

Final report – Safety and health in ports

Introduction

1. This Meeting of Experts was held to review a draft code of practice consisting of two parts, one covering security in ports and the second safety and health in ports. The first part on security derives from the work of the Joint ILO/IMO Working Group on Port Security, established by the Governing Body of the ILO at its 286th Session (March 2003) and by the IMO Maritime Safety Committee at its 77th session (May-June 2003), which met in Geneva from 9 to 11 July 2003. The text on security in ports complements IMO's International Ship and Port Facility Security (ISPS) Code, which contains requirements relating to the security of the ship and the immediate ship/port interface. The second part on safety and health was prepared by the Office with external expertise.
2. The Governing Body of the ILO, at its 287th Session decided that the Meeting should be composed of 12 experts nominated by Governments, 12 after consultation with the Employers' group, and 12 after consultations with the Workers' group of the Governing Body. The 12 Government experts were from Australia, Brazil, Canada, China, Egypt, Germany, Nigeria, Panama, Philippines, Spain, United Kingdom and the United States. Expert observers from the Governments of Finland, Italy and Turkey also attended. According to the Governing Body decision taken at its 288th Session, a number of United Nations specialized agencies, intergovernmental organizations and international non-governmental organizations were represented at the Meeting as observers. A list of participants is annexed to this report.
3. The terms of reference of the Meeting were "to review and adopt a draft ILO code of practice on security, safety and health in ports".
4. The Meeting had before it the draft code of practice on security, health and safety in ports, Part A: Security (MESSHP/2003/A), and Part B: Safety and health (MESSHP/2003/B), which it decided to adopt as the basis for the discussion. The Meeting adopted a timetable which provided for parallel sittings of Part A: Security and Part B: Safety and health.
5. Ms. Sally Paxton, Executive Director, Social Dialogue Sector, stressed in her opening address that the right to a safe and healthy workplace had always been a priority issue for the ILO. In the case of work in ports, the ILO has adopted several sector-specific international instruments. However, to date only 20 countries had ratified the Occupational Safety and Health (Dock Work) Convention No. 152 adopted in 1979. Meanwhile, technical developments, including the introduction of increasingly

sophisticated cargo-handling equipment with greatly increased capacity and reach, had outpaced the advice in the 1977 code and 1976 guide. While it was to be acknowledged that many changes in cargo-handling methods had resulted in significant improvements for the safety and health of portworkers, sometimes these changes had introduced new hazards and port work still had very high accident rates. She then observed that since the September 11 events in the United States in 2001, the focus had shifted from the threats **to** trade and transport such as theft and hijackings, to the much more alarming threat **from** trade and transport, where the mechanisms and processes of transport could be used as weapons. For these reasons, the draft code concerning port security was to be seen in the framework of the two new international initiatives by the ILO and the IMO. In the case of the ILO, the International Labour Conference in June 2003 had adopted the ILO seafarers' identity documents Convention, which provided seafarers with shore leave and would allow access to port areas. In 2002, the IMO had adopted amendments to the International Convention on Safety of Life at Sea, which included the adoption of the International Ship and Port Facility Security Code, and was due to enter into force in July 2004. The draft code of practice on security in ports extended the consideration of port security beyond the area of the port facility into the whole port area. It was intended to be compatible with the provisions of the IMO's ISPS Code, which contains requirements that related only to security of the ship and the immediate ship/port interface.

6. The Officers of the Meeting were:

<i>Chairperson:</i>	Mr. Henderson (United Kingdom)
<i>Vice-Chairpersons:</i>	Mr. Pope (United States)
	Mr. Cox (Employer member)
	Mr. Tannock (Worker member)
<i>Chairperson Part A:</i>	Mr. Platts (Canada)
<i>Chairperson Part B:</i>	Mr. Henderson (United Kingdom)

Employers' group

<i>Vice-Chairperson and Spokesperson Part A:</i>	Mr. Van de Laar
<i>Vice-Chairperson and Spokesperson Part B:</i>	Mr. Cox

Workers' group

<i>Vice-Chairperson Part A:</i>	Mr. Tannock
<i>Vice-Chairperson Part B:</i>	Mr. Hansen
<i>Spokesperson Part A:</i>	Mr. Carlstedt
<i>Spokesperson Part B:</i>	Mr. Marges

7. A representative of the Office made a presentation on the background of the present Meeting. He recalled, in particular, the terms of reference of the Joint ILO/IMO Working Group that met in July 2003, and the broad lines of the code of practice to be considered

by this Meeting, as well as on the various comments received from member States on the draft code.

8. The spokesperson for the Employer experts declared that he saw the ILO as the appropriate entity to produce such a code, since it took into account the interests of all interested parties. The spokesperson for the Workers' group declared his interest in a detailed document, and his hope that such a level of details would appear in the final text.
9. The experts, after discussion, unanimously agreed to recommend that the draft code should be adopted and published as two separate publications, namely a code of practice on security in ports and a code of practice on safety and health in ports. The experts drew attention on the need to publish these codes in as many languages as possible and requested governments to consider translations in their national languages when this would not be done by the ILO.

Point-by-point discussion

10. The discussion of the draft code of practice on safety and health in ports took place from 8 to 17 December 2003. A number of editorial and drafting changes of a non-substantive nature were made to the code and are not specifically referred to in this report.

Introduction, scope, implementation and definitions

11. The Meeting agreed that the correct title of the draft code was to read "Safety and health in ports". It was also agreed that the term "portworker" was to be used throughout the document as a synonym for "dockworker" as used in Convention No. 152.
12. The Secretary-General of the Meeting provided a historical perspective on the code of practice on safety and health in ports noting that the current revision had been undertaken after an interval of 26 years.
13. The Chairperson invited the groups to give precedence to the written comments submitted to the Office, although all comments would be taken into account. Noting the submission by the Government expert from Sweden regarding the inadequate treatment of ergonomics in the document, the experts agreed that the Office would prepare a draft text for consideration by the Meeting.
14. Regarding implementation, the Employer experts proposed that a new text be added requiring cooperation between worker and employer groups which resulted in continuous improvement. This new text was adopted, as amended by the Government expert from Germany.
15. As a result of an amendment proposed by the Worker experts which aimed to avoid the impression that the code encouraged or allowed for cargo handling by seafarers, a debate took place as to whether this was a safe practice. It was agreed to remove two sentences, which referred to cargo handling by seafarers.
16. A number of relevant definitions contained in Convention No. 152 were introduced so as to ensure that the code could stand on its own, as far as possible, without reference to other sources. In connection with a discussion on vertical tandem lifting (VTL), the experts felt that the code should address the introduction of innovations in port work. Both the Workers and Employers indicated their general agreement to a draft text on this question. The experts deliberated the impact of technological or other innovations on

safety and health in ports. They found that innovations should be introduced on the basis of evidence and data, and after consultations and agreement between the social partners. Such introduction of innovations should be compliant with applicable laws, standards and regulations and be monitored. A debate took place on the role of governments (i.e. the competent authority), which was understood by some as limited to an intervention in the absence of an agreement between the social partners, and by others as more proactive. Government assistance could include advice on the interpretation of applicable national regulations, laws and standards. The Meeting preferred to stay with the initial wording, which took account of the different national legislations. The text as amended was accepted.

General provisions

17. The Meeting considered the comment submitted by the Government of Finland¹ that responsibilities dealt with in the general provisions were often vague or repetitive. The experts amended the section. There was general agreement that the wording of this section should also be changed with a view to ensuring that employers' responsibilities were adequately and clearly set out.
18. The Meeting accepted a proposal from the Government experts from Finland and Germany to remove "port authorities" from the title of 2.1.3.
19. The suggestion of the Worker experts to add a new paragraph 3 concerning management was agreed upon. New text concerning supervisors was agreed to in order to highlight their role. The proposal to change the heading "Employees" to "Portworkers" was accepted. The Employer experts requested that new text be drafted regarding cooperation between ships' officers and shore personnel. This was accepted as amended by the Worker experts. It was agreed that the use of defective or otherwise dangerous equipment should be suspended until it had been checked and approved for further use. However, the question of the right of workers to cease work in such a case would be considered elsewhere. Paragraph 2 of section 2.1.8 recognized the value of training provided by trade unions but was amended so that funding of such training would be negotiated between social partners.
20. In the section concerning safety and health advisers, a new provision relating to the submission of analyses of accident rates and trends to management was proposed and accepted. Regarding other persons at work, it was agreed that the words "port premises" should be changed to "port areas" for consistency.
21. Under the heading of "Safe systems of work", it was agreed that a new bullet point should be added to read: "the nature of the cargo to be handled". This section also gave rise to a discussion on the relationship between ergonomics and human factors. It was proposed that the two issues be addressed separately and the importance of these issues was recognized.
22. As regards safety and health committees, it was agreed that there should be a system of coordination between the port security advisory committee and the port safety and health committee. In case of conflict, safety and health would be paramount. There was a need to ensure consistency between the draft code of practice on security in ports with that on safety and health in ports.

¹ cf. MESSHP/2003/6, p. 7.

-
23. In response to the debate concerning the reference to “safety representatives” and “groups of workers” under the heading of “Organization”, the Chairperson indicated that the draft took into account the position of the European Union on this question. The Workers expressed the opinion that the draft text gave the employer the right to choose between two groups of workers, one unionized and the other not. The text was redrafted in order to reflect the importance of workers’ representatives being appointed by recognized trade unions or by groups of workers should unions not exist.
 24. Relating to the in-house reporting of accidents, the Meeting supported the concept of reporting without “repercussions” and adopted the relevant text. New text was adopted providing for special facilities for disabled persons according to national legal requirements.

Port infrastructure, plant and equipment

25. The experts discussed levels of lighting in ports. The Government expert of Brazil considered that lighting levels were an important factor in the safety of port operations and supported much higher than current levels. The Meeting decided to upgrade the lighting levels to a minimum of 10 lux in access routes while in operational areas the minimum was set at 50 lux. The Employer experts noted that the new levels represented a 100 per cent increase compared with existing standards. The Worker experts agreed to the new levels although they would have preferred even higher levels.
26. Regarding clearance along quaysides, the Meeting agreed that a 2 m clearance should be left to enable a 1 m unobstructed access along the quayside.
27. With respect to walkways, a proposal by the Government expert from the Philippines concerning elevated walkways was adopted with minor changes. A proposal from the Government observer from Italy reflecting the possible presence of persons who have a legitimate reason to be in port areas was accepted. Another proposal by the expert from the Government of the Philippines stating that any temporary covering should have suitable weights or attachments or anchors that would prevent accidental movement was agreed. It was also agreed that the United Kingdom proposal about fencing at quay edges reflected the principle of keeping large numbers of passengers away from harm. The Meeting agreed to the Worker experts’ suggestion that the interval for life-saving equipment should be every 50 metres.
28. After a discussion about who should have responsibility for providing safe access to the ship – the ship’s master or the shore-side employer – it was agreed that whoever provided the means of access should ensure that it was safe. A United Kingdom amendment concerning the need to have slip-resistant surfaces was accepted. Another amendment from the Philippines to paragraph 2 providing for a spacing between ladder rungs of no less than 25 cm nor more than 35 cm (as opposed to the initial text of “equally spaced 30 cm apart”) was accepted.
29. With respect to mobile equipment it was proposed that the reference to “automated vehicles” would be more appropriate in section 6 (Operations on shore). It was also agreed that “including skeletal trailers” be inserted after “mobile equipment”. A provision requiring an emergency stop button, where possible on access cages, was inserted in the text.
30. The section on personal protective equipment was redrafted to ensure that such equipment would not be used as a substitute for eliminating or controlling a hazard. The section was made more specific in terms of legal requirements in relation to risk

assessment. Reference was made to the comments of the Government of Australia that other protective items needed to be included in the list, but there was general agreement that such lists could not be exclusive.

Lifting appliances and loose gear

31. There was considerable discussion of whether “round slings” which were twin slings covered with a sleeve (woven cover) could be really tested since, although they might have originally met safety requirements, their interior could not be seen. As they were unknown in some jurisdictions, the suggestion not to use them was accepted by the Meeting.

Safe use of lifting appliances and loose gear

32. There was some discussion of whether such lifting appliances should also refer to the lifting of persons. It was also indicated that the use of terms in the text was consistent with that of Convention No. 152. A Worker expert proposal for a new text was inserted in a bullet point under 5.1.4.2 as part of the “daily checks”. Checking for oil leaks on a weekly basis was also inserted in a bullet point under 5.1.4.3. After referring to the fact that fork-lifts were covered under the definition of lifting appliances in Convention No. 152, a discussion ensued on the use of seat belts. While not all lifting vehicles had them, but since the nature of the work on the other hand suggested that they be used when provided, it was agreed to insert a reference on the use of seat belts when appropriate.
33. The inclusion of a diagram to supplement the tables contained in the section on loose gear was welcomed. It was decided that slings on pre-slung cargo should always be inspected to ensure that no accident could result from a possible deterioration of the sling. Although it would have been desirable to require slings to be traceable to a certain batch to ensure their safety, the Meeting was unable to devise a system which would allow assumptions to be made on the safe working load of slings. While a tracking system was possible in some countries, it was not a possibility for most countries and could not be included in the code.
34. The Meeting agreed to delete a provision, which would have allowed manufacturers to repair or alter slings. The Meeting also agreed that material to be repaired should be identified and “recorded”. The Meeting took note of the Finnish Government expert’s statement that slings belonging to foreign ships could not be destroyed under national law. In order to ensure that the code did not encourage attempts to repair unsuitable items, the Meeting agreed on a text on the sorting of loose gear, their examination and criteria for removal from service. This would aim to avoid the reuse of damaged loose gear. The Worker experts’ proposal to include a reference to securing the pins of shackles with seizing wire was deemed very helpful and in line with the requirement for the mousing of permanently rigged shackles.

Operations on shore

35. The Meeting considered a proposal that workers should be able to stop an operation when there was a serious risk to safety and health. The Worker experts had difficulties with the term “serious risk”, which implied that refusal to work would only be justified if the risk was imminent. They felt that it was sufficient that the risk might materialize at any time, as long as the danger was not just hypothetical. The concept of work refusal should not be restricted only to cases of serious or immediate risk. The Employer experts declared that proper training was closely linked to this issue. During training, workers would learn how

to identify risks, how to assess whether risks were serious, in which cases they should automatically stop work or inform the supervisor, e.g. signal the malfunction of equipment as appropriate. The Worker experts objected that established procedures in certain countries might imply draconian measures. The Government experts of Finland and Brazil signalled the necessity of qualifying the risk because certain risks were inherent to port work. The Government expert of Canada suggested referring to the “rules established by the safety and health committee” than to “established procedures”. Finally, the Meeting agreed to a compromise text recognizing a worker’s right to stop an operation in a risky situation.

36. New wording was added in the section on housekeeping and cleanliness to ensure that oil and other materials spilled be cleaned up as soon as possible. In the section on hot work, it was decided to insert a requirement that a hot work permit should state the identity of the person authorizing the work. As concerns the use of personal protective equipment, the Meeting concluded that such equipment should not be used as a substitute for eliminating or controlling the hazard. If this was not possible, then protective equipment should be used. A reference to the weight of the cargo unit was inserted in the section on cargo packing. Two paragraphs were added to the text regarding the opening of sealed containers and their resealing, which should be done in the presence of customs or other responsible authority. A new paragraph was added to recommend that containers should be sealed but since not all containers are required to be sealed, the paragraph was amended to include “in accordance with relevant customs requirements”. Since exhaust fumes were dealt with elsewhere in the code, cross-references to Chapters 3 and 9 were added to the section on gatehouses and reception buildings. Consideration was given to the stowage of pulp and it was agreed to add a reference to the placing of dunnage on the corner bales of the first tier.
37. Two new paragraphs were added to the section on mooring operations, one specifying that mooring lines should be in good condition and the other dealing with the use of automated mooring systems and the training required.
38. The section on “confined spaces” was moved from Chapter 9 and inserted in Chapter 6 following a proposal of the Employer experts. The Meeting agreed that work in confined spaces was an important aspect of safety and health protection relating to work aboard ships.
39. The Meeting agreed to remove the section on “Lifting containers” and insert most of its content in the section on “Container handling” with the new title “Container handling and lifting”. In view of the decision not to include the issue of VTL in the code, it was decided not to refer to ISO 3874 in its entirety since it dealt with VTL. Containers should be handled and lifted in accordance with the relevant international standards and the only reference to ISO 3874 remaining in the code was linked to a specific part of the standard, i.e. a table not related to VTL.

Operations afloat

40. Following a previous discussion on lighting, the Meeting decided on a minimum level of 10 lux for access routes and 50 lux for working areas. A new provision was added on the need for damage to the ship or its equipment to be reported to the responsible ship’s officer in order to prevent such damage becoming a source of hazard.
41. As concerns access to ships, an important provision was added relating to access routes which should not pass under cargo being worked.

-
42. An insertion was made on portable ladders which should be physically maintained in position by a co-worker unless the ladder was otherwise secured. The Meeting, having noted that the section on “container top working” dealt only with purpose-built container ships, added a new paragraph concerning working atop containers in non-purpose built container ships.
 43. The Meeting discussed the lifting of containers and discussed the issue of vertical tandem lifting, i.e. the lifting of freight containers linked vertically together in a group. ISO Technical Committee 104 (ISO/TC 104) had developed an amendment to ISO standard 3874, which allowed for up to three containers to be linked and lifted, subject to specific parameters such as maximum gross weight of the unit of 20 tons. In response to safety concerns in this area, ISO/TC 104 had passed a resolution requesting ICHCA International Ltd. to develop operational guidelines for VTL. ICHCA International adopted these guidelines in January 2003.
 44. The Worker experts introduced their proposed amendment to remove all provisions relating to VTL and to insert a prohibition of these lifts. They strongly opposed VTL, stressing that the trade unions had made such a decision at the highest level. They had prepared a world campaign if this practice would become more widespread. The Worker experts considered it appalling that the industry had started an illegal practice and now required a legal blessing for that practice. The ISO standard could be tested under laboratory conditions, but this did not mean that VTL should be accepted. In view of the provisions concerning loose gear on which the experts had agreed, the Workers expressed their surprise that some experts seemed willing to give up the concept of workers always being able to examine the tools they worked with. VTL physically prevented workers from examining their tools. Lift locks were such complicated loose gear that traceability and assessment of the condition of the equipment was simply impossible, since twist locks were not examinable unless dismantled. The Worker experts further stated that the International Convention for Safe Containers, 1972 (CSC) had never envisaged VTL, and criticized the concept of the Approved Container Examination Programme (ACEP) because of its cursory nature and non-traceability. He also condemned the use of two different testing criteria for different components of the same lifting system. Moreover, he noted that the United States Occupational Safety and Health Administration (OSHA) did not allow vertical tandem lifting in relation to containers carrying dangerous goods, whereas containers with dangerous goods were normally handled as all other containers. Therefore, it could be assumed from this prohibition that OSHA considered that there was an increased risk. In view of the numerous accidents due to improper loading in normal circumstances, the Worker experts concluded that such accidents were more likely to occur when VTL was used. They expressed doubts as to whether the practice was so widespread that it could not be stopped. The Worker experts noted that even normal practices did not always entail acceptance and could still be prohibited. The idea to subject the use of VTL to prior agreement of the workers in each port was rejected, because differing practices between one port and another, or even within the same port, would necessarily lead to confusion.
 45. The Employer experts rejected the proposed amendment from the Worker side and referred to the common use of VTL in several countries and noted that VTL had been subjected to full review, including safety concerns. They considered that in case of new operations, it was important to ensure awareness of safety concerns and to determine any necessary restrictions to ensure safe operation. An Employer expert indicated that the Port Safety Committee of the International Association of Ports and Harbours had reviewed the ICHCA guidelines and decided to circulate them as recommended practice for the use of VTL. He emphasized that to ignore or oppose an existing practice did not make it disappear, and that it was important to ensure that the practice was safe. As regards twist locks, the Employer experts mentioned that it would be interesting to debate whether the

unit load or rather the part of the load lifting the second container was relevant. He pointed out the critical importance of the provision which ensured that the use of VTL was not decided unilaterally but rather on the basis of an agreement of all parties including the workers. He noted that trade around the world was increasing at a fast rate and, in some countries, trade would double between 2000 and 2020. Innovative cargo handling techniques were critical to handling the increase in trade.

46. The Government experts of Finland and the United States indicated that VTL was used in their countries. The Government expert of the United States informed that OSHA had proposed regulations on the matter, and that consultation was ongoing.
47. A small group held informal discussions on the use of VTL. The outcome was positive and useful. However, the issue was too controversial for agreement to be achieved in this respect in the present code. The Meeting decided to delete several paragraphs relating to vertical tandem lifting. Nevertheless, it was recognized that there was a need for mechanisms to deal with innovations in the industry whether organizational or technical. It was therefore decided to include a new section in the code to elaborate on how to resolve difficulties when new systems of work or technical innovations were introduced. Thus, the code would mirror the dynamism of the industry and set parameters going well beyond 2003. Considering that innovations might require the content of the code to be revisited or extended, the issue of periodic reviews of the code had also been addressed. A resolution was drafted to recommend that the code should be reviewed more frequently than every 25 years, and that the ILO should sponsor meetings of experts to consider technical innovations.

Dangerous goods

48. Additional text was inserted on packaged dangerous goods based on the IMDG Code, following a discussion on a proposal by the Worker experts to include a requirement that incompatible materials should not be loaded simultaneously, including bunkers.
49. A reference to the possibility of the mis-declaration of cargo and the need to use correct bulk shipping names in accordance with the IMO/BC Code was added.
50. References to relevant IMO model courses were added to the section on training. Since the physical checking of dangerous goods could be carried out in an area other than one designated for the purpose, the paragraph was amended accordingly. Following a discussion in the section on handling and stowage on whether the IMDG Code should be the sole one used, particularly in the light of different national regulations, “may” was changed to “should”. The Meeting decided to move two paragraphs relating to “hot work” to Chapter 7.
51. A new paragraph was inserted on bunkering to ensure that simultaneous cargo handling and bunkering operations did not constitute a hazard. Bunkering should conform with the *IMO Recommendations on the Transport of Dangerous Goods*. Although the Worker experts were not entirely satisfied that sole responsibility was placed on the master instead of referring to an employer-employee relationship, they accepted the formulation because of the need to refer to an existing international standard, which had not been formulated with workers in mind.

Health

52. It was decided to insert a new general requirement to ensure that portworkers exposed to hazardous materials should be trained and provided with safety data sheets on such

materials. The materials should be adequately labelled and workers informed as to the precautions to be taken when exposed to these materials.

53. The Meeting discussed amendments to texts on “dusty cargoes” and “other cargoes” (e.g. hides or mouldy cargoes). In the section relating to “other cargoes”, changes were made to ensure that portworkers handling such cargoes presenting special risks were provided with protective equipment. As concerns noise, it was agreed that noise levels should be periodically monitored and new equipment should make as little noise as possible. In view of the fact that it was difficult to define a maximum noise exposure limit, which was dependent on other parameters such as the environment and duration of exposure, it was agreed that these be “defined by national legal requirements”. In recognition of the fact that noise standards may not be defined in some countries, the Working Environment (Air Pollution, Noise and Vibration) Convention, 1977 (No. 148), and related Recommendation No. 156 were included in the list of references. It was also agreed to move the entire section on “confined spaces” to Chapter 6.
54. A new section on “ergonomics” was introduced, based partly on existing text. This section sought to encourage improved design of workplaces, systems and equipment.
55. The Meeting discussed the section on occupational health services at length. The suggestion by the Employer experts to delete a paragraph relating to medical supervision was endorsed by the Worker experts. Both Employer and Worker experts felt that the question could not be decided upon by the Meeting, because no common position (even within the experts’ groups) could be found.
56. The Worker experts felt that mandatory periodic examinations could be taken to be violations of individual rights, while agreeing at the same time that some workers might have to be subject to these tests to ensure that co-workers were not endangered. The Employer experts stressed that national legal requirements varied widely and were often contradictory.
57. There was thorough discussion of privacy and confidentiality issues as regards medical examinations. The experts agreed that a medical evaluation programme was important as part of good health promotion and disease prevention practice. However, there were conflicting positions on how periodic medical examinations should be carried out. Considering the numerous proposals to improve the text on “health”, it was decided that a small working group would examine these proposals and draft a new text for the Meeting. The newly drafted text omitting reference to “medical examinations” was accepted with minor amendments. For consistency, references to medical examinations elsewhere in the draft code were deleted.

References

58. The Meeting agreed that the list of references should include the web sites where, to the extent possible, the listed publications can be found. The term LNG was added to the list of abbreviations and acronyms. The Meeting also agreed that the reference to ISO standard 4878 (Textiles – flat-woven webbing slings made of man-made fibres) should be deleted as it had been withdrawn. The experts requested the ILO to request ISO to adopt a revised standard on this question.

Other chapters

59. Other chapters of the code not covered in this report were briefly discussed and accepted by the experts with minor changes.

Resolution concerning codes of practice on security and on safety and health in ports

- 60.** A draft resolution was considered by the Meeting. The resolution, taking into account the need for a methodology for the updating of codes and guidelines relating to security and to safety and health in ports, requested the ILO to implement a work programme to regularly assess the effectiveness of the codes and revise them as required. The resolution requested the Office to translate the codes in the official languages of the ILO as well as request governments to do so in other languages. The Meeting adopted the resolution with minor changes.

Adoption of the draft code of practice on safety and health in ports

- 61.** Both Worker and Employer experts felt that the draft code was an excellent document reflecting the thorough work of all concerned. After the consultants corrected a number of minor errors in the text of the code, the latter was adopted unanimously by the experts.

Closing of the Meeting

- 62.** The experts expressed their satisfaction with the outcome of the Meeting. They urged the Office to publish the code as soon as possible, highlighting its importance to the port industry. They requested the Office to produce an interactive CD in addition to placing the code on the ILO web site.
- 63.** The Secretary-General, in her concluding remarks, outlined the anticipated steps that would follow the approval of the two codes of practice by the Governing Body. These included their publication, promotion and monitoring of their implementation as well as the establishment of the platform and mechanisms for the continuous updating of the codes in consultation with the ILO constituents.

Appendix

Draft resolution concerning the codes of practice on security and on safety and health in ports

The Tripartite Meeting of Experts on Security, Safety and Health in Ports,

Having met in Geneva from 8 to 17 December 2003,

Noting that the present edition of the code of practice on safety and health in dock work was adopted in 1976, making an interval of 27 years by the time the ILO Governing Body approves this revised code,

Further noting the pace at which technical and other developments have continued to take place in the port industry which impact on safety and health,

Taking into account paragraph 9 of the conclusions concerning the action plan for promotion of safety and health at work adopted by the International Labour Conference at its 91st Session, 2003, requesting the ILO to develop a methodology for a systematic updating of codes and guidelines,

Considering the need to ensure that ILO advice on safety and health issues in ports should be as current as possible;

Adopts this 17th day of December the following resolution:

The Tripartite Meeting of Experts on Security, Safety and Health in Ports calls upon the Governing Body of the ILO to:

- (1) consider the convening of small tripartite meetings of experts, as appropriate, to review and assess innovations in ports submitted to the ILO for advice and to give guidance on updating the codes of practice;
- (2) monitor the implementation and effectiveness of the codes of practice on security and on safety and health in ports;
- (3) ensure the more regular updating of the codes of practice on security and on safety and health in ports in order to ensure that the guidance contained therein remains relevant;
- (4) make arrangements for the translation of the two codes of practice in all the official languages of the Organization and encourage national governments to provide the codes of practice in their national language;
- (5) urge governments, employers and workers and their representatives to promote these codes and make use of them, as appropriate.

List of participants
Liste des participants
Lista de participantes

Experts nominated by Governments
Experts désignés par les gouvernements
Expertos designados por los Gobiernos

AUSTRALIA AUSTRALIE

Mr. John Kilner, Assistant Secretary, Maritime Security, Department of Transport and Regional Services,
Canberra

BRAZIL BRÉSIL BRASIL

Mr. Daltro D' Arisbo, Labour Office Auditor – FISCAL, Porto Alegre

Adviser/Conseiller technique/Consejero Técnico

Captain Darlei Pinheiro, Mission Officer, Brazilian Permanent Representation to IMO, London

CANADA CANADÁ

Mr. John Platts, Special Adviser, Marine Security, Transport Canada, Security and Emergency and Preparedness
Directorate, Ottawa

Adviser/Conseiller technique/Consejera Técnica

Ms. Lynn Young, Director, Human Resources Development Canada (HRDC), Ottawa

CHINA CHINE

Mr. Ye Hongjun, Division Chief, Department of Worker Transport Administration, Ministry of Communication,
Beijing

Advisers/Conseillers techniques/Consejeros Técnicos

Mr. Xu Yi, Director, Department of Human Resources, Ministry of Communication, Beijing

Ms. Zhao Xiaoliang, Official, Department of International Cooperation, Ministry of Communication, Beijing

EGYPT EGYPT EGIPTO

Mr. Tarek Hassan Ibrahim Sharef Eldin, Director, Industrial Health and Safety Institute, Cairo

Advisers/Conseillers techniques/Consejeros Técnicos

Mr. Hazem Abdel Hazem Halim, Head of Maritime Sector Administration, Alexandria

Mrs. Nadia El-Gazzar, Labour Counsellor, Permanent Mission of Egypt, Geneva

GERMANY ALLEMAGNE ALEMANIA

Mr. Achim Sieker, Junior Unit Leader, Federal Ministry of Economics and Labour, Bonn

Adviser/Conseiller technique/Consejera Técnica

Ms. Ute Bödecker, Executive for Legal and Security Matters, Ministry of the Interior, Hamburg

NIGERIA NIGÉRIA

Mr. Mobolaji Olurotimi Banjo, Ag. Director Inspectorate Department, Federal Ministry of Labour and Productivity, Abuja

Advisers/Conseillers techniques/Consejeros Técnicos

Mr. Wali Mansoor Kurawa, Director of Maritime Services, Federal Ministry of Transport, Abuja

Mr. Sotonye Inyeinengi-Etomi, Special Assistant to the Honourable Minister of Transport, Federal Ministry of Transport, Abuja

Dr. O.C. Nathaniel, Deputy Director, Joint Maritime Labour Industrial Council, Lagos

Ms. Ifeoma Christina Nwankwo, Deputy Director, Federal Ministry of Labour and Productivity, Abuja

Mr. John Idakwoji, Assistant Chief Administrative Officer, Abuja

Mr. Andu Isaac Igbo, Administrative Officer, Joint Maritime Labour Industrial Council, Lagos

Mr. Henry A. Ajetunmobi, Assistant General Manager, Security, Nigerian Ports Authority, Lagos

PANAMA PANAMÁ

Sra. Julissa Tejada de Humphrey, Directora de la Oficina Institucional Recursos Humanos, Ministerio de Trabajo y Desarrollo Laboral, Panamá

PHILIPPINES FILIPINAS

Mr. Gerardo S. Gatchalian, Supervising Labor and Employment Officer, Bureau of Working Conditions, Department of Labor and Employment, Manila

Advisers/Conseillers techniques/Consejeros Técnicos

Mr. Benjamin B. Cecilio, Assistant General Manager for Operations, Philippine Ports Authority, Manila

Ms. Yolanda C. Porschwitz, Labor Attaché, Permanent Mission of Philippines, Geneva

SPAIN ESPAGNE ESPAÑA

Sr. D. Juan Ramón Bres, Inspector, Inspección de Trabajo y Seguridad Social, Cádiz

Adviser/Conseiller technique/Consejero Técnico

Sr. Pedro J. Román Núñez, Safety and Security Department Manager, Spanish Ports Administration, Madrid

UNITED KINGDOM ROYAUME-UNI REINO UNIDO

Mr. Graeme Henderson, Head of Marine and Civil Contingencies Section, Health and Safety Executive, London

Advisers/Conseillers techniques/Consejeros Técnicos

Mr. David Carter, Deputy Head, Health and Safety Executive, Transport Safety Division, Marine, Aviation and Civil Contingencies Section, London

Mr. Ashley Reeve, Head of Maritime Security Operations, Department of Transport, London

UNITED STATES ETATS-UNIS ESTADOS UNIDOS

Mr. Charles Thomas Pope, Area Director, United States Department of Labor Occupational Safety and Health Administration, United States Department of Labor-OSHA, Norfolk

Advisers/Conseillers techniques/Consejeros Técnicos

Captain Jon S. Helmick, USMS, Director, Logistics and Intermodal Transportation Program, United States Merchant Marine Academy, Kings Point

Captain David L. Scott, Chief, Office of Operating and Environmental Standards, Washington, DC

Mr. John W. Chamberlin, First Secretary, Permanent Mission of the United States of America, Chambesey

Experts nominated by the Employers
Experts désignés par les employeurs
Expertos designados por los empleadores

Mr. Abdou Ba, directeur du bureau de la main-d'œuvre portuaire, Syndicats des entreprises de manutention des ports du Sénégal, Mole

Mr. Francis Bertrand, Directeur des ressources humaines et des affaires juridiques, Organisation internationale des employeurs, Nantes

Mr. Guido Marcelo Bocchio Carbajal, Superintendente legal, Southern Peru Copper Corporation, Lima

Mr. Joseph J. Cox, President, Chamber of Shipping of America, Washington DC

Ms. Lynne Harrison, Human Resources Manager, Port of Napier Limited, Napier

Mr. Dierk Lindemann, Managing Director, German Shipowners Association, Hamburg

Mr. Claes Olmarker, Port Security Officer, Port of Gothenburg, Gothenburg

Mr. Usman Husein Punjwani, Seaboard Services Partner, Seaboard Services, Karachi

Mr. Daharii Ujud, Senior Manager, Ancilliary Services, Port Klang

Mr. Michael Joseph Van der Meer, General Manager – Port Authority Division, Namibian Ports Authority, Walvis Bay

Mr. Pieter M. Van der Sluis, Adviser Social Affairs, General Employers Organization, Nieuwerherh

Adviser/Conseiller technique/Consejero Técnico

Mr. Fer M.J. Van de Laar, Chairman, International Association of Ports and Harbours, Environment and Marine Operations Committee, Amsterdam Port Authority, Amsterdam

Mr. Alexander Zaitsev, President, Association of Ports and Shipowners of River Transport, Moscow

Experts nominated by the Workers
Experts désignés par les travailleurs
Expertos designados por los trabajadores

Mr. Gary Brown, Port Security, AFL-CIO, Fife WA

Mr. Marcel Carlstedt, Swedish Transport Workers Union, Stockholm

Mr. P.M. Mohamed Haneef, Working President, Cochin Port Staff Association, Kochi

Mr. Knud Hansen, Copenhagen

Mr. Albert François Le Monnier, Second Vice-President, Safety Coordinator, International Longshore and Warehouse Union (ILWU), Vancouver

Mr. Peter Lovkvist, Co-Sweden, Valbo

Mr. Kees Marges, Union Adviser, FNV Bordgenoten Netherlands, London

Ms. Veronica Mesatywa, National Sector Coordinator, Maritime Industry, South African Transport and Allied Workers' Union (SATAWU), Johannesburg

Mr. Leal Sundet, International Longshore and Warehouse Union (ILWU), California

Mr. James Trevor Tannock, Deputy National Secretary, Maritime Union of Australia, Sydney

Mr. Kenji Yasuda, President, National Council of Dockworkers' Union of Japan (ZENKOKU-KOWAN), Tokyo
Advisers/Conseillers techniques/Consejeros Técnicos

Mr. Yuji Iijima, Chief of European Office, All Japan Seamen's Union, London

Mr. Shimpei Suzuki, General Secretary, National Council of Dockworkers' Union of Japan, Tokyo

Others

Autres

Otros

FINLAND FINLANDE FINLANDIA

Mr. Harri Halme, Senior Safety Officer, Ministry of Social Affairs and Health, Tampere

ITALY ITALIE ITALIA

Mr. Mario Alvino, Fonctionnaire, Ministero Del Lavoro E Politiche Sociali, Roma

TURKEY TURQUIE TURQUÍA

Ms. Asiye Türker, Senior Engineer, Head of Delegate, The Prime Ministry Undersecretariat for Maritime Affairs, Ankara

Representatives of the United Nations, specialized agencies and other official international organizations

Représentants des Nations Unies, des institutions spécialisées et d'autres organisations internationales officielles

Representantes de las Naciones Unidas, de los Organismos Especializados y de otras Organizaciones Internacionales Oficiales

European Commission

Commission européenne

Comisión Europea

Mr. W. Elsner, Head of Port Unit, Brussels

Mr. Diego Teurelinx, Port Unit, Brussels

International Maritime Organization (IMO)

Organisation maritime internationale

Organización Marítima Internacional

Mr. Christopher C. Trelawny, Senior Technical Officer, Navigational Safety and Maritime and Security Section, Maritime Safety Division, London

United Nations Economic Commission for Europe (UN/ECE)
Commission des Nations Unies pour l'Europe
Comisión de las Naciones Unidas para Europa

Mr. Viatcheslav Novikov, Economic Affairs Officer, Geneva

Representatives of non-governmental international organizations
Représentants d'organisations internationales non gouvernementales
Representantes de Organizaciones Internacionales no Gubernamentales

International Association of Ports and Harbours (IAPH)
Association internationale des ports (AIP)
Asociación Internacional de los Puertos

Mr. Fer M.J. Van de Laar, Chairman, International Association of Ports and Harbours, Environment and Marine Operations Committee, Amsterdam Port Authority, Amsterdam

ICHCA International Ltd.

Mr. John Nicholls, Director, Romford, Essex

International Shipping Federation (ISF)
Fédération internationale des armateurs

Mr. Brian Parkinson, Adviser, London

International Confederation of Free Trade Unions (ICFTU)
Confédération internationale des syndicats libres (CISL)
Confederación Internacional de Organizaciones Sindicales Libres (CIOSL)

Mr. Dan Cunniah, Director, Geneva Office, Geneva

Ms. Anna Biondi, Assistant Director, Geneva Office, Geneva

International Organization of Employers (IOE)
Organisation internationale des employeurs
Organización Internacional de Empleadores

Mr. Jean Dejardin, Adviser, Cointrin, Geneva