

OSH PROTECTION FOR DOMESTIC WORKERS AS INFORMAL WORKERS UNDER LEGISLATION (A COMPARATIVE STUDY OF INDONESIA AND FINLAND)

Alya Azmi Putri Eryani¹, Ahmad Nailul Author²

Faculty of Law, Universitas Negeri Surabaya, Indonesia

alyaazmi.22002@mhs.unesa.ac.id

ahmadauthor@unesa.ac.id

Abstract

This research examines Occupational Safety and Health (OSH) protection for domestic workers as informal workers through a comparative study between Indonesia and Finland, driven by the high vulnerability to work-related hazards in the domestic sphere that has not been explicitly accommodated by Indonesian national law. Employing a normative juridical research method with statutory, comparative, and conceptual approaches, this study identifies a legal vacuum in Indonesia resulting from the limitations of regulations such as the Minister of Manpower Regulation No. 2 of 2015 and Law No. 1 of 1970, which inherently lean toward the formal-industrial sector. Conversely, Finland has successfully implemented universal-preventive protection through the Occupational Safety and Health Act (738/2002) and the ratification of the ILO Convention No. 189 of 2011 concerning Decent Work for Domestic Workers to realize welfare state principles. Based on human rights and social justice principles, this study highlights the urgency of strengthening legal protection in Indonesia, which must be realized through regulatory reform in the Domestic Workers Protection Act (UU PPRT) by incorporating concrete OSH standards, mandatory written employment contracts, and community-based enforcement mechanisms that adapt the successful model of Finnish law.

Keywords : Occupational Safety and Health (OSH), Domestic Workers, Informal Workers, Comparative Law.

INTRODUCTION

Occupational Safety and Health (OSH) is a fundamental aspect in the world of employment in the era of rapid industrialization, aiming to ensure the health, safety, and welfare of workers from various risks in the work environment (Abdurachman Shaleh, Diah Arimbi, 2025). The objective of OSH focuses not only on the prevention of occupational accidents (KK) and occupational diseases (PAK), but also contributes comprehensively to supporting productivity and business sustainability. In Indonesia, the main legal umbrella regarding OSH is based on the considering paragraph letter (a) of Law Number 1 of 1970 concerning Occupational Safety, which asserts that every worker has the right to protection for their safety for the welfare of life and the improvement of national productivity. This is also strengthened through Article 1 number 2 of Government Regulation Number 50 of 2012 concerning the Implementation of the Occupational Safety and Health Management System, which positions OSH as an activity to ensure and protect worker safety. At the global level, the state's responsibility in upholding this right is in line with the International Labour Organization (ILO) Convention Number 155 of 1981, which obliges states to develop risk prevention policies in the work environment. Therefore, OSH must be viewed as a constitutional obligation, not merely as a technical tool.

The urgency of implementing OSH becomes increasingly important considering the high number of worker accidents and deaths. Global data from the ILO and the World Health Organization (WHO) in 2019 recorded 2.9 million worker deaths worldwide, consisting of 2.58 million due to occupational diseases and 320 thousand due to occupational accidents (Takala et al., 2024). At the national level, based on BPJS Ketenagakerjaan data up to May 2025, there were 323,652 occupational accident cases and 4,410 occupational disease cases in Indonesia (SPSI, 2025). These high figures not only reflect the global and national health burden, but also indicate a highly detrimental impact for workers in vulnerable sectors due to the loss of income and increased medical costs.

The implementation and protection of OSH in Indonesia to date still shows a very sharp contrast between the formal and informal sectors. Workers in the formal sector tend to receive much better protection due to the availability of resources from companies, access to OSH training programs, and stronger government supervision mechanisms. Conversely, protection for workers in the informal sector such as contract workers, daily workers, MSME actors, and Domestic Workers (PRT) is still very limited (Djarmiko & Pudyastiwati, 2024). Data provided by the Central Statistics Agency (BPS) in February 2025 shows that the employment structure in Indonesia is dominated by informal workers at 59.4%, compared to 40.6% formal workers (GoodStats, 2025). This data reflects a deep structural problem between formal and informal workers in Indonesia, which weakens the position of OSH protection for informal workers and indicates a lack of government supervision compared to formal workers, thereby exacerbating the condition of social injustice for the majority of workers in Indonesia.

Domestic Workers (PRT) occupy a vulnerable position within the informal sector. This group constantly faces low wages, uncertain working hours, excessive workloads, vulnerability to violence, and the absence of social security and OSH protection (Katara & Sharma, 2023). Even though Article 13 of ILO Convention No. C189 explicitly states that PRTs have the right to a safe and healthy work environment. PRTs face various hazard threats in their routines, ranging from physical, chemical, biological, ergonomic, to psychological hazards. The reality of this risk is clearly illustrated by a case in Indonesia involving a PRT with the initials "I" in Cengkareng, whose leg was severely injured by a sudden LPG gas explosion from under the sink due to a loose regulator hose (Syukur, 2024). Besides physical hazards such as gas explosions and electric shocks, PRTs are also vulnerable to chemical hazards from cleaning products, biological hazards from waste management, ergonomic risks due to poor working posture, and psychological hazards in the form of stress (burnout) and emotional exhaustion due to exploitation (Academy, 2023).

This high vulnerability collides with a legal vacuum in the national regulatory system. The main regulation governing PRTs in Indonesia, namely the Minister of Manpower Regulation Number 2 of 2015 concerning the Protection of Domestic Workers, functions more as an administrative rule for distributing agencies than as an instrument for protecting basic rights for PRTs. Article 7, which contains nine points of PRT rights, and Article 11, which regulates the obligations of users (employers) in the Ministerial Regulation, do not contain a single clause explicitly guaranteeing the rights of PRTs to a safe, healthy work environment that is free from occupational accidents. Furthermore, the stalled ratification of the Draft Law on the Protection of Domestic Workers (RUU PPRT) for two decades has also exacerbated the absence of OSH protection. As emphasized by the Representative of the Law and Human Rights Council of PP Aisyiyah, Ninik Rahayu, this Bill is very urgent and crucial because PRTs have so far only been considered as temporary and informal workers who do not require further legal protection (Ady Thea DA, 2025).

Although this protection initiative for PRTs has begun to emerge at the regional level, such as through the DIY Governor Regulation Number 31 of 2010 and the Yogyakarta Mayor

Regulation Number 48 of 2011, its scope is very limited to those regions and does not yet apply nationally. According to the Coordinator of the Advocacy Division of the Tjoet Njak Dien NGO, Buyung Ridwan Tanjung, these regional regulations are actually aimed at motivating the central government to form regulations that recognize PRTs on par with other workers (Wibisono, 2010). However, its implementation remains hindered by the dominant view that PRTs are merely familial relations with employment agreements limited only to verbal ones.

The absence of an adequate legal umbrella in Indonesia becomes very contrasting when compared to the protection framework in Finland as an advanced European Union country. As a fellow adherent to the Civil Law legal system, Finland has implemented a preventive and comprehensive protection model for all its workers. Finland is bound by the Occupational Safety and Health Act (OSHA) (738/2002), which enforces OSH protection universally without excluding either the formal or informal sectors. Through the ratification of ILO Convention Number 189 of 2011, Finland explicitly grants OSH rights to PRTs equal to formal workers.

The selection of Finland as a comparison country is also based on the integrated OSH standards in Finland, meaning Finland does not divide every worker formally and informally; rather, the existing OSH regulations apply universally so they can serve as a best practice applicable in Indonesia, especially for the new PRT protection regulation, namely Law Number 2 of 2026 concerning the Protection of Domestic Workers (Sulistiowati, 2025). In Finland, PRTs work under clearly regulated contracts covering working hours, rest durations, and minimum wages, and are supported by a statutory accident insurance mechanism in the event of an accident. Employers in Finland are also legally required to strictly conduct direct risk assessments in the household environment where the PRT works.

Based on the explanation above, there is clearly a fundamental gap between PRT protection laws in Indonesia, which are reactive and partial, and Finland, which are preventive and comprehensive. Through a normative-comparative approach, this research aims to identify weaknesses and legal vacuums in OSH protection for the informal sector in Indonesia, especially PRTs. By comparing the regulations between Indonesia and Finland, this research is expected to formulate the urgency of strengthening the law and provide a concrete contribution for policymakers in designing a protection regulatory framework that is fair, inclusive, and integrated with international standards.

METHODS

This research employs a normative legal research method (normative juridical); normative legal research is a research process that examines legal issues in the form of norms, legal principles, legal theories, and existing doctrines to answer the problem being investigated (Muhaimin, 2020). The focus of the study stems from the existence of a legal vacuum in the regulation of occupational safety and health for informal sector workers, particularly Domestic Workers in Indonesia. This paper utilizes a statute approach, a comparative approach, and a conceptual approach. Legal materials are collected through library research, with primary legal materials consisting of national regulations (Law No. 1 of 1970, Law No. 13 of 2003, Minister of Manpower Regulation No. 2 of 2015, and the PPRT Law) and Finnish regulations (Occupational Safety and Health Act 738/2002), as well as international legal instruments (ILO Convention No. 189). Secondary legal materials are sourced from academic literature, books, scientific journals, and credible news portals. The analysis is conducted using a descriptive-prescriptive method to formulate recommendations for strengthening the law in Indonesia.

RESULTS AND DISCUSSION

1. Comparison of OSH Protection for PRTs in Indonesia and Finland

a. OSH Protection Regulation for PRTs in Indonesian Law

Occupational Safety and Health (OSH) regulation in Indonesia is essentially a universal principle inherent to every worker in an employment relationship.

Substantially, OSH is understood as a series of systematic efforts to ensure workers are free from various hazard risks, whether physical, chemical, biological, or psychological (Raganingtyas & Prima, 2025). This constitutional foundation is enshrined in Article 27 paragraph (2) of the 1945 Constitution, which affirms the right of citizens to work that is fit for humanity, as well as Article 28D paragraph (1), which guarantees the right to legal certainty and equal treatment before the law. Therefore, every state is obliged to ensure the fulfillment of workers' rights, including the right to OSH protection while carrying out their work, as emphasized in OSH regulations and the government's responsibility regarding the constitutional rights of workers (Gunadi, 2024).

Article 86 paragraph (1) of Law Number 13 of 2003 concerning Manpower further reinforces the state's commitment by stating that every worker has the right to OSH protection, moral protection, and treatment consistent with human dignity. Thus, in the realm of implementation, this protection still faces structural discrimination and profound inequality toward informal workers. Although labor law theoretically provides a protection framework, the reality on the ground indicates that informal workers such as PRTs (Domestic Workers) remain in a vulnerable situation due to a lack of adequate juridical recognition and the absence of supervisory instruments that touch the domestic sphere; consequently, the implementation of worker protection in accordance with existing regulations has not operated optimally for vulnerable groups like PRTs (Hamid, 2024).

The primary OSH regulation in Indonesia has relied on Law Number 1 of 1970 concerning Occupational Safety. The scope of the workplace, as regulated in Article 2 paragraph (1) of the law, encompasses "all workplaces," whether on land, underground, or on the water's surface. This provision should theoretically serve as a strong foundation for protecting PRTs, as the household environment is a workplace with real potential risks. However, Article 3 paragraph (1) of the law outlines occupational safety requirements that are heavily oriented toward the formal industrial sector, such as the prevention of explosions, fire hazards, extreme temperature control, and the use of technical personal protective equipment specific to manufacturing or construction. As a result, legal dysfunction occurs when these norms are forced to be implemented in private domestic employment relations without the existence of specific implementing regulations.

The procedural obligation for administrators or employers, as regulated in Article 9 paragraph (1) of Law No. 1 of 1970, to explain hazardous conditions and safe work methods to new workers remains highly difficult for PRTs to access today. In the informal realm, risk identification often fails to occur due to the absence of technical standards similar to those in the formal sector and weak socialization regarding the importance of OSH in the domestic environment (Hizriansyah, 2023). Other derivative regulations, such as the Minister of Manpower Regulation Number 5 of 2018 concerning Occupational Safety and Health in the Work Environment, have indeed added psychological and ergonomic aspects to OSH hazard factors. However, this obligation is imposed on entrepreneurs with clear legality and organizational structures, leaving PRTs unaccommodated within the existing supervision and law enforcement mechanisms.

The limited protection for PRTs is further emphasized by the Minister of Manpower Regulation Number 2 of 2015 concerning the Protection of Domestic Workers. Critical analysis indicates that this regulation focuses more on

administrative functions for labor placement agencies rather than providing guarantees of basic rights for PRTs. Article 7 concerning the Rights of PRTs and Article 11 concerning the Obligations of Users do not contain a single clause that explicitly guarantees the rights of PRTs to a safe work environment, health, or the prevention of occupational accidents. This condition causes PRTs to legally reside in a prolonged "legal vacuum." This ambiguous legal status is also driven by Indonesia's failure to ratify ILO Convention Number 189 of 2011, which should serve as a specific international legal instrument to ensure decent working conditions for PRTs. The lack of ratification in Indonesia regarding ILO Convention No. 189 directly impacts the weak standardization of PRT protection in Indonesia (Nisrina Putri Fauzi, 2025).

Hope for change emerged with the passage of the Domestic Workers Protection Law (UU PPRT) on April 21, 2026, which underwent a legislative process spanning 22 years. Article 15 of Law No. 2 of 2026 concerning the PPRT includes the right of PRTs to "obtain a safe and healthy work environment." However, the government's rejection of the proposed two-year transition period for the establishment of implementing regulations, alongside the DPR's pressure to complete derivative rules immediately, demonstrates that the challenges of implementing the PPRT Law remain massive (RI, 2026). The challenge moving forward is not merely the existence of new regulations, but how these rules are translated into inclusive technical policies, adhered-to written employment contract mechanisms, and supervision that reaches the domestic sphere without violating privacy. The case of the LPG gas explosion in Cengkareng that befell a PRT is clear evidence that if OSH protection is not regulated applicably and is not accompanied by a supervisory mechanism that reaches residential homes, PRT protection will merely become a formality. Without concrete reform, PRTs will continue to be neglected as legal subjects, even though the state has a constitutional responsibility to guarantee protection for every citizen without exception, including within the scope of informal work that has historically been vulnerable to exploitation and occupational accidents.

b. OSH Protection Regulation for PRTs in Finnish Law

Finland as a European Union member state adhering to the same legal system as Indonesia, namely Civil Law, possesses a foundational principle of the welfare state, meaning that social protection is a collective right of citizens, not merely assistance from the state (Mikkonen, 2026). Consequently, this has created an inclusive protection framework for the workforce and positions OSH (Occupational Safety and Health) conditions not solely as the fulfillment of technical standards, but as the implementation of the right to universal social security for all workers in Finland. The principle of equality in OSH regulations in Finland is subsequently reflected through its primary OSH regulations, namely the Occupational Safety and Health Act (738/2002) and the Act on Occupational Health Services (1383/2001) these regulations have applied the principles of Council Directive 89/391/EEC, which is the OSH framework in the European Union that has been adopted by Finland (Kirsi Koskela, 2023).

These regulations then apply to all paid and comparable work, ensuring that OSH protection is not strictly limited to the industrial or formal worker sectors, but also extends to informal workers such as PRTs (Domestic Workers), who are entitled to safe and healthy working conditions (Finland, 2016). Provisions regarding the employer's obligation to ensure the safety and health of workers are specifically regulated in the Occupational Safety and Health Act (738/2002). Section 5 of this law, regarding the application of rules to work performed in the worker's home or someone else's home, asserts that this Act applies to work performed by agreement by workers in their own residence or in the employer's home. Although it is acknowledged that employers face limitations in influencing working conditions within the domestic sphere, they remain obligated to comply with provisions concerning the use of machinery, work equipment, personal protective equipment, and the use of hazardous substances that could harm the health of workers.

Section 8 of the act regulates the Employers' general duty to exercise care, dictating that employers are obliged to take the necessary measures to maintain the safety and health of workers while working. Employers are required to design preventive measures, eliminate workplace hazards, and continuously monitor the work environment and the health of workers. This principle demonstrates that for Finland, worker protection must be viewed as an integrated system requiring coordination and synergy, rather than the mere fulfillment of formalistic norms (Majumdar, 2019). Its technical implementation is also governed by the Government Decree on the Safe Use and Inspection of Work Equipment (403/2008), which obliges employers to ensure that all work tools used by PRTs, such as kitchen appliances or cleaning machines, are in proper functioning and safe condition throughout their useful life.

Not stopping at physical safety aspects, Finland pays serious attention to the health aspects of the work environment through the Government Decree on Chemical Agents at Work (715/2001). Article 10 of this regulation specifically obliges employers to protect workers against the physical hazards of chemical agents, such as the risk of fire and explosion, by prioritizing the prevention of hazardous substance concentrations forming in the workplace. This obligation demands that employers safely store household cleaning chemicals and provide adequate control systems. Finland's commitment is supported by the practice of risk assessments, which have become a mandatory routine; data shows that more than 90% of top management in Finland are committed to OSH development, and the majority of workers have received adequate OSH training (Anttonen & Pääkkönen, 2010).

The Occupational Healthcare Act (1383/2001) strengthens this system by obliging employers, at their own expense, to organize preventive occupational health services for workers. Section 1 and Section 4 of this regulation state that the primary objective of occupational health services is

to prevent work-related diseases and accidents, as well as to protect the health and working capacity of workers. Section 12 stipulates that occupational health services must include hazard identification and risk assessments through periodic workplace visits, individual worker health monitoring, and the provision of advice regarding rehabilitation if workers experience health disturbances. Supervision over the implementation of these services is strictly overseen by the Ministry of Social Affairs and Health and the occupational safety supervisory authority, leaving no room for employers to regard health obligations as a mere formality (Keskimäki & Anna, 2024).

The legal standing of PRTs within employment contracts in Finland is based on the Employment Contracts Act (55/2001), which in Section 1 determines its scope of application to employment agreements where the worker performs work under the direction and supervision of the employer in exchange for remuneration. This law applies even if the work is performed in the worker's home or a location chosen by the worker, demonstrating that the employment relationship of PRTs is legally recognized and not constrained by the physical location of the workplace. Chapter 2 Section 3 of this Act further binds the employer to observe occupational safety to protect workers from accidents and health hazards, as regulated in the Occupational Safety and Health Act (738/2002).

The effectiveness of OSH enforcement in Finland is supported by the Act on Occupational Safety and Health Enforcement (44/2006), which provides an operational framework for inspectors to conduct domiciliary peace inspections if there is a suspected serious danger to the life or health of a worker (Guideline on Occupational Safety and Health Enforcement and the Use of Authority, 2022). The existence of an occupational safety and health representative, as regulated in Section 29, also provides a formal channel for workers to participate in and oversee the implementation of OSH in their workplace. Through a tripartite system involving the government, employers, and trade unions, Finland has successfully presented a preventive and progressive protection model wherein PRTs are positioned as legal subjects who receive tangible protection equal to workers in other formal sectors.

c. Comparison of OSH Protection Regulations for PRTs in Indonesian and Finnish Regulations

Aspects of Regulation	Indonesia	Finland	Differences
Legal System & Basic Principles	Civil Law with the main OSH focus on the formal industrial sector.	Civil Law with welfare state principles, emphasizing universal social protection.	Indonesia tends to be sectoral-formal, while Finland is universal for all workers.
Main OSH Regulations	Law No. 1/1970, Government Regulation No. 50/2012, and Law No. 2 of 2026	Occupational Safety and Health Act (738/2002) dan Act on Occupational Health Services (1383/2001).	Finland's regulations are more inclusive and integrated for all types of work.

	concerning the PPRT.		
Employer Obligations	Article 11 Minister of Manpower Regulation No. 2/2015; Article 9 Law No. 1/1970	Section 8 OSHA (738/2002) (duty of care); Section 4 Occupational Health Care Act (1383/2001)	Employers in Finland are obliged to routinely conduct risk assessments.
Prohibitions for Employers	Implicit in Article 3 Law No. 1/1970.	Section 5 Government Decree 403/2008; Section 10 Government Decree 715/2001	Finland specifically prohibits the provision of dangerous tools/chemicals for the informal sector.
Supervision	No specific article for inspections in the domestic realm.	Section 9 Act 44/2006 (domestic inspections are permitted if there is a suspected serious danger)	Finland allows supervisory access in the private realm.
Sanctions	Article 15 Law No. 1/1970 (Criminal) and Article 190 Law No. 13/2003 (Administrative).	Chapter 47 Section 1 Criminal Code (39/1889); Negligence fee (administrative fine).	Finland applies strict criminal sanctions and administrative fines (negligence fees).
OSH Cooperation	Not yet regulated in specific articles for the domestic sector.	Section 26 Act 44/2006 (obligation for joint discussion on safety issues).	Finland obliges employer-worker dialogue/cooperation.
Worker Representation	No mechanism in the Law.	Section 29 Act 44/2006 (occupational safety representative).	Finland guarantees worker participation through OSH representatives.

The comparison of OSH regulations for PRTs (Domestic Workers) between Indonesia and Finland reveals fundamental differences in sectoral scope, the guarantee of rights, and the state's commitment to law enforcement. Indonesia, through Law No. 1 of 1970, remains trapped in a legal construction oriented toward the formal sector, resulting in a tangible legal dysfunction regarding technical implementation in the domestic sphere. Although the 2026 PPRT Law has been passed, the protection it provides remains in a transitional phase and lacks the support of robust supervisory instruments within the private domain.

On the other hand, Finland has implemented a more advanced, preventive, and operational protection model by positioning PRTs as equal legal subjects through the Employment Contracts Act (55/2001) and the Occupational Safety and Health Act (738/2002). Through mandatory risk assessments for employers, supervisory mechanisms that extend into the private sphere, and a strict sanction system (including negligence fees), Finland has successfully established an inclusive standard of protection. This contrast underscores the necessity for Indonesia to

strengthen its specific legal foundation and develop a supervisory system capable of addressing the unique characteristics of the domestic sector, ensuring that OSH protection for PRTs is no longer incidental, but rather possesses legal certainty and effective reach.

d. Analysis of Effectiveness and Identification of the Legal Vacuum in OSH Protection for PRTs in Indonesia

The effectiveness of OSH protection for PRTs is not only measured by the existence of normative rules, but also by the extent to which these rules can be implemented, supervised, and provide real protection in daily work activities. Based on the analysis, it is found that there are vague norms and a legal vacuum that hinder the effectiveness of PRT protection in Indonesia. Philosophically, a PRT is a worker who works under the orders of an employer by receiving wages, who should be protected by Article 86 paragraph (1) of Law Number 13 of 2003 concerning Manpower. However, in reality, basic rights to a safe and healthy work environment are often ignored in informal employment relations.

Legal dysfunction in Law Number 1 of 1970 concerning Occupational Safety lies in the definition of "workplace," which in Article 1 number 1 is limited only for "the purpose of a business". This definition automatically excludes the domestic sector from the reach of OSH protection, because households are considered private entities and not commercial business units. Consequently, domestic occupational safety standards do not have clear technical references. This unclear legal status is compounded by the Minister of Manpower Regulation Number 2 of 2015, which failed to integrate OSH aspects as basic PRT rights, as well as the PPRT Law (2026), which, although it includes the right to a safe environment, remains stalled in its implementation due to the absence of operational derivative regulations.

The effectiveness of OSH protection is also hindered by community views that still position PRTs as "helpers" instead of professional workers (Raharjo, 2026). This view triggers unfair work practices, where work risks (such as LPG gas hazards, electrical hazards, and work stress) are considered the personal burden of the worker, not the employer's responsibility. This is supported by National Commission on Violence Against Women data recording 2,641 cases of violence and occupational accidents against PRTs throughout 2018–2023, where the majority of victims failed to receive compensation due to a weak legal basis for holding employers accountable (Perempuan, 2024).

The comparison with Finland shows that OSH effectiveness is achieved because the all paid employment principle is embraced, where OSH protection attaches to every wage-earning employment relationship without being bound by the physical location of the workplace (Kirsi Koskela, 2023). The absence of a structured institutional design in Indonesia, such as the minimal number of labor inspectors capable of reaching the domestic realm, makes OSH protection for PRTs merely incidental and dependent on the good faith of employers. Therefore, strengthening legal effectiveness requires reform that focuses not only on forming substantive legal norms, but also on building integrated institutional coordination mechanisms, involving the government, distributing agencies, and active community participation, so that OSH protection for PRTs has real reach and legal certainty in the field.

This analysis shows that the challenge of PRT legal uncertainty in Indonesia lies not only in the absence of substantive norms, but also in the unformed effective institutional coordination mechanism between the government, distributing agencies, and the community. Real occupational accident cases befalling PRTs, such as the LPG gas explosion reported by Antaranews, serve as a reflection that PRT protection demands reform touching on risk prevention aspects, employer training, and easily accessible complaint systems.

Therefore, strengthening legal effectiveness requires reform focusing not only on forming substantive legal norms in the PPRT Law, but also on building integrated institutional coordination mechanisms involving the government, the private sector, and active community participation (Notko et al., 2022). This reform must be able to fill the legal vacuum by providing applicable technical standards in the domestic realm, so that OSH protection for PRTs has reach, legal certainty, and real effectiveness in the field, while ensuring that work in the domestic sector is no longer a lawless space vulnerable to exploitation and the neglect of workers' human rights. Without comprehensive reform, PRTs will continue to be in a marginalized position without adequate protection, which in turn hinders the realization of social justice for all Indonesian people as envisioned constitutionally.

CLOSING

The comparison of Occupational Safety and Health (OSH) protection for Domestic Workers (PRTs) in Indonesia and Finland demonstrates fundamental differences in terms of sectoral scope, the guarantee of rights, and the state's commitment to law enforcement. Indonesia, which relies on Law Number 1 of 1970 concerning Occupational Safety, continues to experience legal dysfunction because its construction leans heavily toward the formal sector, resulting in highly limited implementation of OSH protection in the domestic realm. Although the 2026 PPRT Law has been enacted, the protection for PRTs remains transitional and lacks the support of effective supervisory apparatus in the private sphere. Conversely, Finland has implemented a universal, preventive, and inclusive OSH protection model through the Occupational Safety and Health Act (738/2002), which applies to all paid workers, including domestic workers, and is supported by strict supervisory mechanisms and a resolute sanction system that guarantees the position of PRTs is equal to that of other formal workers.

The urgency of strengthening legal protection for the OSH of PRTs in Indonesia is a pressing need because PRTs constitute an informal worker group with high vulnerability to the risks of occupational accidents and work-related diseases, yet they currently remain in the "gray area" of the national labor system. The results of the comparison indicate that effective protection for PRTs must be supported by the explicit recognition of their legal status, the employer's obligation to conduct risk assessments, the provision of preventive health services, and the strengthening of supervisory and law enforcement mechanisms capable of reaching the private space. OSH legal reform for PRTs not only functions to protect the fundamental rights of workers but also plays a crucial role in realizing a humane and fair order of domestic employment relations, while being capable of providing legal certainty and tangible protection for PRTs as equal legal subjects, in alignment with the principle of decent work and international legal standards.

In light of these findings, the government and legislators are advised to strengthen OSH regulations for informal workers by adopting the principles of universal protection, mandatory risk assessments, and an effective supervisory system as practiced in Finland, while simultaneously ensuring that technical implementing rules can be executed immediately. For

users or employers of PRTs, it is expected that there is an awareness that domestic employment relations demand a legal responsibility to guarantee the safety and welfare of PRTs, including the provision of a safe work environment and a transparent, written employment agreement. Furthermore, the Ministry of Manpower is advised to strengthen continuous cross-sectoral socialization and coordination so that OSH protection policies for PRTs do not merely halt at normative recognition, but are implemented effectively and applicably in the field to minimize the risk of occupational accidents in the future.

CONCLUSION

The comparison of Occupational Safety and Health (OSH) protection for Domestic Workers (PRTs) between Indonesia and Finland reveals a fundamental discrepancy within the labor legal framework, where Indonesia remains trapped in a sectoral-formal approach that causes legal dysfunction for workers in the domestic realm, whereas Finland has successfully integrated universal, preventive, and comprehensive protection standards for all paid workers without exception. The research findings indicate that the legal vacuum in Indonesia is not merely the absence of substantive norms, but also weak institutional design, minimal supervision in the private sphere, and the lack of sanctions providing a deterrent effect for employers. The urgency of strengthening legal protection for PRTs in Indonesia is a pressing, cross-dimensional need, encompassing the recognition of equal legal status, the employer's obligation to conduct risk assessments, and the establishment of adaptive collaborative supervisory mechanisms. The essence of this research asserts that the transformation of OSH protection for PRTs demands a paradigm shift from informal familial relationships toward professional employment relations based on legal certainty, wherein the state is present as the guarantor of occupational safety for the most vulnerable parties, thereby creating a humane and fair domestic work order aligned with decent work standards and social justice principles, as mandated by international law and Indonesian constitutional instruments.

ADVICE

For the government and legislators, it is recommended to immediately draft the technical or derivative regulations for the new Domestic Workers Protection Law, namely Law Number 2 of 2026 concerning the Protection of Domestic Workers. This aims to ensure that the provision regarding the right of PRTs (Domestic Workers) to receive OSH protection can be properly implemented and supervised by the government. Furthermore, the primary OSH regulation in Indonesia, namely Law Number 1 of 1970 concerning Occupational Safety, needs to be updated to align with the dynamics of the labor world in the modern era, ensuring that OSH standards can be applied to all workers without exception. For users or employers of PRTs, it is recommended to shift the employment relationship paradigm from one that is familial in nature to a professional employment relationship by integrating OSH commitments into a transparent, written employment agreement. This agreement should include provisions regarding a safe work environment, the supply of proper work equipment, and guarantees of physical safety and health for PRTs. Service users are also expected to be more proactive in identifying potential hazards in their respective households to minimize the occurrence of occupational accidents and work-related diseases. For Domestic Workers (PRTs), it is advised to increase awareness of the normative rights and OSH protections now guaranteed by law, and to be more assertive in demanding written employment agreements that provide legal certainty for their bargaining position. Lastly, for future academics and researchers, it is recommended to conduct further, more in-depth research on OSH supervisory models in the informal sector based on community empowerment, and to further examine the effectiveness of implementing administrative sanctions and negligence fees within the Indonesian legal system to provide a deterrent effect against violations of workers' safety rights in the domestic sector.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

Book:

- Academy, M. (2023). *Mengenal Jenis Bahaya Dalam K3*.
- Anttonen, H., & Pääkkönen, R. (2010). *Risk Assessment In Finland : Theory And Practice*. 1–10.
- Guideline On Occupational Safety And Health Enforcement And The Use Of Authority, 1 (2022).
- Muhaimin. (2020). *Metode Penelitian Hukum*.
- Keskimäki, L.-K. T. I., & Anna, M. K. (2024). *Finland Health System Summary 2024*.
- Sulistiowati, D. (2025). *Profil K3 Finlandia: Model Sukses Kolaborasi Pemerintah, Pengusaha, Dan Pekerja*.
- Majumdar, A. (2019). *Alignment And Organization Of Inter- National Occupational Health And Safety Management*. Metropolia University.
- Nugraha, I. H. S. Dan S. (2025). *Pendekatan Keselamatan Dan Kesehatan Kerja (K3) Untuk Mendukung Kelompok Pekerja Rentan Di Tempat Kerja* (S. D. A. M. S. Dan N. R. Satria (Ed.)). UIN Jakarta.

Journal

- Abdurachman Shaleh, Diah Arimbi, L. A. (2025). Legal Protection Of Occupational Safety And Health Of Employees Under Law No. 1 Of 1970 Concerning Safety Perlindungan Hukum Terhadap Keselamatan Dan Kesehatan Kerja Terhadap Tenaga Kerja Berdasarkan Undang-Undang No. 1 Tahun 1970 Tentang Keselamatan. *RECHTSWETENSCHAP Jurnal Mahasiswa Hukum*, 3(1). <https://doi.org/10.36859/rechtswetenschap.v3i1.4121>
- Affiah, H., Anwar, S., Andriyani, M., & Jumhana, E. (2025). Analisis Efektivitas Penegakkan Hukum K3 Sebagai Upaya Perlindungan Hak-Hak Pekerja Di Indonesia. *ILMU PENGETAHUAN NARATIF*, 06(1), 187–198.
- Djarmiko, A., & Pudyastiti, E. (2024). Legal Review Of Justice In Occupational Safety And Health Protection. *Ganesha Law Review*, 6(2), 21–30. <https://Ejournal2.Undiksha.Ac.Id/Index.Php/GLR>
- Faiz, P. M. (2018). Teori Keadilan John Rawls. *Jurnal Konstitusi*, 6, 135–149. <https://doi.org/10.2139/ssrn.2847573>
- Gunadi, J. E. B. Dan A. (2024). Tanggung Jawab Pemerintah Terhadap Pekerja Yang Mengalami Kecelakaan Kerja Akibat Kelalaian Perusahaan Dalam Prinsip Kesehatan Dan Keselamatan Kerja (K3). 5(5), 1–18.
- Hamid, A. (2024). Tantangan Dan Peluang Dalam Perlindungan Hukum Bagi Pekerja Sektor Informal Dalam Pembangunan Ketenagakerjaan Di Indonesia. 1(2), 97–115.
- Hartanti, Ivan Fauzan Raharja, A. A. R. (2024). Perlindungan Hukum Terkait Upah Pekerja Rumah Tangga (Prt) Berdasarkan Undang-Undang Nomor 13 Tahun 2003 Tentang Ketenagakerjaan. 184–200.
- Hizriansyah, S. Dan. (2023). Sosialisasi K3 Lingkungan Rumah Tangga Di Desa Kuranji Dalang Lombok Barat. 4(3), 6090–6093.
- Katara, A., & Sharma, P. (2023). The Lifeworld Of Women Domestic Workers : Some Case Studies. *Integrated Journal For Research In Arts And Humanities*, 1, 52–56. <https://doi.org/10.55544/ijrah.3.1.10>
- Mikkonen, A. (2026). Affective Debates Of Finnish Welfare State Imaginary Amidst Financialization : Case Of Equity Savings Account For Newborns. 1–22.

<https://doi.org/10.1177/02610183251410120>

- Nisrina Putri Fauzi, N. A. R. (2025). Urgensi Ratifikasi Konvensi Ilo 189 Dalam Perlindungan Hukum Pekerja Rumah Tangga: Implikasi Terhadap R UU Pprt Indonesia. *Hukum Lex Generalis*, 6(5).
- Notko, M., Husso, M., Piippo, S., Fagerlund, M., Notko, M., Husso, M., & Fagerlund, M. (2022). Intervening In Domestic Violence : Interprofessional Collaboration Among Social And Health Care Professionals And The Police Health Care Professionals And The Police. *Journal Of Interprofessional Care*, 36(1), 15–23. <https://doi.org/10.1080/13561820.2021.1876645>
- Novitz, T., & Syrpis, P. (2015). The Place Of Domestic Work In Europe An Analysis Of Current Policy In The Light Of The Council Decision Authorising Member States To Ratify Ilo Convention No. 189. *European Labour Law Journal*, 6(189), 104–127. <https://doi.org/10.1177/201395251500600202>
- Pratama, C. H. Y. (2023). Akses Keadilan Bagi Pekerja Rumah Tangga : Menelaah Perlindungan Hukum Pekerja Rumah Tangga Dalam Pengaturan Formal Dan Informal. *UNES LAW REVIEW*, 6(1), 3705–3717.
- Raganingtyas, S. A., & Prima, T. (2025). Pemahaman Konseptual Keselamatan Dan Kesehatan Kerja (K3): Tinjauan Sistematis Terhadap Penyebab Dan Pencegahan Kecelakaan Kerja Kelelahan Dan Peningkatan Risiko Kecelakaan Kerja Pada Tenaga Kerja (Mandias , Shintya , &. 4.
- Rasji, A. F. Dan. (2023). Jaminan Hak Asasi Manusia Bagi Pekerja Rumah Tangga Melalui Perjanjian Kerja. *UNES LAW REVIEW*, 6(2), 5738–5749. <https://doi.org/10.31933/Unesrev.V6i2>
- Takala, J., Hämäläinen, P., Sauni, R., Nygård, C. H., Gagliardi, D., & Neupane, S. (2024). Global-, Regional-And Country-Level Estimates Of The Work-Related Burden Of Diseases And Accidents In 2019. *Scandinavian Journal Of Work, Environment And Health*, 50(2), 73–82. <https://doi.org/10.5271/Sjweh.4132>

Website:

- (Finland), M. Of S. A. And H. (2016). *OCCUPATIONAL SAFETY AND HEALTH IN FINLAND*. Ministry Of Social Affairs And Health.
- Ady Thea DA. (2025). *RUU PPRT Posisikan Pekerja Rumah Tangga Sebagai Pekerja Formal*. Hukum Online. <https://www.hukumonline.com/berita/a/ruu-pprt-posisikan-pekerja-rumah-tangga-sebagai-pekerja-formal-lt683468575c134/?Page=2>
- Goodstats. (2025). *Proporsi Pekerja Di Sektor Informal Kembali Naik Pada 2025*. <https://data.goodstats.id/statistic/proporsi-pekerja-di-sektor-informal-kembali-naik-pada-2025-ivywz>
- Kirsi Koskela, R. S. (2023). *OSH System At National Level - Finland*. <https://oshwiki.osha.europa.eu/en/themes/osh-system-national-level-finland>
- Perempuan, K. (2024). *Siaran Pers Bersama Komnas Perempuan, Komnas HAM, KPAI, KND Mendorong Pengesahan RUU PPRT*. <https://komnasperempuan.go.id/Siaran-Pers-Detail/Siaran-Pers-Bersama-Komnas-Perempuan-Komnas-Ham-Kpai-Knd-Mendorong-Pengesahan-Ruu-Pprt>
- Raharjo, D. B. (2026). *Bukan Sekadar Aturan, Hal Ini Jadi Tantangan Terberat UU PPRT Di Lapangan*. Suara.Com. <https://www.suara.com/news/2026/04/22/124110/bukan-sekadar-aturan-hal-ini-jadi-tantangan-terberat-uu-pprt-di-lapangan>
- RI, D. (2026). *Aturan Pelaksanaan RUU PPRT Disepakati Paling Lama Setahun Setelah Ditetapkan*. <https://www.dpr.go.id/kegiatan-dpr/berita/aturan-pelaksanaan-ruu-pprt-disepakati-paling-lama-setahun-setelah-ditetapkan-64597>

- SPSI. (2025). BPJS Ketenagakerjaan Catat 4.410 Kasus Penyakit Akibat Kerja Hingga Mei 2025. In *SPKEP-SPSI*. <https://Spkep-Spsi.Org/2025/08/27/Bpjs-Ketenagakerjaan-Catat-4-410-Kasus-Penyakit-Akibat-Kerja-Hingga-Mei-2025/>
- Syukur, R. E. R. (2024). *Seorang Pekerja Rumah Tangga Terluka Kena Ledakan LPG Di Cengkareng*. Antara News. https://Www.AntaraneWS.Com/Berita/4142685/Seorang-Pekerja-Rumah-Tangga-Terluka-Kena-Ledakan-Lpg-Di-Cengkareng#Google_Vignette
- Wibisono, K. (2010). *Pergub DIY Nomor 31 Memotivasi Provinsi Lain*. Antara News.