



## TENTH ITEM ON THE AGENDA

**Report of the Committee on Sectoral and  
Technical Meetings and Related Issues****Contents**

	<i>Page</i>
VII. Other questions .....	1
Oral report on the emergency meetings .....	1
Informal Meeting on the Hotel and Tourism Sector: Social Impact of Events Subsequent to 11 September 2001 .....	3
Modification of the title of the Tripartite Meeting on Restructuring of Civil Aviation: Consequences for Management and Personnel.....	3
I. Review of the Sectoral Activities Programme.....	5
II. Composition and purpose of the meeting concerning health services to be held in 2002 .....	10
III. Effects to be given to the recommendations of sectoral meetings.....	12
(a) Tripartite Meeting on the Employment Impact of Mergers and Acquisitions in the Banking and Financial Services Sector .....	12
(b) Tripartite Meeting on Human Resources Development, Employment and Globalization in the Hotel, Catering and Tourism Sector .....	13
IV. Report of the Meeting of Experts on Safety and Health in the Non-ferrous Metals Industries .....	15
V. Report of the Third Session of the Joint IMO/ILO Ad Hoc Expert Working Group on Liability and Compensation Regarding Claims for Death, Personal Injury and Abandonment of Seafarers.....	16
VI. Report of the ILO Working Group on Harmonization of Chemical Hazard Communication.....	17

1. The Committee on Sectoral and Technical Meetings and Related Issues met on 6 November 2001. The Chairperson was Mr. Rimkunas (Government, Lithuania) and the Employer and Worker Vice-Chairpersons were Mr. Jeetun and Mr. Zellhoefer, respectively. It was decided by the Officers of the meeting that, due to the special circumstances caused by the 11 September events, priority would be given to the reports under item VII of the agenda.

## VII. Other questions

### Oral report on the emergency meetings

2. The representative of the Director-General (Ms. Paxton, Executive Director, Social Dialogue Sector) informed the Committee that two informal emergency meetings were held in the light of the 11 September events: the *Informal Meeting on the Hotel and Tourism Sector: Social Impact of Events Subsequent to 11 September 2001*, which had been requested by the social partners, as well as the *Think Tank on the Impact of the 11 September Events for Civil Aviation*. The hotel and tourism report was submitted to this Committee but, for practical reasons, it was not possible to submit the report of the Think Tank. It would be presented to the Governing Body as part of the Report of the Director-General.
3. Ms. Paxton explained that the meetings were obviously organized very quickly so as to react to the events and to work on the solutions together with the constituents. The meetings differed in purpose and composition, but shared the common goals of offering a rapid response to the crisis, providing a forum for social dialogue, and reducing formalities to a minimum so as to allow an unhampered exchange of ideas. Mr. Jean-Jacques Elmiger, Ambassador, representative of the Government of Switzerland and Chairperson of the ILO Governing Body for 1999-2000, chaired both meetings so as to provide continuity and establish the links between the closely related sectors. Ms. Paxton expressed her profound gratitude to Ambassador Elmiger's able chairmanship, and informed the Committee that a Chairperson's summary was produced at the end of both meetings. Ms. Paxton stressed that both industries had been grappling with a general downturn, but the 11 September crisis had precipitated particularly serious consequences. The paper on the hotel and tourism sector concentrated on the current state of the industry and compared the situation with past events to provide lessons learned in how the industry had reacted in the past. The Meeting confirmed the papers' findings: there was no single hotel and tourism market and there was no "one size fits all" approach to the crisis. The impact hit the United States the hardest, resulting in a 30-40 per cent drop in demand. Other parts of the world were seriously affected as well, as it was estimated that 8.8 million jobs would be lost worldwide. Ms. Paxton went over the key points discussed in the Meeting, such as the unanimous view of the importance of the sector's contribution to national economies, the ramifications of the crisis on vulnerable groups in the workforce, the impact on small and medium-sized enterprises, the importance of training and retraining and the role of the social partners and the government. She highlighted the recommendations by the social partners as presented in the report, which were generally endorsed by the Government representatives as well. The role of the social partners to work with governments in order to fashion remedies was reaffirmed. Action to be taken by the ILO was proposed, in particular close collaboration with international financial institutions, continued research, and follow-up on the recommendations of the ILO's April 2001 hotel and tourism meeting.
4. Ms. Paxton further noted that the Think Tank on civil aviation was convened to provide guidance that could be incorporated into the issues paper being prepared by the Office for

the *Tripartite Meeting on Civil Aviation: Social and Safety Consequences of the Crisis Subsequent to the 11 September 2001 Events*, to be held in January 2002. Many of the conclusions of the Think Tank have been incorporated into the Chairperson's summary, including suggestions for further action by the governments, social partners and the ILO. The industry assessment was bleak, as described in the three reports prepared for the Meeting. Again, there was no one single civil aviation market, and the impact of 11 September was immediate, resulting in a 19 per cent downturn in demand. An estimated 200,000 jobs would be lost out of 4 million total jobs in the industry. A wide range of issues in an extremely complex and regulated environment were discussed, and the social partners underscored the need for social dialogue, primarily at the company level, so as to incorporate best practices and minimize job loss. The ILO was to undertake further research, collect best practices, explore collaboration with the International Civil Aviation Organization (ICAO) and consider the creation of a global task force.

5. On behalf of the Employers' group, Mr. Jeetun thanked the Office for having reacted very quickly and efficiently. These informal meetings were interesting initiatives and allowed for a free and open exchange of views that were not bound by a formal set of conclusions. He commended the positive outcomes of the informal meetings, accepted the papers as they had been presented and thanked Ambassador Elmiger for his chairmanship. Mr. Jeetun also endorsed the points for decision.
6. Mr. Zellhoefer noted that the Workers' group needed to study the report more extensively, as they had only recently received it. He extended the group's appreciation to Ms. Paxton and to Mr. de Vries Reilingh, Director of the the Sectoral Activities Department, in responding quickly, demonstrating that the ILO could act appropriately in engaging a serious subject on short notice. The two informal meetings underscored successful social dialogue and were also mentioned in the Committee for Employment and Social Policy. They had implications for other committees as well and created synergies for cooperation with other sectors. Mr. Zellhoefer also commended the Office and its leadership, and approved the points for decision.
7. Ambassador Elmiger added that the two meetings fell squarely within the rapid response capacity of the Office. He, in turn, responded equally rapidly to the call of duty, as the decision to chair the meetings was made almost overnight. He was particularly pleased that the Office was able to unite the representatives of the three partners and academics to come up with operational measures on different international and national levels. He found the discussions particularly relevant in light of his Ministry's task force on handling the problems of Swissair, and assured the Committee of his Government's interest and support for the ILO efforts. He endorsed the change in title of the civil aviation meeting and the opening of the participation to larger numbers. He commended this constructive, innovative process, including the ability of the Office in producing the documents and the meeting in such a short time, and stated that the emotional impact of responding rapidly had been positive and worthwhile. In conclusion, Ambassador Elmiger thanked Ms. Paxton and her team.
8. The representative of the Government of the United States thanked the Office for the success of both meetings and especially thanked Ambassador Elmiger for his skilful chairmanship. In addressing both substance and process, he noted with satisfaction that the Office had been able to produce documents and organize a meeting, demonstrating that the ILO had the ability and capability to rally around an important topic in a relevant time frame. This capability also determined what was possible with the cooperation of the Sectoral Activities Programme and the constituents. His Government supported the change in title of the January meeting and supported the participation of additional governments, provided that the ILO did not incur additional expenses.

9. The representative of the Government of Slovakia, speaking on behalf of the Central and Eastern European subregion, also underlined the ability of the Office to respond rapidly and with flexibility, and thanked Ms. Paxton and Mr. de Vries Reilingh, Director of the Sectoral Activities Department.

**Informal Meeting on the Hotel and Tourism  
Sector: Social Impact of Events Subsequent  
to 11 September 2001**

(Geneva, 25-26 October)

10. The Committee had before it a paper<sup>1</sup> on the report of the Informal Meeting on the Hotel and Tourism Sector: Social Impact of Events Subsequent to 11 September 2001.
11. In light of Ms. Paxton's oral report on the emergency meetings and the positive observations made by Committee members, the Governments and the Employers' and Workers' groups endorsed the points for decision.
12. *The Committee on Sectoral and Technical Meetings and Related Issues recommends that the Governing Body –*
- (a) *authorize the Director-General to communicate the report of the discussion and the Chairperson's summary:*
- (i) *to governments, requesting them to communicate these texts to the employers' and workers' organizations concerned;*
- (ii) *to the international employers' and workers' organizations concerned; and*
- (iii) *to the international organizations concerned;*
- (b) *request the Director-General to bear in mind, when drawing up proposals for the future work of the Office, the recommendations made by the social partners for action by the ILO, as reflected in the Chairperson's summary of the Meeting.*

**Modification of the title of the Tripartite Meeting on  
Restructuring of Civil Aviation: Consequences for  
Management and Personnel**

(Geneva, 21-25 January 2002)

13. The Committee had before it a paper<sup>2</sup> on the report of the modification of the title of the Tripartite Meeting on Restructuring of Civil Aviation: Consequences for Management and Personnel.

<sup>1</sup> [GB.282/STM/7/2](#).

<sup>2</sup> [GB.282/STM/7/1](#).

14. Introducing the topic, Ms. Paxton stated that the unprecedented events of 11 September necessitated a reconsideration of the purpose and the participation of the January Meeting. The preparation for the Meeting should include an analysis of the impact on all segments of aviation in its broadest sense, including the aircraft manufacturing sector. The list of international organizations and international non-governmental organizations would be submitted for approval to the present Governing Body as per standard procedures. Ms. Paxton concluded that the Office was committed to working together with the industry in what was a very difficult time, and reiterated the ILO's commitment to support the industry.
15. Mr. Zellhoefer noted that it was by chance exactly the right time to hold the January Meeting, given the catastrophe the industry was facing. The Workers agreed with the idea expressed in the paper that the Meeting should be "open", and with the Think Tank conclusions. In addition, they agreed that participation in the Meeting "should be extended to all relevant parties to ensure a comprehensive dialogue". As far as the Workers' group was concerned, the formula of 20 participants from each of the three groups was only for ILO budgetary purposes in covering expenses, and that other participants would be entitled to speak as well. His group strongly believed that this should be treated as a special meeting and the Officers and the groups' secretariats should indicate a willingness to stretch the Standing Orders, perhaps allowing an indeterminate number of advisers, and thus showing that the ILO was in touch with current events. He pointed out the need to change paragraph 3(b) so that additional participation would not only refer to additional government participation but the social partners as well.
16. Mr. Jeetun commented that the Employers' group felt that the previous title had been a relevant title, but they had no objection to the change in light of the events of 11 September. They were confident that the Meeting would no doubt deal with the consequences of the events for management and personnel. He endorsed the idea of inviting all governments to this Meeting in view of the critical nature and timing of the Meeting.
17. A representative of the Director-General, Ms. Doumbia-Henry, Deputy Director, Sectoral Activities Department, explained that the new report would encompass restructuring but would be broader in scope and proposed the modification of decision paragraph 3, as presented below.
18. *The Committee recommends to the Governing Body –*
  - (a) *to approve the change in title and the purpose of the Meeting as proposed in paragraph 2;*
  - (b) *to invite the Director-General, in these circumstances, to extend an invitation, at no cost to the Office, to the other governments of ILO member States, to relevant international organizations and, also as observers, relevant and directly concerned international non-governmental organizations that may wish to attend the Meeting;*
  - (c) *that Worker and Employer representatives may, at no cost to the Office, be accompanied by advisers;*
  - (d) *that, notwithstanding the provisions of the Standing Orders for sectoral meetings, all participants should have the right to speak and participate in the Meeting.*

## I. Review of the Sectoral Activities Programme

19. The Committee had before it a paper<sup>3</sup> on the review of sectoral activities. Ms. Paxton recalled the history and purpose of the review exercise which had been broadened, through consultations, to ensure that the needs of sectoral constituents could be incorporated into the Decent Work Agenda and the strategic policy framework. The paper explored a range of means to achieve integration while taking into account sectoral objectives and retaining relevance in a changing global environment. Benefits from having smaller meetings, for example, were exemplified by those recently held for the civil aviation and hotels and tourism sectors. New opportunities for social dialogue were to be found at the regional level and through interaction with enterprises. The paper also explored the potential for specific action programmes that would combine the benefits of a range of means of action, from meetings, to research, to best practices. The concept of a “one-stop sectoral shop”, which had been supported during the consultations, would be developed on a pilot basis for the two sectors mentioned above. The challenge of integrating sectoral activities into the mainstream of ILO work had started, as was shown in an appendix to the paper. The potential for greater partnership was being realized within the ILO and outside, including with relevant international organizations.
20. Ms. Doumbia-Henry gave a visual presentation of four different “packages” of sectoral activity. Each had the same level of resources and five common basic components: the “one-stop sectoral shop” with a variety of products such as codes of practice, guidelines and training; bulletin boards on relevant themes; meetings; a selection of countries to enhance national implementation; and outreach in order to move forward effectively. The first option comprised five meetings a year instead of six, with the savings being used as seed money to develop sustainable action programmes in selected sectors. The second possibility – small meetings for each sector in a single biennium – was built on the insights gained from the two recent small meetings. Thematic and country-focused action programmes would be developed and implemented in the same or subsequent biennia using the resources liberated by having smaller meetings and by seeking extra-budgetary inputs. The third option involved doing away with the cycle of meetings and having the Committee select meetings based on the nature and importance of the issues facing each sector. Issues and priorities having thus been identified would lead to the development and implementation of thematic action programmes in selected countries and sectors. The fourth possibility was for each of the 22 sectors to decide whether to have a global meeting (business as usual) with some follow-up, to forgo a meeting and use the resources to develop and implement an action programme for that sector, or have a small meeting and use the (lesser) resources for follow-up activities.
21. Ms. Paxton concluded the Office’s introduction of the paper by looking forward to making significant progress in the review. She proposed that a small working party of the Committee meet before the end of January to put the results of the Committee’s deliberations at this session into final proposals for consideration and agreement at its session in March 2002. For this reason, the Office also proposed that decisions concerning the meetings to be held in 2003 also be postponed until March 2002.
22. Mr. Zellhoefer said that, since the late receipt of the paper had precluded consultations with the International Trade Secretariats (ITSs), his comments were of a preliminary nature, as well as those concerning the visual presentation that had just been made by the Office. The Workers’ group reiterated its commitment to the Sectoral Activities

<sup>3</sup> [GB.282/STM/1/1](#).

Programme as a means for translating the theory of ILO instruments into practice at the sectoral level. But, the 1995 reforms had not enabled the programme to be a tool for influencing positively the world of work, despite good sectoral reports and positive conclusions and resolutions. He was puzzled by the so-called “anomalies” in paragraph 4 of the paper. He recalled that meetings were structured to provide a full week of social dialogue. Forums and symposia were not substantive, nor did he favour meetings that were merely an informal exchange of views. The importance of conclusions and resolutions lay with their operationalization in a sector (above all through national legislation and collective bargaining) and the extent to which they guided ILO work. He wondered whether the problem of limited follow-up was not due more to budgetary or political constraints, or lack of coordination within the Office, than to the texts themselves. As for the notion that the universal coverage of a sector could be a limiting factor, he pointed out that the ILO routinely adopted universal standards. The Office should have more faith in conclusions and resolutions as promotional tools. He welcomed the opportunity to review and improve the Sectoral Activities Programme in the Committee so that it was fully integrated with the strategic objectives, notably in the field. He stressed that impact was the principal, if not the only, indicator of success and the trade union movement was ready to work with the Office to strengthen the impact of sectoral activities. A good example of an effective sectoral approach was the decent work in agriculture example in Appendix 1 of the paper. The ILO should lead in this sector. More flexibility, such as was commendably shown in the holding of the two recent informal meetings, was required. The outcomes of such meetings should be the basis of follow-up, possibly augmented by extra-budgetary resources.

23. When considering what sort of sectoral meetings might be held, the advocacy role of the Office, for example in promoting the Declaration, sectoral Conventions and codes of practice, should always be kept in mind. This was the best programme for promoting sectoral standards and it was a pity that insufficient resources had been devoted to it. Perhaps the possibility should be explored of MDT and regional office financing follow-up activities in the field. Sectoral social dialogue should deal with global sectoral issues and all the relevant structures should be strengthened to achieve this with the involvement of the means for social dialogue that existed in MNEs, ITs, regional groups, etc. He reiterated the need for the Workers’ and Employers’ groups to remain autonomous when it came to the selection of participants to sectoral meetings. Participants needed a mandate from their sector if policy guidance were to be developed. He was interested in exploring the establishment of guidelines for the three groups, possibly similar to those for the maritime sector. The “one-stop sectoral shop” had some interesting aspects, but it was what sectoral specialists were already supposed to do. The “shop” should not conflict with the idea of an inter-departmental task force. It was important to note that other avenues for contact existed too, including ACT/EMP, ACTRAV and GLLAD. The “shop” should also facilitate contact with other technical departments and external agencies, particularly the financial ones. SECTOR should be more proactive with other departments in seeking action on the outcome of meetings. He agreed that the Office should present a set of options for each sector and felt that a small working party to advise the Committee before its March 2002 meeting would be useful, provided its terms of reference were clear and it was representative in its composition.
24. Mr. Jeetun regretted the late arrival of the document and reserved his group’s comments on the visual presentation. He felt that this seventh exercise was a review rather than a reform that was not demand-driven; rather, the paper reflected the Office’s views and perceptions of what the constituents wanted. This was not appropriate since what the Office considered to be mainstream was not necessarily echoed by the constituents. He recognized that there was room for improvement in the Sectoral Activities Programme, particularly relating to follow-up action, the lack of which had already been identified and, as the Workers’ group had noted, was due to resource constraints not the nature of the output from meetings. He

reiterated that the Employers' group was not prepared to sacrifice sectoral meetings for some other activity; they recognized their impact and relevance. The recent civil aviation meeting had underscored their *raison d'être* and he stressed the need for a continuing programme of focused meetings decided by the Committee in the light of global trends. Moreover, their importance for developing countries, as a means for learning, sharing experience and keeping pace with change, should not be forgotten. The fact that previous reviews were considered to have achieved procedural rather than substantial change was proof that meetings had stood the test of time. Moreover, they were an ideal opportunity to discuss how to achieve the objective of decent work. Change was not necessarily associated with improvement, which was more difficult to achieve. The present structure was flexible enough to accommodate different types of sectoral meeting; any improvements should be made within it and be transparent. The substantial positive feedback from participants after each meeting that was recorded in the *Notes on the Proceedings* should be borne in mind before change was contemplated. Referring to specific parts of the document, Mr. Jeetun pointed out that: the Employers were a single group and spoke with one voice; many of the Governments that saw the need for a review also spoke in favour of sectoral meetings; sectoral meetings were easily incorporated into the ILO's strategic objectives, which should take into account constituents' needs; and meetings should not open the door to unfettered participation by NGOs. He agreed with the Workers' group about the need for group autonomy in selecting participants. While national delegations might sometimes be desirable, they were not feasible since the desired expertise did not necessarily reside with all the social partners in the same country. Also, sectoral meetings should not be the forum in which to argue national issues. The Employers' group had always favoured tripartite participation in regional meetings. It was important to note that employers' organizations included sectoral organizations. Mr. Jeetun did not believe there was a case for creating new sectoral structures. They certainly should not be imposed; any changes should be at the request of the constituents. He added that some framework agreements could run counter to international labour standards and that, while MNEs might seek information for the ILO, they were not sectorally structured. He was uncertain what one-stop shops would achieve. He acknowledged the need for sectoral information but there was no need to undertake a process of reform in order to post information on the Internet. Employers were not in favour of intersectoral task forces but did support better exchange of information between departments. Mr. Jeetun supported the establishment of a working party, provided it had a clear mandate from the Committee and was not merely a vehicle for discussion. He summed up by saying that the Employers' group wanted consensus on review rather than reform of the Sectoral Activities Programme, with the constituents playing the key role, including in the development of new ideas for follow-up and action programmes. He stressed that sectoral meetings were the basis for both.

25. A representative of the Government of Germany, speaking on behalf of IMEC governments, welcomed the comprehensive document and appreciated the prior consultations that had occurred. He fully agreed with the move to integrate sectoral activities more into the mainstream of ILO activities, particularly the Decent Work Agenda and the strategic objectives through the strategic budgeting process. Referring to the proposals for new sectoral structures, IMEC governments would like to know more about such instruments of sectoral social dialogue and their role. What would be the role of governments in this process? Sectoral meetings should provide opportunities and forums for social dialogue and he agreed that further improvements could and should be made to ensure they met their intended goals. More active government participation was important and the original practice of inviting tripartite national delegations should be reconsidered. He noted the options that had been proposed. The proposal to set up a small working party was acceptable, provided it had a temporary mandate and governments were adequately represented on it.

26. In response to a question from a representative of the Government of Germany on the financial aspects of smaller meetings and the extent to which interpretation would be provided, Mr. de Vries Reilingh said that the recent meeting for the hotel and tourism sector, with 15 participants all paid for by the Office and with interpretation in the languages that were required, had direct costs of about US\$60,000. Additional languages would add to the cost, but he pointed out that Government participants normally met their own costs. A regular sectoral meeting had direct costs of about US\$150,000.
27. The representative of the Government of India highlighted some of the benefits of sectoral meetings and agreed that smaller meetings could be more effective as well as more economical. He supported the setting up of a small working party, the postponement of a meeting in favour of an action programme and the better integration of the Sectoral Activities Programme into the mainstream of ILO activities. He agreed that the best guarantee of relevance of sectoral activities was consensus among the constituents. He called for more activities related to employment of the type mentioned in Appendix 2 to the document and supported the proposal for an action programme in the area of education and training to enhance labour competence.
28. The representative of the Government of Japan supported the view of IMEC governments but felt that some of the outcomes of sectoral meetings were vague and gave no clear signs on how to ensure decent work. The economic situation in Japan had led to high unemployment and large social problems; decent work was being called into question. He noted that, since governments had to put more emphasis on domestic employment policies, they needed to ensure the results of ILO activities justified the contributions they made to them. It was important that sectoral meetings contributed to national progress towards decent work.
29. The representative of the Government of China agreed that sectoral and technical meetings provided avenues for social dialogue. Each of the three parties in China felt that such meetings were important. He was in favour of national delegations, which made it easier to get a commitment to national follow-up. He supported the points for decision.
30. The representative of the Government of the United Kingdom supported the statement on behalf of IMEC governments and appreciated the willingness to reform sectoral activities to make them more effective. He agreed with the Workers' group that the Office should take full advantage of the information technology revolution in disseminating examples of good practice. He agreed with the Employers' group that sectoral activities should not lead to regional or sectoral collective bargaining. The three main reasons for the low level of government participation were well known. They were: cost; the reorganization of many ministries leading to the dispersion of responsibility for ILO issues; and the fact that some government departments did not focus on ILO issues. The programme would clearly be more relevant with more tripartite social dialogue, greater integration with the Decent Work Agenda and the strategic and operational objectives. He agreed with the proposals contained in the paper, particularly action programmes.
31. The representative of the Government of the United States supported other IMEC governments and recommended that innovative approaches continue to be explored. Sectoral meetings were an important input to the ILO means of action and an integral part of the strategic vision. He agreed with other Government speakers about the need for national delegations. Action programmes were an appropriate way to address the rapidly changing global economy. A one-stop shop was a good idea if it provided easier access to the ILO's services. It had worked well in various United States departments.
32. The representative of the Government of Ghana, speaking on behalf the African governments, sought greater recognition for the Sectoral Activities Programme. He agreed

with the need for greater integration into mainstream ILO activities and stressed that follow-up activities should be properly implemented and evaluated. There was a need for more trained experts in the field. Whatever changes were made, the main objectives of sectoral meetings – providing a forum for dialogue at different levels and for the exchange of information – should be retained. Caution should be exercised when providing information via the Internet. The fact that many in Africa did not have access meant that hard copies had to be provided too, as well as capacity building in the ICT so that Africa could participate in the benefits of globalization.

33. An observer from the Arab Labour Organization emphasized that the need for interpretation in Arabic should be kept in mind during the review process.
34. Mr. Zellhoefer said that paragraph 6 should have included the Secretary of the Workers' group and that if there was a move towards more national delegations for sectoral meetings, the Workers' group would want to be involved in the selection of countries while maintaining group autonomy in selecting their participants from the same countries. He pointed out that framework agreements did support international labour standards. In fact many of them referred to the Declaration on Fundamental Principles and Rights at Work and the Conventions in it and thus promoted the standards and work of the ILO. While recognizing the need to finalize the review process, he foresaw that a working party might need to go beyond next March. The Workers' group was not of the view at this time to take a position on postponing a meeting from 2003 to 2004.
35. Mr. Jeetun agreed that January might be too optimistic a completion date for a working party and reiterated that one needed a clear mandate.
36. As far as a working party was concerned, consensus was reached on having two representatives from each group, including IMEC and developing country participation. Each group would provide the Office with nominations as soon as possible. The working party would develop proposals for the Committee that would be circulated well in advance of its next meeting in March 2002.
37. *The Committee on Sectoral and Technical Meetings and Related Issues recommends that the Governing Body –*
  - (a) *set up a small working party comprised of two Government representatives, two Employer representatives and two Worker representatives to consider the issues related to the review of sectoral activities, and submit a report for the consideration of the Committee at the 283rd Session of the Governing Body in March 2002; and*
  - (b) *postpone to the 283rd Session of the Governing Body, a decision on the meetings and agenda which have been provisionally selected for 2003.*

## **II. Composition and purpose of the meeting concerning health services to be held in 2002**

- 38.** The Committee had before it a paper<sup>4</sup> containing propositions on the composition and purpose of the meeting concerning health services to be held in 2002.
- 39.** The Chairperson reminded the Committee that at its meeting in March 2001, it had considered a paper on the composition and purpose of the sectoral meetings to be held in 2002. Since there was no agreement in the Committee concerning the health services meeting, it was decided that the composition and purpose of this meeting would be decided in this Committee's session. The Office had submitted three options to be considered.
- 40.** Mr. Zellhoefer explained that the figures provided by the Office gave the answer of the Workers' group. In health services, only about 30 per cent of employers were from the private sector,<sup>5</sup> so in a group of 25 Government/Employer representatives, the private employers should be entitled to seven representatives. This meant that option 3(a), that is, a joint meeting composed of 50 participants (18 Government representatives, seven Employer representatives and 25 Worker representatives) was the only logical one, while option 3(c), outlining a tripartite meeting of 60 participants (20 Government representatives, 20 Employer representatives and 20 Worker representatives) would be a gross overrepresentation of private employers. The Workers' group therefore strongly endorsed option 3(a). In addition, the Workers' group reminded the Committee of the cost implications to the Office in increasing the numbers of participants.
- 41.** Mr. Jeetun indicated that the true spirit of social dialogue was bypassed when figures were mentioned. Thirty per cent of employers from the private sector in health services was not a low figure. It was paradoxical to use the argument of low representation, as in some cases union membership represented only 9 or 10 per cent of the workforce in some sectors, and yet employers still engaged in social dialogue. Furthermore, private health services were growing rapidly in many countries, and figures differed from country to country.
- 42.** The representative of the Government of Germany stated that having a tripartite meeting in the health services sector was inappropriate, as global figures indicated that the majority of countries relied on public health services. Therefore his Government had proposed option 3(b) as a compromise.
- 43.** Option 3(a) was endorsed by the representative of the Government of the Russian Federation.
- 44.** The representative of the Government of Ghana, speaking on behalf of the African Government group, indicated that considering the importance of the health sector, his group had opted for option 3(c) so as to enrich the discussions with the maximum number of participants.
- 45.** Mr. Zellhoefer said that, while the Workers' group would clearly prefer option 3(a), they could also compromise on option 3(b). Social dialogue in the public sector should be

<sup>4</sup> [GB.282/STM/2](#).

<sup>5</sup> [GB.280/15](#), p. 17.

encouraged, as governments were the employer partners in about 70 per cent of the health services in most countries, and perhaps even more in developing countries.

46. The representative of the Government of the United States found the compromise of option 3(b) proposed by the representative of the Government of Germany acceptable, as it kept the meeting's costs within limits while increasing employer representation. This view was also endorsed by the representatives of the Governments of Canada and France.
47. Mr. Jeetun stressed that, based on the principle of engaging in social dialogue even when there has been low representation of one of the partners in a particular sector, the Employers insisted on holding a tripartite meeting. As consensus could not be reached on this subject, the Employers' group requested that the Committee conduct a vote.
48. A vote was conducted reflecting the voting coefficients and option 3(b) was adopted by the Committee with 6,974 votes in favour, 4,785 votes against and no abstentions.
49. The Employers' group requested a modification of paragraph 4, which the Committee endorsed.
50. *The Committee on Sectoral and Technical Meetings and Related Issues recommends to the Governing Body –*
  - (a) *the type of meeting and the number of delegates be as proposed in paragraph 3(b) of document GB.282/STM/2; and*
  - (b) *that the purpose of the meeting be as proposed and amended in paragraph 4 to read:*

*... to exchange views on new structures and approaches in health services and how they affect the capacity and effectiveness of the social partners in social dialogue and to identify a framework for how social dialogue could be strengthened, using a report prepared by the Office as a basis for its discussions; to adopt conclusions that include practical guidance for the strengthening of social dialogue and proposals for action by governments, by employers' and workers' organizations at the national level and by the ILO; and to adopt a report on its discussion. In addition, the meeting may also adopt resolutions.*

### **III. Effects to be given to the recommendations of sectoral meetings**

#### **(a) Tripartite Meeting on the Employment Impact of Mergers and Acquisitions in the Banking and Financial Services Sector (Geneva, 5-9 February 2001)**

51. The Committee had before it the *Note on the Proceedings*<sup>6</sup> of the Tripartite Meeting on the Employment Impact of Mergers and Acquisitions in the Banking and Financial Services Sector.
52. The Chairperson of the Meeting, Mr. Mansfield (Worker representative), stated that the Meeting had been complex by the nature of the industry, the lack of previous contact between the participants and the fact that in some countries workers in banking and finance services were not heavily organized. There was a broad general discussion on the key issues in the report, and the outcome of the Meeting was expressed through resolutions and conclusions. In regard to the resolutions, the process was vigorous but productive and agreement was reached on two issues. In regard to the conclusions, Mr. Mansfield described the details behind the lack of agreement on certain paragraphs, and the subsequent impact on the last plenary of the Meeting, as described in the report of the discussion. Mr. Mansfield believed that all the parties involved would do things differently if they had the time over again. In subsequent discussions with senior representatives of employers it was made clear that the actions taken were regrettable and did not indicate a future intention as to how employers would behave in the future. He also accepted that his description of the employers' actions as not honourable were at the time taken as provocative by the employers. Mr. Mansfield made two suggestions regarding future sectoral meetings:
- prior to the Meeting commencing, the spokespersons for the Workers' and Employers' groups be brought together for one day with the Office to have a private general discussion around the issues; and
  - during the Meeting have the Governing Body's representative remain in the Chair for the whole Meeting, including possibly the working parties.
53. Mr. Zellhoefer thanked Mr. Mansfield for chairing the Meeting. This was a timely meeting since two-thirds of mergers and acquisitions (M&As) in this sector failed to achieve their objectives. No matter what the motive, M&As are invariably accompanied by announcements of job reductions, sometimes on a massive scale. The adoption of the three resolutions was particularly welcome. While regret was expressed that the first resolution on the establishment of a tripartite mechanism was adopted only by the majority of the Meeting, there was also satisfaction that the whole Meeting had called on government and social partners "to fully respect and promote freedom of association and the right to organize in the banking and financial services sector". Mr. Zellhoefer expressed his gratitude to the representative of the Government of Canada for his efforts as Chairperson of the Working Party on Conclusions, and regretted that no consensus was found on three issues that should be at the core of activities (the role of governments in promoting social

<sup>6</sup> TMBF/2001/13, appended to [GB.282/STM/3/1](#).

dialogue; specific strategies for training and lifelong learning; encouragement of good practices, such as enterprise-wide regional and global forums). The real worrying development was not that the Workers' group was not able to find common ground with the Employers – it had happened before that consensus was not reached – but that the dividing issues were those of social dialogue. Mr. Zellhoefer thanked the overnments present at the Meeting for recognizing the importance of these issues and allowing the document to be approved, and gave approval for the points for decision in paragraphs 4 and 5.

54. Mr. Jeetun said that the Employers' group did not want to assign blame to any party and that there was no further need to justify past actions. Quoting the Roman statesman Marc Anthony that all men were honourable, he hoped that good spirits would prevail He communicated that the Employers' group endorsed the points for decision in paragraphs 4 and 5. However, for the sake of consistency, he stressed that the Employers were still opposed to the Conclusions and requested that this be recorded in the report of the Committee.

55. *The Committee on Sectoral and Technical Meetings and Related Issues recommends that the Governing Body –*

(a) *authorize the Director-General to communicate the Note on the Proceedings:*

(i) *to governments, requesting them to communicate the texts to the employers' and workers' organizations concerned;*

(ii) *to the international employers' and workers' organizations concerned; and*

(iii) *to the international organizations concerned;*

(b) *request the Director-General to bear in mind, when drawing up proposals for the future programme of work of the Office, the wishes expressed by the Meeting in paragraphs 11-13 of the conclusions and in the relevant parts of the resolutions.*

**(b) Tripartite Meeting on Human Resources Development, Employment and Globalization in the Hotel, Catering and Tourism Sector (Geneva, 2-6 April 2001)**

56. The Committee had before it the *Note on the Proceedings*<sup>7</sup> of the Tripartite Meeting on Human Resources Development, Employment and Globalization in the Hotel, Catering and Tourism Sector.

57. The Chairperson of the Meeting, Mr. Willers (Government, Germany) informed the Committee that the Meeting had been less dramatic than the previous meeting and participants were motivated to reach acceptable results by consensus. A set of conclusions was adopted, which raised the salient issues addressed in the report. Globalization, which

<sup>7</sup> TMHCT/2001/13, appended to [GB.282/STM/3/2](#).

affected the hotel, catering and tourism sector, even before the term was coined, was highlighted, as was the need for social dialogue. Three resolutions were adopted, one proposed by the Government group and two by the Workers' group. Mr. Willers thanked the Vice-Chairpersons of the Meeting as well as Ms. Paxton and the secretariat, indicating that his task as Chairperson had been simplified because of their support and cooperation.

58. Mr. Jeetun said that the Employers' group had a very productive meeting and supported the points for decision.
59. Mr. Zellhoefer supported the conclusions and resolutions of the Meeting. He stated that the Meeting had almost been psychic, prior to the current situation of crisis in the sector, in concluding that "the ILO should, in consultation with the tripartite constituents, address emerging issues and trends in the hotel, catering and tourism sector". Relevant sections of the Office document mentioned subcontracting, part-time and temporary or casual employment (especially for women and migrant workers), the need to promote a system of certification of competencies and qualifications, and the development of joint programmes for socially sustainable tourism, especially in the framework of the United Nations Year of Eco-Tourism (2002). The serious problem of child labour in the sector and the need to jointly and very strongly act against child sex tourism, one of the most horrendous forms of child exploitation, needed to be recognized. The Meeting also indicated important avenues of work through the adoption of three resolutions on promoting employment in the sector: health and safety and occupational. The Workers' group regretted that there had been no time to discuss an important resolution on freedom of association.
60. *The Committee on Sectoral and Technical Meetings and Related Issues recommends that the Governing Body –*
- (a) *authorize the Director-General to communicate the Note on the Proceedings to:*
- (i) *governments, requesting them to communicate these texts to the employers' and workers' organizations concerned;*
- (ii) *the international employers' and workers' organizations concerned;*  
*and*
- (iii) *the international organizations concerned;*
- (b) *request the Director-General to bear in mind, when drawing up proposals for the future programme of work of the Office, the wishes expressed by the Meeting in paragraphs 16 and 17 of the conclusions and in the relevant parts of the resolutions.*

#### IV. Report of the Meeting of Experts on Safety and Health in the Non-ferrous Metals Industries

(Geneva, 28 August-4 September 2001)

61. The Committee had before it the report of the discussion<sup>8</sup> as well as the code of practice<sup>9</sup> of the Meeting of Experts on Safety and Health in the Non-ferrous Metals Industries.
62. A representative of the Director-General, Mr. Jennings, Senior Industry Specialist, Sectoral Activities Department, noted that this was the first time that a meeting was held concerning this sector. Chaired by Mr. Fahey (Government, United Kingdom), the experts worked toward adopting a code of practice which provided specific guidelines for the industry. The code focused on foundries and on the production of primary non-ferrous metals, including from recycled material. The document set out general principles of prevention and protection, and identified and examined a range of physical hazards, including noise vibration, heat stress, radiation, confined spaces, dust and chemicals. Separate chapters dealt with furnaces, molten metal, alloys and recycling. Several new sections were added at the request of the experts. These were mainly drawn from existing codes and standards. The final text was unanimously adopted with minutes to spare on the final day of the Meeting.
63. Mr. Zellhoefer stated that the Workers' group welcomed the new code and its comprehensive outcome. The process to achieve consensus had been a lengthy one. He noted that it was especially important that all participants come to Meetings of Experts with the proper preparatory work having been done. While reiterating the support for the final result, the Workers' group wanted to point out that it was unfortunate that the document did not make reference to altitude and its impact on working conditions, an issue that was raised by the Worker experts in reference to paragraph 40 of the report of the discussion. He also expressed regret in noting the delay in the production of the French and Spanish version of the documents and the problems in the accuracy of the Spanish text, which was sadly common to other meetings as well. He also indicated a point of notation to Appendix B, page 96 of the code, concerning benzene. The fact that a government had proposed to reduce the exposure limits below these in an ILO instrument should be taken into account when the Organization reviews occupational safety and health standards
64. Mr. Jeetun mentioned that the Meeting of Experts resulted in a revised code, but that the Employers' group felt that the document had been too detailed and ambitious and had tried to cover all too many topics. He pointed out that the Employer Vice-Chairperson of the Meeting of Experts had written a letter to the Office, providing feedback for improvement of future meetings. Mr. Jeetun said that the pain taken to draft a letter and make proposals for improvement was testimony to the importance accorded to the Meeting by the Employers' group, and communicated the group's approval of the decision points.
65. *The Committee on Sectoral and Technical Meetings and Related Issues recommends that the Governing Body take note of the report of the Meeting and authorize the Director-General to publish the code of practice on safety and health in the non-ferrous metals industries.*

<sup>8</sup> MENFM/2001/8, appended to [GB.282/STM/4](#).

<sup>9</sup> MENFM/2001/9, appended to [GB.282/STM/4](#).

**V. Report of the Third Session of the Joint IMO/ILO Ad Hoc Expert Working Group on Liability and Compensation Regarding Claims for Death, Personal Injury and Abandonment of Seafarers**  
(London, 30 April-4 May 2001)

66. The Committee had before it a paper<sup>10</sup> on the report of the Joint IMO/ILO Ad Hoc Expert Working Group on Liability and Compensation regarding Claims for Death, Personal Injury and Abandonment of Seafarers.
67. As was evident from its title, the report covered the third session of a joint IMO (International Maritime Organization)/ILO working group originally established by the 273rd (November 1998) Session of the Governing Body. The outcome of the first two sessions of the Working Group were reported to this Committee at the 277th (March 2000) and 280th (March 2001) Sessions.
68. Ms. Doumbia-Henry noted that the third session of the Joint Working Group had been chaired by Mr. Jean-Marc Schindler, (Government, France). It had produced, as seen in Annex 2 and Annex 3, draft resolutions on, respectively, Guidelines on provision of financial security in case of abandonment of seafarers and Guidelines on shipowners' responsibilities in respect of contractual claims for personal injury to or death of seafarers. If and when adopted by this session of the Governing Body and by the upcoming session of the IMO's Assembly, these resolutions and accompanying guidelines will urge States to ensure that shipowners have in place a financial security system in case of abandonment and to have in place an effective insurance cover or financial security system to provide full and prompt payment of claims for personal injury and death. The latter resolution also provides a model receipt and release form for contractual claims, which should expedite payment of contractual claims while avoiding pressurizing seafarers to waive their rights to pursue any claim at law in respect of negligence. Ms. Doumbia-Henry recommended the report to the Committee for its consideration, and also noted that the dates of the proposed fourth session had been changed, after consultation with the IMO secretariat, from 28 January to 1 February 2002, to early-May or early-July 2002.
69. Mr. Jeetun communicated the full endorsement of the points for decision by the Employers' group.
70. Mr. Zellhoefer reported that the Workers' group were very pleased with the outcome and supported the adoption of the text, as had been done at the IMO Legal Committee last month. He looked forward to the work continuing with a fourth Working Group session next year in London, and that long-term solutions may involve mandatory instruments. A thorough reading of the guidelines showed how much progress had been made, with clear references to decent work and human rights.
71. The representative of the Government of Ghana, speaking on behalf of the African Government group commended the progress made and stated that his group was reassured that there was serious concern for the fate of seafarers – many of whom came from Africa – in rescuing them from the hands of unscrupulous shipowners. He mentioned that there were two serious omissions in the guidelines: the prosecution of shipowners who did not repatriate seafarers and the responsibility of flag States to repatriate abandoned seafarers.

<sup>10</sup> IMO/ILO/WGLCCS3/9, appended to [GB.282/STM/5](#).

**72. The Committee on Sectoral and Technical Meetings and Related Issues recommends that the Governing Body –**

- (a) take note of the report of the third session of the Working Group;**
- (b) approve the actions set out in paragraph 4; and**
- (c) approve the holding of a fourth session of the Working Group, with participation by the eight ILO (four shipowner and four seafarer) representatives, at no cost to the ILO, in mid-2002, with the terms of reference provided in paragraph 5.**

## **VI. Report of the ILO Working Group on Harmonization of Chemical Hazard Communication**

- 73.** The Committee had before it the report of the ILO Working Group on Harmonization of Chemical Hazard Communication.<sup>11</sup>
- 74.** A representative of the Director-General, Mr. Obadia, Coordinator, Occupational Health Cluster, SafeWork, stated that the overall work on the elaboration of a globally harmonized system (GHS) was a good example of the wide international cooperation in developing a major tool with global coverage. The output of the Working Group was an essential and most visible element. It took 12 years, the participation of 300 experts in over 150 meetings, and the production of at least 1,000 documents and reports. Now that the GHS has become a United Nations standard, it was expected to have far-reaching impact at both national and international levels, as it created a unified basis for chemical hazard communication for the workplace, consumer transport and the environment resulting in improved protection. It also resulted in the facilitation of trade as well as the reduction of testing on animals by improving mutual acceptance of hazard data.
- 75.** Mr. Zellhoefer expressed his satisfaction on behalf of the Workers' group, not only for the achievement of a GHS, but also for the political and technical leadership that the ILO had shown in initiating and bringing the process to completion. They expected the same kind of commitment in providing technical assistance to developing countries in order for them to upgrade or establish chemical hazard communication systems, in working with UNITAR and UNDP to develop an action plan and in working with the ICEM and other unions in the sector to implement the system's recommendations.
- 76.** Mr. Jeetun commended the Office for the completion of 12 years of work and noted with satisfaction that the Employers' group approved the report. He stressed that the ILO should continue to provide assistance to developing countries and promote what had been achieved.
- 77.** The representative of the Government of Germany indicated that the technical experts had requested him to not only support the point for decision, but to also reiterate his Government's support of the work of the Office.

<sup>11</sup> [GB.282/STM/6](#).

78. The representative of the Government of the United Kingdom recognized and commended the ILO's vital contribution to the work on GHS, and endorsed the recommendation in paragraph 12 of the report. Her Government was fully committed to the work on GHS and had played an active part in taking all aspects of this work forward, including implementation and the work of the UN subcommittee. In addition, the United Kingdom recognized the need for training and, although resources had already been committed, it would consider any proposals for capacity building.
79. The representative of the Government of the United States stated that his country was an early and active participant in this process, and was very pleased to see its conclusion. He commended the ILO for its long-term support, in particular Mr. Obadia who served as the secretary for the coordinating group and the Working Group on Hazard Communication. He noted the potentially positive impact on workers worldwide who were currently exposed to hazardous chemicals but who did not have the information necessary to ensure their safe use. The United States supported the continuation of the important work of classifying and labelling such chemicals in an integrated and coherent manner. Furthermore, his Government supported providing additional resources for the capacity-building phase of the GHS.
80. The spokesperson for the African Government group stated that his group had taken note of the successful completion of the work undertaken, believed in a GHS system and supported the recommendations made by other Committee members.
81. *The Committee on Sectoral and Technical Meetings and Related Issues recommends that the Governing Body –*
- (a) take note of the successful completion of the task given to the ILO Working Group on Harmonization of Chemical Hazard Communication;*
  - (b) take note of the establishment of a new United Nations body to maintain and update the globally harmonized system for the classification of labelling of chemicals;*
  - (c) endorse the work of the ILO Working Group.*

Geneva, 9 November 2001.

*(Signed)* Mr. Rimkunas,  
Chairperson.

*Points for decision:*

Paragraph 12;	Paragraph 60;
Paragraph 18;	Paragraph 65;
Paragraph 37;	Paragraph 72;
Paragraph 50;	Paragraph 81.
Paragraph 55;	