources) -> indirect employment
 - via agencies (-> poor conditions)
- > precarious employment (student interns, ..) -> temporary contracts
- > overtime (forced, unpaid, ..) -> ...
- According to Locke: Neither (social) audits nor "worker empowerment" lead to significant improvements.
 - Problems are inherent to the present global production system which is based on "lean production":
- > fluctuating demand
- > cost reduction (incl. avoidance of "too much": production, stock, waiting time, transport, corrections, ...)
- Global production systems are controlled by the brands (incl. definition of products, design, innovation, ..)**
- Benefits (and margins) are controlled by the brands. According to Bfa internal analysis: In 2014, Apple made a total benefit of USD 40 bio, at a turnover of USD 183 bio. While Apple's supplier Foxconn made a total benefit of USD 4.18 bio, at a turnover of USD 135 bio.
 - Apple's margin on an iPhone was 50% (and on an iPad was 38%), while Foxconn's margin per item was approx, 2%
- Conclusion**
- Research, monitoring and communications that show how brand business models create labor violations at suppliers' level could be a promising avenue towards improvements.
2. What are the political opportunities and threats for us in using this tactic?
- This tactic would allow for a stronger focus on (individual) brands, and/or on industry standards, such as EICC, with potentially bigger impact at a global level. This tactic proposal could be combined with:
- tactic no 4: concerted international campaign
 - tactic no 7: target brands via public procurement leverage tools?
 - tactic no 8: support global brand union across production countries
 - tactic no 10: Engaging with EICC
3. Who amongst the Network and outside the Network is willing to join a working group to push this tactic forwards after the conference in Batam? Not sure yet
- Small group discussion on the proposal on researching brand links to worker conditions

Appendix 3 Votes for strategies proposals

Organisation	First name	Last name	Tac and Strat 1	Tac and Strat 2	Tac and Strat 3	Tac and Strat 4	Tac and Strat 5 <i>(merged with 2)</i>	Tac and Strat 6	Tac and Strat 7	Tac and Strat 8	Tac and Strat 9	Tac and Strat 10	Tac and Strat 11	Tactic TOTAL
AGHAM	Roseam Jonamae	Rodriguez		2										5
AIRC	Omara	George	3											3
AIRC	Tubagus	Abu Mulkahir												3
APIL	Jongpaul	Kim			3									5
Baifekus Foundation	Kesana	Bayumont M Zaki	3											6
Beal for all	Kam	Makar			2									6
CEBRIC	Ronell	Villasas		2										6
CDI	Thi Thu Ha	Kim												6
Center for Trade Union and Human Roben		Casilda												6
														6
														6
CEREA	Miguel Angel	Avarez Rodriguez												6
CETEN	Amapola	Lopez Hernandez	1		3									6
Citizen of the Earth	Chia-Liang	Shih	1		2									6
Citizen of the Earth	Han-Lin	Li												6
Citoid	Goponathan	Kunithayal Parakkun	3											6
Dedrick Employees Union-Hidapei Kristina		Ungas	2		3									6
EIEU Southern Region	Khanul Zuhri	Takal												6
EIEU Southern Region	Rakzhan	Jantun												6
EIEU Western Region	Saharuddin	Adnan			1									6
EIEU Western Region	Burno	Perrera												6
ELEER	Rochelle	Perrera	2											6
Electronics Watch	Ejgon	Claeson												6
Environmental Rights Foundation	Yan-Ting	Lin	3											6
Environmental Rights Foundation	Yu-Vien	Tu												6
FPBI	Bahar	Rival												6
FPBI	Santoso	Widodo												6
FSPMI	Judy	Wirano												6
FSPMI	Pipin	Sugihari												6
FSPMI	Prihantani	Boeradi												6
FSPMI	Siharni	Riyadi												6
FSPMI Batam	Dedy	Iksandar												6
FSPMI Batam	Edwin	Christawan												6
FSPMI Batam	Muhammad	Mustofa												6
FSPMI Batam	Nailfawati	Mustofa												6
GET	Patchanee	Kumrak												6
Globalization Monitor	Rena	Lau												6
GeoElectronics Network	Alejandro	Gonzalez												6
GeoElectronics Network	Richard	Erans												6
GSSI	Dadang	Nuzarudin												6
GSSI	Ok	Firman												6
IndustriALL	Kan	Matsuzaki	3											6
ICTRT	Ted	Smith												6
Kalkeasan	Garinna Camille	Gairno	3											6
Labour Action China	Jason	Chan												6
Labour Education and Service New Shang	bernhang	So												6
LPS	Fahni	Penning												6
LPS	Syafiq	Amin												6
Lorenik (Central)	Eduard P.	Waparang												6
Lorenik	Masnur	Sahnan	1											6
Lorenik (Batam)	Zulkifi	Sahnan												6
MHSSN	Garet	Brown	2											6
MMAP	Julius	Carandang												6
NCPVRSST	Rovena	Mateanzo												6
NMP Manufacturing Workers Union Vallop	Chooil	Chooil	3											6
SACOM	Michael	Ma												6
SOMO	Irene	Schipper												6
SOMO	Pauline	Ovstern												6
Thal Confederation of Trade Union	Bunryan	Suhani												6
United Workers of Ksym Election Jasmn	Wang	Meloccones	2											6
Worker Empowement	Ting (Cheny)	Wang												6
Workers Assistance Center, Inc	Cecilia	Tanco	2											6
Workers Assistance Center, Inc	Charles Hector	Fernandez												6
Wag-Reichert	Gale	Fernandez												6
Wag-Reichert	Jim	Coranshaw												6
TOTAL			34	64	36	33	6	4	46	6	64	46	4	344

Appendix 4 Votes for Structure

Organisation	First name	Last name	Organising 1	Organising 2	Organising 3	Organising 4	What could you offer?
AGHAM	Roseann Jonamae	Rodriguez					1 Technical expertise, mining campaign
AMRC	Omana	George					1 WG on current need. AMRC will be part of group based on its work
AMRC	Tubagus	Abu Mufakhir					
APIL	Jongchul	Kim					1 Samsung WG and research
BaliFokus Foundation	Krishna	Bayumurti M. Zaki					1
Bread for all	Karin	Mader					1 Based on need and opportunities
CBBRC	Roneil	Villegas					1
CDI	Thi Thu Ha	Kim	1				Will be a member
Center for Trade Union and Human Rights	Roben	Casalda					1
CEREAL	Miguel Angel	Alvarez Rodriguez					1
CETIEN	Amapola	Lopez Hernandez					1 Work-based
Citizen of the Earth	Chia-Liang	Shih					1 Transparency, chemicals
Citizen of the Earth	Han-Lin	Li					1 Capacity building group
Cvitep	Gopinathan	Kunhithayil Parakuni					1
Daeduck Employees Union-Independent	Kristine	Llagas					1
EIEU Southern Region	Khairul Zurain	Takat					
EIEU Southern Region	Radziah	Jantan					
EIEU Western Region	Saharuddin	Adnan	1				
EIEU Western Region	Bruno	Periera					
EILER	Rochelle	Porras					1
Electronics Watch	Björn	Claesson					
Environmental Rights Foundation	Yan-Ting	Lin					1 Transparency, chemical, Samsung and research
Environmental Rights Foundation	Yu-Wen	Tu					
FPBI	Bahtiar	Rwa'i	1				
FPBI	Santoso	Widodo					
FSPMI	Judy	Winarno					1
FSPMI	Pipin	Supinah					
FSPMI	Prihanani	Boenadi					
FSPMI	Slamet	Riyadi					
FSPMI Batam	Dedy	Iskandar					
FSPMI Batam	Edwin	Christiawan					
FSPMI Batam	Muhammad	Mustofa					
FSPMI Batam	Nelfidawati						
GET	Patchanee	Kumnak		1			
Globalization Monitor	Rena	Lau				1	
GoodElectronics Network	Alejandro	Gonzalez					
GoodElectronics Network	Richard	Evans					
GSBI	Dadeng	Nazarudin	1				
GSBI	Oki	Firman					
IndustriALL	Kan	Matsuzaki	1				Can lead WG on just transition
ICRT	Ted	Smith				1	
Kalikasan	Gianina Camille	Glarino					1 Campaigning environmental issues, mining, e-waste, capacity sharing and grassroots, as well as sharing materials in chemicals
Labour Action China	Jason	Chan					
Labour Education and Service Network	Sheung	So					1 Samsung campaign
LIPS	Ismambang	Jahana				1	
LIPS	Fahmi	Panimbang					
LIPS	Syarif	Arfin					
Lomenik (Central)	Eduard P.	Marpaung				1	
Lomenik	Masmur	Siahaan					
Lomenik (Batam)	Zulkifli					1	
MHSSN	Garrett	Brown					1 WG of any of the 3 types as needed based on the current and future work
MWAP	Julius	Carandang		1			
NCPWR-ST	Rowena	Matienzo					1
NXP Manufacturing Workers Union	Wallop	Choojit		1			
SACOM	Michael	Ma				1	
SOMO	Irene	Schipper					1 Take priority themes into account; transparency, precarious work, chemicals. SOMO has interest in transparency and should be functional Fund-raising group
SOMO	Pauline	Overeem					
Thai Confederation of Trade Union	Bunyuen	Sukmai		1			
United Workers of Keyrin Electronics	Jasmin	Melocotones					1
Worker Empowerment	Ting (Cherry)	Wang					
Workers Assistance Center, Inc.	Cecilia	Tuico				1	Immediately form WG
	Charles Hector	Fernandez					1
	Gale	Raj-Reichert					
	Jim	Cranshaw					
			TOTAL	5	4	7	22

Appendix 5 Structure and ways of organising proposals

Option 3. GE has the same structure and is hosted by SOMO.

if EC funding or other large funding can be found then the Network can continue in a similar way that it is now. Assuming more EC funding is not available: and other large funders cannot be found, the Network would need to reduce down to simply paying the costs of the Coordinator, some website maintenance, and costs for some meetings. All Network activity would be done by its members, not as a Network.	1 Coordinator	SOMO	The size and activity of the Network itself in this case, could be huge/reduced whilst new funding is sought. As the costs would be lower though, it might be possible to continue funding at a much lower level. Other institutional funders may place lost EC funding or if not, trusts and foundations could.	SOMO with membership support.	No need to formally constitute Network. Still open to possibility to constitute the organisation as a Network or Association in the future.	Depends on the funding that is obtained.	It would make sense that the Coordinator mainly coordinates volunteer liaison office, who themselves coordinate regional or thematic working groups	1 FTE plus support staff from hosting organizations and maybe other organizations.	Consistency, existing systems stay the same. Funding source in place for now. High level of support in place from team.	SOMO carrying on all the hosting responsibilities. EC funding possibly drying up, other members taking the project too Europe-centric.	
---	---------------	------	--	-------------------------------	---	--	---	--	---	--	--

Option 4. GE moves to being hosted by one of the main Asian Organizations or Networks.

This could mean combining capacity with, or at least synergising with other Networks, ANROEV, for example, or another key Asian network. This could be combined with the secretariat model with some Northern NGOs on that secretariat (at least one from Australia, US and Europe). This would help to gain sustainable funding.	This could mean some staff capacity sharing between, say, AMRC, ANROEV and GE, for example. So the capacity needs could go down or stay the same, depending on whether synergies can be found.	A well placed Asian member org?	This could reduce possible income stream from EC. It might increase possibilities from funders like the Asia Foundation, or Rockefeller, or Ford, or Stigrid Rausing, who all currently fund Asian hosted networks.	A suitable Asian partner	No need to formally constitute Network unless host organisation cannot be found. However, formally constituting the organisation as a Network or Association does give the advantage of flexibility in the future and help with funding possibilities.	Hard to judge whether this would make the Network able to do more because of synergies with other Networks or less because of reduced Coordinator capacity	Synergies could be found with existing working methods at another Network.	0.5 - 1 FTE	Sharing capacity and finding economies of scale. Synergising campaign and strategies, living the Network's values by being based in production countries.	Less large funders available, less spread of funding sources between Asian orgs and GE, would take a lot of negotiation, less close to consumption countries and some brand head offices.	1. Could we have some kind of hybrid SOMO could use its resources and closeness to European funders to do the hosting, and then the operations would be run from a key Asian partner org. If decision making was closer to actual production and worker networks it would strengthen the Network. 2. Others said that it is true, but that the same effort could be achieved through developing a thematic working group or regional councilway of organising the Network.	
---	--	---------------------------------	---	--------------------------	--	--	--	-------------	---	---	--	--

Ways Networks can organise their work.	Description	How it connects to the Networks as a whole	How it helps members connect to each other	Additions to this proposal made during focus group
Thematic Working Groups	We could have working groups for mining, chemicals, for precarious work, e-waste, etc. These groups could organise research, campaigns on this topic.	Each group would nominate a liaison officer and/or (a) leading organization(s) to liaise with the International Coordinator, stay in touch, and discuss future plans. The group should also submit proposals to Annual conference, at which the broader Network could choose to get involved.	Each group, alongside the International Coordinator, should survey the whole Network to find out how other members can help their thematic area, and take responsibility for bringing in Network and external members into their group, depending on the needs of the group. Each group could meet on con-call every quarter.	One way of helping to maintain energy and commitment from organisations with limited resources would be to allocate a small stipend budget for coordinators of these councils.
Regional Councils	We could have Regional Councils, for example for South East Asia, Latin America, Europe.	Each group would nominate a liaison officer to liaise with the International Coordinator, stay in touch, and discuss future plans. The group should also submit proposals to Annual conference, at which the broader Network could choose to get involved.	Each group, alongside the International Coordinator, should survey the whole Network to find out how other members can help their Region, and take responsibility for bringing in Network and external members into their group, depending on the needs of the group. Each group could meet on con-call every quarter.	Another version of this is that of Health Care Without Harm in the US, who have an entirely decentralised network based around stipended coordinators of functional working groups.
Functional Working Groups	We could have functional working groups, so members could choose to support the goals of the wider Network by contributing forms of expertise. So we could have a fundraising group, a capacity building group, a policy group, and perhaps a research group to liaise with external and internal researchers to forward our common agenda.	Each group would nominate a liaison officer to liaise with the International Coordinator, stay in touch, and discuss future plans. The group should also submit proposals to Annual conference, at which the broader Network could choose to get involved.	Each group, alongside the International Coordinator, should survey the whole Network to find out how other members can help their WG, and take responsibility for bringing in Network and external members into their group, depending on the needs of the group. Each group could meet on con-call every quarter.	Another version of this is that of Health Care Without Harm in the US, who have an entirely decentralised network based around stipended coordinators of functional working groups.

Colophon

GoodElectronics Conference Report

October 2017

Author	Jim Cranshaw
Coordinator	Alejandro González
Editors	Alejandro González / Richard Evans
Published by	GoodElectronics Network



This work is licensed under a Creative Commons Attribution-NonCommercial-NoDerivs 4.0 Unported License.



EU

This publication has been produced with the assistance of the European Union. The content of this publication is the sole responsibility of its authors and can in no way be taken to reflect the views of the European Union.



The GoodElectronics Network accommodates networks, organisations and individuals that are concerned about human rights, including labour rights, and sustainability issues in the global electronics supply chain, including but not limited to trade unions, grass roots organisations, campaigning and research organisations, academia, and activists. The Network has a strict civil society-only profile.



GoodElectronics

Sarphatistraat 30
1018 GL Amsterdam
The Netherlands

+31 (0)20 639 12 91
info@godelectronis.org
www.godelectronis.org

