

Joint Initiative on Corporate Accountability and Workers' Rights Trial Project Design

Final Version
1 June 2006

A. Background and Context of the Trial Project

In Spring 2003 six multi-stakeholder initiatives, each committed to achieving improved working conditions in industry, met and committed to a collaborative project or 'Joint Initiative' with the purpose of determining whether and how such collaboration might improve the results of their respective efforts.¹ The underlying motivation for each of the organizations is to improve working conditions; thus the question is not whether the six organizations have such a commitment, but rather how the groups, working together, might achieve greater effect.

The Terms of Reference (TOR) developed by the group articulated the overall goals of the Joint Initiative which are:

- a) To maximize the effectiveness and the impact of the multi-stakeholder organizations by ensuring that resources are directed as efficiently as possible to improving the lives of workers and their families.
- b) To explore possibilities for closer cooperation between the multi-stakeholder organizations and ensure that resources are directed as efficiently as possible through shared learning.
- c) To assess in what manner voluntary codes of labour practice² and various approaches to their implementation can best contribute to better workplace conditions.

Representatives of the organizations met during 2003 and 2004 and agreed the broad outline of a 'trial project' which would pose and test various aspects of the overall collaborative effort (the 'Joint Initiative'). They elaborated concrete, measurable objectives in an initial Project Design (2004), spanning over 30 months and two "phases" of testing.

In July 2005, the Steering Committee reviewed the objectives and timeline of the project. The Steering Committee decided to refine the focus of the Trial Project and to extend the timeline. This document replaces the original 2004 Project Design and elaborates on the methodology that will be used in the factory trials.

¹ The organizations involved in the Joint Initiative are the Ethical Trading Initiative, Clean Clothes Campaign, Fair Labor Association, Fair Wear Foundation, Social Accountability International and the Worker Rights Consortium.

² For the purposes of this document "code" refers to both workplace standards and systems for implementation.

Turkey was chosen as the site for the Trial Project. Organizations involved in the Joint Initiative intend to build on the results of the Turkey Trial Project, elaborating on the models of collaboration developed and the lessons learned there, in other countries.

B. Strategy for the Trial Project

The purpose of the Joint Initiative is to explore opportunities for collaborative efforts to improve working conditions in global supply chains and generate learning on the ways in which code implementation and enforcement contributes to these improvements.

1. Objectives, indicators and outputs

The objectives of the Trial Project in Turkey are to:

- a.) improve conditions and observance of labour rights for garment workers and their families in a specified number of Turkish garment producing facilities;
- b.) delineate the points at which the participating multi-stakeholder initiatives might avoid duplicative efforts; where they might reinforce each other and where the efforts of some of the initiatives differ, leading to potential complementarity between the initiatives;
- c.) demonstrate to companies and other stakeholders how they might take advantage of the compatibilities and complementarity;
- d.) identify jointly with Turkish stakeholders the roles MSI's and local stakeholders can play in implementing codes of conduct;
- e.) agree best practice in the implementation of codes of conduct through pooling the experience of all six organizations;
- f.) disseminate lessons from the experience;
- g.) identify areas for future collaboration.

Table 1

	Objectives	Indicators	Outputs
a	To improve conditions and observance of labour rights for garment workers and their families in a specified number of Turkish garment producing facilities.	Determination by workers that there have been improvements in one or more areas of factory life	Final Report documenting experience and improvements in workplace standards
b	Delineate the points at which the participating multi-stakeholder organizations might avoid duplicative efforts; where they might reinforce each other; and where the efforts of some of the organizations might complement the efforts of other organizations in the project.	<p>Comprehensive identification and analysis of any similarities and differences between the various organizations in respect of the implementation of workplace standards identified as priorities.</p> <p>Demonstrated and documented incidences of cooperation between organizations during the trial in Turkey.</p> <p>Agreed language and terminology to describe code implementation.</p> <p>Convergence on a set of workplace standards that doesn't require any of the multi-stakeholder initiatives to weaken their respective commitments to helping workers.</p>	<p>Final Report to highlight similarities and differences between the MSI's with concrete recommendations on how duplication can be avoided and where MSI's might reinforce each other</p> <p>Agreement to common terminology in Final Report.</p> <p>Publication of a Common Code.</p>
c	Demonstrate to buyers, suppliers, trade unions, NGOs and other stakeholders how they might take advantage of the compatibilities and complementarity.	Demonstrated interest by buyers, suppliers, trade unions, NGOs and stakeholders to take advantage of compatibilities and complementarities.	<p>Joint training package for stakeholders on the methods and approaches of the different MSIs and how stakeholders can take advantage of these.</p> <p>Interim participant seminars with stakeholders and end of project conference for two-way feedback.</p> <p>Final Report to detail how buyers, suppliers, trade unions, NGOs and other stakeholders can take advantage of complementarities.</p>
d	To identify jointly with Turkish stakeholders the roles that MSI's and local stakeholders can play in implementing codes of conduct.	<p>Determination by stakeholders that MSI's can assist them in achieving improvements in working conditions.</p> <p>Ongoing relationships between MSIs and with one or more Turkish stakeholder organization.</p>	Final Report to describe respective roles and experience during project and outline principles for stakeholder consultation.
e	Agree (to the extent possible) on	Agreed-upon guidelines, protocols and	Final Report describing

	good practice in application of codes of conduct through pooling experiences to test out different methodologies.	principles of good practice (for all parties) in the implementation of codes of conduct. Stakeholders share determination that identified “good practice” leads to improvements in their lives. “Good practices” are adopted by relevant multi-stakeholder organizations.	good practice in code implementation. Published guidelines on freedom of association and collective bargaining, wages and hours of work. If additional funds allow, follow-up report on the extent to which good practices have been adopted by relevant MSIs.
f	Disseminate lessons from the experience, in regard to process, content, results and good practice.	Documents and guidelines published on website. Timeliness and breadth of dissemination of publications and report.	End of project conference . Final report documenting learning and good practice in code implementation.
g	Identify areas for future collaboration	Actual occurrences of collaboration. Proposals for ongoing collaboration. Commitment by one or more of the multi-stakeholder initiatives to reinforce efforts of other members in the group.	Final Report with proposals of models of future cooperation.

2. Scope of the Trial Project

While the purpose of undertaking a trial project is to discern good practice and provide guidance that will inform the global effort of achieving improved working conditions, it is critical that the experiment itself also produce real, positive outcomes in the country where it takes place.

The trial project is being carried out in the garment sector in Turkey. Particular elements of the trial will be tailored to the Turkey context. Any conclusions drawn from the effort will take this into account.

On the basis of a process of consultation with stakeholders in late 2004 and early 2005, the following code elements have been included in the scope of the Trial Project:

2.1. Workplace standards

The project will focus on the following workplace standards:

- a.) freedom of association and the right to collective bargaining;
- b.) wages³; and
- c.) hours of work.

³ Significant differences exist between the organizations on the wage standard, in particular whether or not a code includes a “living wage”, what is understood by this code element and how it is implemented.

The project will examine how to best assess and achieve improvements in these workplace standards through the implementation and enforcement of codes of conduct. A list of key questions is attached as Annex 1.

2.2. Code implementation

One difference among the six organizations is the manner in which initial code implementation is part of their programme. For example, one initiative requires a highly-articulated set of steps to be taken by the brand in order to implement the workplace standards down through the supply chain, while another requires initial commitment of the brand to implement the code, but focuses more on the ability / willingness of that brand to assist in resolving problems as they are raised by workers.

For the purposes of the project, the following is understood to form part of efforts to implement codes of conduct:

- a. Stakeholder consultation and involvement (trade unions, NGOs, local government, industry associations, local communities).
- b. Exercise of leverage by the buyer in its relationships with suppliers for the latter to comply with the code.
- c. Attention to buying practices that may hinder fair working conditions and the ability of the supplier to comply with the code.
- d. Training and education of workers and management (both supplier and factory level) and communication on a range of matters such as code content, industrial relations, potential long-term business benefits, facility improvement, health and safety, etc.
- e. Complaints systems and industrial relations systems (i.e. collective bargaining and negotiation mechanisms), including education for workers and management on how these systems are best used, and the commitment of the supplier and buyer to engage in dialogue with workers and respond to complaints in a reasonable and timely manner.
- f. Investigation/assessment/audits of workplace conditions (and of the extent to which code standards are complied with). This includes off site interviews and detailed and independent investigations.
- g. Monitoring by sourcing companies of implementation and code compliance systems (including management systems) in each supplier.
- h. External, independent verification that the implementation process is underway; that it is progressive; and that it is robust, in terms of both

processes and results. Such verification must be credible to all stakeholders.

- i. Clear and transparent code implementation systems and timely communication to workers, other stakeholders and the general public about key aspects of the code implementation process, such as public reports on performance of these implementation systems and findings on factory conditions.

The trials are not designed to answer the question of which is the “best” approach among the six participating organizations. Rather, they attempt to determine what method, or combination of methods (including the exercise of brand leverage and changes in business practices, training, worker participation and dialogue etc.) can best deliver improvements for workers in participating factories in Turkey.

After an initial assessment of the extent to which a particular supplier (facility) meets the standards set out in the draft Jo-In Code of Labour Practice on freedom of association and the right to collective bargaining, wages and hours of work - the Trial Project will focus on how best to achieve improvements (remediation) and on the effective resolution of complaints in respect of these particular workplace standards.

3. Project Trials

The project trials are designed as policy experiments or ‘pilots’, the objective of which is to improve policies and their execution in practice, reduce observable inefficiencies and open up possibilities for future innovation and/ or collaboration which could ultimately improve the lives of workers in global supply chains.

Different strategies for remediation and for the effective resolution of complaints in respect of Jo-In code elements identified above will be piloted during the factory trials.

Jo-In will develop guidelines on good practice and make a number of recommendations in the final report, based on the outcomes of these factory trials.

3.1. The draft Jo-In Code of Labour Practice

The Joint Initiative developed a draft Jo-In Code for the factory trials. This sets a common standard for the assessment of workplace standards in supplier facilities and for the improvement of these. It adopts the highest standard across the different initiatives.

The draft Jo-In Code elements will be refined at the end of the Trial Project, with the intention of developing a Jo-In Code with common workplace standards and

guidelines for the implementation of workplace standards on freedom of association and collective bargaining, hours of work and wages.

3.2. Buyers and factories participating in project

Buyers

Seven* international buyers, each belonging to one or more of the MSI's with member companies, will participate in the trials (See table 2).

Table 2

Brand	ETI	FLA	FWF	SAI
Adidas (tentative)		√		
Gap Inc.	√			√
Hess Natur			√	
Marks and Spencer	√			
Nike		√		
Patagonia		√		
Puma		√		

* An eighth brand, Otto Versand of SAI, has cooperated in earlier portions of the project and is seeking to involve Turkish factories in the project in order to continue its cooperation.

Suppliers

A number of suppliers have been selected from lists submitted to Jo-In by the buyers. This selection was based on the following criteria:

- i.) Length of relationship with supplier and long-term view / strategic supplier
- ii.) Volume of production that goes to the buyer / leverage
- iii.) Presence of more than one brand participating in the Joint Initiative
- iv.) Integrated manufacturing and similar production processes (at least 4 of: weave, dye, finishing, cutting, sewing, and packaging)
- v.) Established business relationship
- vi.) Mix of organized and unorganized workplaces
- vii.) Based in Istanbul, Bursa, Duzce or Izmir
- viii.) Primary supplier (possibly with subcontractors)
- ix.) Growing rapidly and expected to be at less risk of downturn at end of MFA

Of the suppliers with whom Jo-In is engaged in discussions:

- a few are unionized;
- some have more than one participating brand sourcing from the particular supplier;

- some supply as little as 5% of production to a participating buyer, others supply 100%;
- most are in the greater Istanbul region. One or two are in Izmir and Bursa; and
- all are first tier suppliers. Most also subcontract to other facilities.

3.3. Trial activities

The following activities are planned during the trial:

A. Baseline assessment of supplier facility with regard to key code elements

A baseline assessment will be conducted in each supplier facility, assessing the extent to which that facility meets the standards set out in the draft Jo-In Code of Labour Practice on freedom of association and collective bargaining, wages and hours of work. This will be carried out by an independent Jo-In project team (see 3.4 below).

The baseline assessment will be conducted on the basis of a protocol which will specify:

- the method to be used during the assessment (e.g. sampling techniques, interviews with managers, worker interviews on and off-site by different persons from the Jo-In team).
- relevant information to be collected (e.g. historical material on code implementation in that facility including reports of prior visits or studies by buyers, audit reports, MSI assessments and remediation already underway etc.).
- questions in respect of code elements on freedom of association and collective bargaining, wages and hours of work.

The baseline assessment will include the following steps:

- i.) The gathering of all relevant information (including previous audit reports and data).
- ii.) A meeting with relevant auditor(s).
- iii.) A visit to the facility to conduct the assessment.
- iv.) Off-site interviews with workers (by a different person from the Jo-In team).
- v.) A comparison of the results of the assessment with previous audit reports. This will involve a follow-up meeting with the relevant auditor(s) to confer with them on the results.

B. Analysis

The findings of the baseline assessment will be evaluated (including the comparison of information from worker interviews inside the facility

with those outside the facility). A synthesis report of these findings will be presented to relevant parties for discussion.

C. Creating a remediation plan

A remediation plan will be developed for each supplier (facility). The remediation plan may include actions for both buyers and suppliers. It may include a number of different options for addressing a recognized problem (e.g. with technical assistance, through worker training and /or through changes to pricing and sourcing practices). It will focus on those remedial interventions considered to represent good practice for improving compliance with code elements on wages, hours of work, and freedom of association.

The MSI with which a buyer is affiliated will work with that buyer and factory (including management and workers), and with Jo-In to agree the most suitable remediation plan and a satisfactory timeframe for completion. Turkish and international stakeholders will be involved in devising suggested remediation strategies.

D. Remediation

The buyers, together with the supplier concerned and other relevant parties will implement the remediation plan (with technical assistance where applicable). Buyers that source from the same supplier will be encouraged to collaborate in order to maximize effectiveness.

E. Follow-up and assessment

The Jo-In project team will conduct follow-up visits to assess remediation efforts and their impact. While it is hoped that most remediation will have been completed by this stage, it is understood that some processes will extend beyond the timeline of the project (e.g. continuous improvements in wages and management / worker relations).

F. Independent studies

In addition to the factory trials, two separate studies will be commissioned during the project. The first will examine the extent and nature of subcontracting in an identified geographic area in Turkey. The second will focus on complaints systems and the effective resolution of disputes. These, together with information emerging from the factory trials, will be used to inform recommendations on good practice.

3.4 Jo-In assessment team

Project activities, including the baseline assessment, facilitation of the remediation plan and follow-up assessment will be conducted by a group of experts selected and trained for assessments by Jo-In (“assessment team”). The assessment team will be recruited in Turkey. This small team will be briefed and supervised by Jo-In. They will report to the International Project Manger and Local Coordinator.

The assessment team will work together with buyers, suppliers, workers, MSIs and other relevant parties (trade unions, auditing firms where appropriate etc.) to conduct the baseline assessment and conduct the follow-up assessment. The assessment team will also be responsible for writing relevant reports.

The International Project Manager will facilitate two-way communication between the assessment team and the Steering Committee, and consultation with relevant stakeholders at critical points during the project in line with the project plan below.

3.5 Consultation

Jo-In has identified the following categories of stakeholders:

- Industry organizations, buyers and factories participating in the project.
- Trade Unions and workers.
- NGOs (labour-related, women, community organizations).
- Governmental and quasi governmental organizations (labour inspectorate, ILO, chamber of commerce).

In response to strong stakeholder feedback calling for more formal structures for involvement in the project, and in order to support local structures that can enhance labor relations in Turkey beyond the lifespan of this project, the Steering Committee proposes the creation of a Jo-In Local Working Group. Members of the Working Group will include local staff of participating buyers, participating suppliers, local trade unions, local NGOs, and representatives of the Turkish government and industry. The Working Group will convene at essential stages of the project (at least two or three times a year) for input and feedback to project staff and the Jo-In Steering Committee.

Stakeholders are invited to organize themselves within the Working Group through self-convened committees (e.g., a trade union committee, buyer committee, etc.) in order to more effectively work through issues addressed during meetings. Consensus opinions on key topics will be a goal for meetings. If a consensus cannot be reached, however, each of the committees may submit a separate opinion to be considered by the Steering Committee. Due to tight timelines, absence of timely feedback will be interpreted as consent. Outcomes of Working Group meetings will be included in project documentation.

Key international stakeholders are important to the project’s success. In particular, their input will be needed to advise on the global implications of any changes in the practice and implementation of auditing and remediation that may

be considered as a result of the local studies. For this purpose an International Advisory Panel will be established, and two representatives of each of the key stakeholder groups (i.e. participating brands, global unions and NGO's) will be invited to participate in discussions about items of international significance such as a final Jo-In Common Code and implementation practices that may be agreed as a result of the pilot project in Turkey. Individual stakeholders at the international level will also be invited to participate in the general stakeholder meetings that will take place at important junctures of the project (see design below). They will also have the opportunity to consult with members of the relevant self-convened committees participating in the Local Working Group regarding project activities at the national level.

Stakeholders that are involved in multi-stakeholder initiatives (i.e. global trade unions and NGOs, brands, and suppliers) will also have opportunities to influence the project through the MSI(s) in which they participate.

All stakeholders will be kept informed of project progress by way of a bi-monthly project update. Steering Committee agendas will also be distributed before meetings.

3.6 Reporting

For the purposes of *reporting*, the names of the factories will remain confidential. Participating factories will be given nominal codes in Jo-In reports.⁴ It is hoped that progress will be made during the project on this aspect of public disclosure.

There will be three different types of reports:

- Individual reports for each facility on the results of the baseline assessment, proposed remediation plan and the follow-up assessment (including activities and outcomes). These will be used as inputs to Jo-In synthesis reports and the final project report.
- Jo-In synthesis reports (of individual facility reports).
- Final project report of good practice, learning and recommendations.

To contribute to the final project report, learnings and observations from the project will be recorded by the project on an ongoing basis. These include observations of the consultation process, based on input from the various stakeholder groups.

For the purposes of the *execution* of any of the above project activities, the names of the suppliers participating in the Jo-In project will be known to those involved in the different project activities (e.g. Jo-In, assessors, service providers, and where relevant trade unions and NGOs).⁵

⁴ See Terms of Engagement signed with buyers.

⁵ See also the Confidentiality Agreement signed with participating buyers for the purpose of selecting factories.

4. Project plan

The following table describes a sequence of activities that is designed to achieve the objectives and outputs described above. It allows approximately 18 months for the project start-up, engagement of buyers and suppliers, and the recruitment and training of GIEs; 12 months for the factory trials; and 6 months to write up results and agree guidelines and recommendations.

The 12 month trial period is a somewhat artificial delineation of the span of worker and factory life. It is understood that improved working conditions are a continuous effort, going well beyond the time limitations of the trial project, and any final conclusions regarding success must be made across a much longer time period.

It is understood that, while the trial project is experimental in nature, the activities and outcomes are very real to the players involved - workers, management, buyers, trade unions, other civil society organizations, government - and for that reason even greater care must be taken to effect the desired changes.

The table below will be updated and modified as necessary. More up-to-date project schedules will be circulated by project staff.

Table 3

Step	Activity in Sequence	Method of Implementation	Project Stakeholder Involvement	Start ⁶	Completed
Phase 1					
1	Agree a draft common code of labour practice.	Steering Committee negotiate/amend drafts until common code agreed	International trade union representatives and buyers input into draft Code.	1 – 4	February 2005
2	Identify Turkish stakeholder organizations for the purposes of determining the most critical needs from the standpoint of improving workplace conditions; and ask those organizations to participate in seeking to achieve the improvements.	Consultation with NGOs, trade unions, others with knowledge of region.	Meetings with NGOs, trade unions, suppliers, buyers, government organization, trade and employer associations. Seek input on project focus.	1 – 2	November 2004
3	Prioritize areas of code (workplace standards and implementation) for testing/emphasis because there is not strong consensus and/or not enough is known about implementation. This initial identification will be refined and prioritized at Step 10.	Steering Committee negotiates and agrees this.	Based in large part on stakeholder feedback.	3– 4	January 2005
4	Recruit Local Coordinator	Agreed recruitment process International Project Manager to recruit and appoint	Sought local and international stakeholders' input on candidates.	3 – 4	March 2005
5	Build a working relationship with Turkish organizations – identify capacity/resource needs and develop plan to resource/enable Turkish organizations to participate.	Visits to Turkey	International project and local coordinator met with various stakeholders.	3 – 6	Ongoing
6	Engage with buyers.	Steering Committee agree Terms of Engagement with buyers.	Buyers offered feedback on the project documents and plan, influencing project approach.	4 – 6	April 2005
7	Identify the criteria for selection of suppliers (include geography, those using subcontracting etc).	Steering Committee	Stakeholders were sent copies of the criteria.	7 – 8	November 2004

⁶ This column indicates the month the activity should start but not necessarily the month in which it will be completed

Step	Activity in Sequence	Method of Implementation	Project Stakeholder Involvement	Start ⁶	Completed
8	Identify possible supplier facilities	Buyers to submit list of suppliers in Turkey. Consultation with Turkish stakeholders.	Buyers were consulted regarding various considerations about factories. Trade unions submitted their suggestions for factory selection.	7 – 8	May 2005
9	In consultation with buyers, select suppliers and ask them to participate.	Consultation with buyers. Select sites against criteria. Meeting with buyers and suppliers. Final selection by Jo-In.		8 – 9	July 2005
10	Revisit areas of code implementation prioritized in 3. Define overlap and differences between MSIs. Formulate questions for trials.	Drafted by project staff and Steering Committee	Representatives from buyers, trade unions, and NGOs were involved in discussions about priorities at MIT.	9 – 10	July 2005
11	Design experimental trials.	Trial methodology drafted by project staff and approved by Steering Committee.		10 – 11	September 2005
12	Communicate trial design to stakeholders for comment. Seek agreement of buyers and factories to focus on remedial action. Revise trial methodology accordingly.	Steering Committee and Jo-In staff to consult with buyers, suppliers and international and national stakeholders. Agree MoU with factories.	Consultation held in Istanbul on Oct 3. Project staff and MSIs communicate Steering Committee responses to comments made by stakeholders at consultation.	11 – 12	April 2006
13	Draft protocols for baseline assessment to support those involved in the trials that will specifically help to answer questions identified in Step 10. May include comparison of different approaches.	Protocols (including both the method and questions) to be drafted experts (e.g. consultants and MIT with input from the different organizations involved) and agreed by the Steering Committee.	Project staff send local stakeholders criteria for GIEs and protocol overview. Stakeholders offer suggestions for GIE's and key items to be included in protocols.	13 – 14	Jan 2006
14	Recruit and brief Jo-In project team (GIE's).	Jo-In to identify skill requirement of GIE's. Jo-In staff to recruit GIE's. Jo-In staff to organize seminar for GIE's with input from Steering Committee members.		15 – 16	April 2006
15	Hold seminar for local stakeholders on approaches of different MSIs and complaint systems.	Project staff to organize and deliver	Local stakeholders attend seminar.	15 – 16	July 2006

Phase 2					
16	Conduct baseline assessment .	Jo-In project team (GIE's) to collect data on the facility and provide reports to Jo-In project staff and Steering Committee	Discussions with relevant factory managers, buyers, NGOs and trade unions.	18	
17	Analyze baseline information and devise remediation menu to test various approaches (e.g. technical assistance and/or worker education, etc.) to answer questions posed in step 10.	Jo-In project team and staff together with experts to analyze baseline information and present synthesis report of findings in factories, together with proposed menu of remediation strategies to the Steering Committee. Steering Committee to agree menu of remediation strategies based on best practice and tailored to findings (consult with stakeholders).	Local Working Group meeting, Liaison with International Advisory Panel on remediation strategies. Findings to be reported (unless factories consent, factories will remain unnamed) and suggestions for remediation strategies collected and reported upon (as a potential project learning).	20	
18	Agree a remediation plan in each facility.	Company, its MSI, and Jo-In agree a remediation plan in consultation with management and workers at the supplier factory based on suggestions for remediation strategies by the local working group Factories asked to commit to proposed remediation plan (have option to opt-out at this stage).	Steering Committee send copies of remediation plans agreed with factories.	22	
19	Factories to carry out remediation .	Factories to implement remediation plan with support of buyers and technical assistance (including worker training). One or more of the MSIs may be asked by the Steering Committee to assist where their expertise on a particular issue is required.	Stakeholder involvement depending on remediation plan.	22	
20	Conduct follow-up assessment and report on results.	Follow-up assessment by Jo-In project team with support of MIT or other institution. Supplier facility reports prepared by Jo-In project team.	Discussions with relevant factory managers, buyers, NGOs and trade unions.	29	

21	Draft report on results of experimental trials.	Synthesis report prepared by staff and distributed to Steering Committee.		30	
Phase 3					
22	Steering Committee to discuss results of experimental trials and agree principles for guidelines.	Report on results of experimental trials discussed by Steering Committee. Principles for guidelines drafted by Jo-In project staff and agreed by Steering Committee.	Initial reports/results sent to local stakeholders.	31	
23	Consultation to share initial report/results	Project staff to organize consultation to discuss and debate outcomes with involved stakeholders and distribute synthesis report and draft guidelines.	Local stakeholders attend meeting. Advice will be sought from International Advisory Panel.	32	
24	Review report and guidelines in the light of feedback from workers, trade unions, buyers and other stakeholders. Review draft Code.	Steering committee to discuss / review learning and guidelines, and review and agree Code. Project staff to revise guidelines and code.	As per terms of reference, stakeholders may submit comments for inclusion in report.	33	
25	Final Project Report	Report prepared by project staff, and discussed and approved by Steering Committee.		34	
26	Prepare final public document that is accessible to broad target audience.	Employ professional editor, designer etc.		35	
27	International conference to: share results of the trials; launch report and; discuss opportunities/implications of the shared learning and prospects for convergence/ efficiencies gained by applying common guidelines. Communicate outcomes and seek buy in of all stakeholders through meetings	Project staff to organize conference with agreement of Steering Committee. Project staff and Steering Committee members to meet with relevant stakeholders	International and local stakeholders to attend conference.	36	
28	Discuss and agree to how to take forward recommendations.	Steering Committee meeting to discuss next steps.		On project completion	

Annex 1: Questions to address in the experimental trials⁷

Freedom of Association

1. How to assess whether or not a factory is engaging in anti-union practices?
2. How to assess that factory is not exploiting legal procedures to obstruct freedom of association?
3. How to assess that the company has adopted a 'positive approach' toward the activities of trade unions and an open attitude towards the organizational activities of workers?
4. How to assess if the union is a "freely chosen representative" of the workforce?
5. How should factories demonstrate that they respect workers' rights to join a trade union and bargain collectively (e.g. free access for union representatives, public statements)?
6. How should companies exceed legal minimum requirements in order to comply with conventions 98 and 87 (since the thresholds do not comply with these conventions)?
7. What tools can be used to promote a positive climate toward freedom of association and constructive labor-management relations (e.g. training)?

Related Issues

1. What mechanisms and institutions are needed for a viable **complaint system**?
2. How to build local capacity for mediation?
3. What is the role of the **management system**?
 - How is compliance integrated into the management system?
 - How do you develop compliance in a subcontracting system?
4. What can be done to improve the **industrial relations environment** in Turkey?
5. What are the respective responsibilities of buyers, unions, NGOs, the government and suppliers?
6. What is the value of MSIs and buyers coming together on this issue in Turkey?
7. How do factories and buyers apply the code to subcontractors? What is their responsibility in respect of unregistered workers and suppliers?

⁷ These questions were generated by a Jo-In / MIT meeting in Boston in July 2005. See www.jo-in.org for full report of meeting.

Wages

1. What is a living wage for workers in the Turkish garment sector?
 - How do we develop a consistent methodology and approach to calculating a living wage that is gender sensitive?
 - What are the different methods / formula's used by MSIs around the table to calculate a living wage? What figures do these yield?
 - How can we use the wage rates in collective agreements to assess the level of living wages in Turkey?
 - How should we address regional differences?
2. How to achieve a living wage?
 - What are the gender differentials in wages, their sources, and means for addressing them?
 - What challenge does the living wage standard pose for factories and how can the business case be made?
 - What technical assistance can buyers, NGOs, Unions, and MSIs give factories to support their ability to pay a living wage?
 - What commercial strategies would support factories' ability to pay living wages (e.g. pricing, sourcing, profit-sharing)?
 - What is the impact of double bookkeeping what can be done about it?
3. How are wages paid in practice e.g. (what information is provided to the worker, are wages and benefits paid in full, in cash, regularly, etc.)?

Hours of work

1. How can we establish whether overtime is voluntary or involuntary?
2. How can we assess the magnitude of excessive overtime in Turkey?

Key challenge is non-implementation / enforcement of regulation. It is clear that this is an area where there is widespread non-compliance. The key question is how this can be remediated:

- 2.1 What is best practice in remediation of excessive OT?
 - What is the role of facility management (administration, record keeping)?
 - How can management of work hours, remuneration, and OT be better integrated with strategies to improve productivity, quality, safety and other operational aspects of the business?
 - How can the management of the supply chain—buying and ordering processes, reward and incentive systems, contractor capacity assessment, etc., be managed to reduce OT pressures on factories?
 - What is best practice in management of subcontractors?
 - How is the issue of double bookkeeping best remediated?
- 2.2 How can a business case be made to reduce OT?
 - How do the production system and the nature of the commodity influence the prevalence of OT?
 - How can factories improve production efficiency and capacity planning?
 - What are the relationships between working hours, OT, safety, productivity, and quality?

The trial will either look at best practices and study them in depth or set up a trial to test certain implementation strategies (possible variables):

- facility management (administration, record keeping)
- management of the ordering process by buyers
- nature of the production system (linear or team work, report production capacity in minutes or volume)
- nature of the commodity being produced

Draw out generalizable lessons.