

**Meeting of Experts to Develop a Code of Practice
on Violence and Stress at Work in Services:
A Threat to Productivity and Decent Work**

Geneva
8-15 October 2003

Final report

Introduction

1. At its 279th Session (November 2000) the Governing Body decided to convene a Meeting of Experts to Develop a Code of Practice on Violence and Stress at Work in Services: A Threat to Productivity and Decent Work. The Meeting was held in Geneva from 8 to 15 October 2003.
2. The agenda of the Meeting consisted of a single item: to consider and review a draft and adopt a code of practice on violence and stress at work in services: A threat to productivity and decent work.

Participants

3. Thirty-six experts attended the Meeting, 12 of them appointed by the Governments of Algeria, Canada, Denmark, Germany, Japan, Malaysia, Mauritius, Peru, Philippines, South Africa, United Kingdom, and United States, 12 after consultation with the Employers' group and 12 after consultation with the Workers' group of the Governing Body.
4. Several observers also attended the Meeting. These included Government experts from Ireland, Kuwait, Luxembourg, Norway, Poland, Sweden, Switzerland, and Zimbabwe; as well as observers from the World Health Organization (WHO); Education International (EI); the International Confederation of Free Trade Unions (ICFTU); the International Commission on Occupational Health (ICOH); the International Council of Nurses (ICN); the International Federation of Air Traffic Controllers' Associations (IFATCA); the International Federation of Business and Professional Women; the International Federation of Employees in Public Service (INFEDOP); the International Federation of Social Workers (IFSW); the International Organisation of Employers (IOE); Public Services International (PSI); Union Network International (UNI); and the World Confederation of Labour (WCL).
5. A list of participants is annexed to this report.

Opening address

6. The Secretary-General of the Meeting (Ms. Doumbia-Henry, Director of the Sectoral Activities Department) welcomed the participants and explained the purpose of the Meeting. In view of the widespread impact of violence and stress at work, the Governing Body of the ILO had convened the Meeting to consider underlying causes and adopt a code of practice that would help the governments, employers' and workers' organizations of ILO member States to address the challenges through better policies and practices on assessment, prevention, managing and coping with violence and stress in services sectors. Experience in the ILO suggested that the effectiveness and general success of such important international instruments as the proposed code was directly proportionate to the degree of consensus that was achieved in the final outcome, as this provided a sound tripartite basis for promoting its use in all member States. While participants should avoid reducing the final outcome to a meaningless set of very general principles, they should nevertheless constantly seek that all important consensus through social dialogue, even on the most difficult issues.

Election of the Chairperson and spokespersons

7. Mr. Cruz, the expert appointed by the Government of the Philippines, was unanimously elected Chairperson of the Meeting. Mr. Côté (Canada) and Mr. Richards (United Kingdom) were respectively elected spokespersons of the Employer and Worker experts. Ms. Harwood, the expert appointed by the Government of Canada, was elected spokesperson of the Government experts.

Presentation of the draft code

8. The Executive Secretary (Mr. Myers) summarized the origins and content of the draft code as well as comments on it received from around the world. The draft, developed on the basis of analysis of the extent, nature and causes of violence and stress in public and private services, of the potential interrelationship between the two, and of experience of good practice in enterprises, institutions and organizations across the services sectors, was based on an original outline and a first draft that had been enriched and improved through discussion, consultation, and extensive peer review within the ILO. Comments on the draft received from 41 governments, four employers' organizations and four workers' organizations were available to all participants.

General discussion

9. The spokesperson for the Employer experts stated that it was impossible to deal with both violence and stress in the same code of practice as if they were intrinsically connected. While stress was a much discussed issue, valid and sufficient data were not available to provide a basis for the development of a code applicable to stress. Moreover, it was difficult if not impossible to ascertain whether stress, whatever this notion covered, had a relation to the workplace, given that many issues said to give rise to stress were related to the private or societal domain. This made it impossible to propose measures to guide employers on how the issue should be addressed. Violence, on the other hand, was a hazard, for which instruments existed to measure the direct effects. The Meeting should focus therefore on the prevention of workplace violence.
10. Another Employer expert drew attention to the significant flaws in the research said to establish linkages between work, stress and disease. The major research around the world

was highly challengeable and could not be relied upon. Much of the material in the draft code of practice that was the subject of disagreement actually referred to matters that were currently contested in an industrial relations context in various countries.

- 11.** The spokesperson for the Worker experts indicated that, although he recognized the reasons for the stance of Employer experts, both issues should be dealt with in one code as they were intrinsically linked. Nevertheless, appropriate distinction between violence and stress should be ensured in different aspects, at the appropriate places. The Worker experts also noted that the threat of violence created a climate of fear at the workplace, leading to absenteeism, a change of occupation, or even to quitting work altogether. While accepting the Employer experts' position that there could be no one-size-fits-all solution to the issue of stress, the Worker experts highlighted legal precedents establishing a clear link between excessive workloads and stress as well as the employer's responsibility to alleviate such excessive workloads. A number of Employer experts had themselves clearly recognized there were some links between stress and violence and they therefore needed to be tackled together. A code of practice that addressed stress would be valuable for both workers and their employers, as the phenomenon resulted in increased sickness which was scientifically proven, absenteeism and declining customer-client satisfaction in many service sector enterprises. The Government experts had proposed an acceptable definition of stress, and the Worker experts sought social dialogue with the Employers' side to reach a compromise. The ILO Governing Body's mandate to examine both violence and stress as a threat to productivity and decent work had to be respected.
- 12.** The Government experts agreed that it was difficult to deal with both violence and stress in a single code but noted that this was the task mandated by the Governing Body. It was suggested that the code might link both issues in some places and be divided into separate sections for each issue in other sections for greater clarity on the causes, effects, and measures to address them. Some Government experts were of the view that stress should be dealt with in the context of the Meeting only in so far as it related to violence, excluding the forms of stress that occur on their own in everyday work. As a general question, stress was a safety and health concern that could be the subject of a code of practice of its own. To address it in the document under review, other than in relation to violence, would be attempting too much, even though some empirical studies existed showing that the same tools could be used to address both violence and stress. Recognizing also the economic dimensions of the impact of stress, programmes involving enterprises were under way in some countries, which aimed at introducing measures on stress management into existing human resource management methods.
- 13.** Observers from Public Services International, International Council of Nurses, International Federation of Employees in Public Services, and Education International welcomed the ILO initiative on the code. Recent studies confirmed that workplace violence was widespread in various sectors and it was cited as one of the principal reasons for workers leaving active professional practice in some. Both violence and stress were also a major concern to public service workers worldwide, with stress considered even above salaries and working conditions in some surveys. They hoped the Meeting would achieve its objectives, reduce the impact of violence and stress on employees and thereby improve service to the public.
- 14.** In response to a letter from the International Hotel and Restaurant Association (IH&RA), read to the Meeting by the Employer spokesperson, protesting against information on the ILO web site with regard to the hotel and catering sector, the Secretary-General of the Meeting reported that a reply had been dispatched which explained the basis for background information to the preparation of the code.

-
15. To address what they felt was an impasse created by some major philosophical differences between the Employer experts and the other experts with regard to the expected outcomes of the Meeting and the structure of the draft code, the Government experts introduced a restructured draft code based on some informal discussions among the experts. The revised draft emphasized concepts of a health and safety management system which underlined a proactive and preventive approach to the issue, and focused on workplace violence. The Meeting agreed to take this revision as the basis for its subsequent discussions.

Point-by-point discussion

Preamble

16. The Meeting agreed that a *Preamble* would be helpful to clarify points related to the overall objectives of the proposed code of practice. Accordingly, agreement was reached to add a paragraph explaining the relationship between violence and stress. Employer experts wished to underline the human resource implications of the consequences of violence, whereas the Worker and Government experts placed more emphasis on the linkage between violence and stress as a health and safety management issue. The Worker experts disagreed with the minimalization of stress in the text. Responding to what was meant by “direct adverse consequences”, the spokesperson of the Employer experts noted that it should not be explicitly defined, and referred to the wording in the Preamble that “there are some consequences of workplace violence, which may include stress ...”. In the view of the Employer experts, a clear understanding would emerge from the context. It was agreed also to reinforce the intent that the code of practice should adopt a proactive, preventive approach based on well-understood elements of a health and safety management system advocated by the ILO.¹

General provisions (purpose, use and scope)

17. The Meeting agreed on alterations in the paragraphs concerning the *purpose* in order to place the emphasis on the question of violence and to eliminate the reference to stress, to replace “enterprises” by “organizations”, to reorder the areas of action and to further clarify some of these areas. The Meeting did not agree to add to the listed areas, notably by a reference to “enforcement and inspection” proposed by a Government expert. The Employer experts considered that such terms were too prescriptive.
18. The Meeting agreed on alterations in the paragraph on *use of the code* to change “could” to “should” to align the text with the text on purpose, to utilize the term “representatives” in place of “organizations” when referring to governments, employers and workers on the proposal of the Worker experts, and, on the proposal of the Employer experts, to refer to “concerned stakeholders as appropriate” with reference to others who might have a role in consultation and negotiation.
19. The ILO Deputy Legal Adviser, at the request of the Meeting, clarified the legal status of codes of practice. Conventions and Recommendations which were referred to in the Constitution and which comprise international labour standards, together with Declarations that affirmed the most important values of the Organization and codes of practice or guidelines, were the four types of instruments at the Organization’s disposal. Codes of practice, which are non-binding, were adopted by the Governing Body to provide practical

¹ *Guidelines on occupational safety and health management systems, ILO-OSH 2001*, Geneva, 2001.

guidance on subjects within the technical competence of the ILO. On the basis of this clarification, the Meeting agreed that the code's use could extend to guidance in developing national laws and policies, although the Employer experts felt that such use would exceed the voluntary character of a code of practice.

20. The Meeting agreed to modify the paragraph on *scope* to eliminate reference to internal or external acts of violence, as this was judged to be better addressed in later sections.

Definitions

21. The Worker experts wished to expand the concept of “workplace violence” to “work-related violence”, citing examples of workers who suffered violence related to workplace actions that occurred away from the workplace. The Employer and Government experts considered “workplace” to be sufficiently broad enough to cover such events, and it was so agreed. The Employer experts proposed to describe actions, incidents or behaviour which were “intentional”, on grounds that unintentional or accidental actions or behaviour were not appropriate to be included in the text for various reasons, especially in view of the liability of employers arising from such behaviour. The Worker experts opposed this word as it rendered the description of offensive actions or behaviour too narrow to cover all acts in which workers suffered violence that might not be at its origin intentional. The Government experts also felt that “intentional” was too narrow, and proposed text referring to actions or behaviour that led victims to reasonably believe that they were the subject of, or felt threatened by, violence. “Departure from reasonable conduct” was agreed.
22. The Employer experts then proposed to remove “harassed” from the consequences which defined objectionable behaviour as harassment was not always violent and dropping it from the text would not exclude reference to psychological in addition to physical harm. The Worker experts disagreed; harassment could be even worse and elimination of this type of behaviour would contribute to stopping other forms of violence. Reference to harassment must figure in the code. The Government experts agreed with this perspective and proposed that, as harassment was part of a continuum of violent acts ranging from threats to injury, it should remain in a shortened definition. Given the strong opposition of the Employer experts, it was agreed finally to remove “harassed” but to place this term elsewhere in the code. After a discussion on whether the actions in question occurred in the course of work or in relation to work and clarifications from the Secretary-General on interpretation of terms, it was agreed to use the term “as a direct result of his or her work”, with a footnote to define what was meant. Finally, it was agreed to deal with more detailed descriptions of behaviour under *types of workplace violence* in another part of the code.
23. Definitions for *other relevant terms* were agreed on, with modifications made notably to clarify the definitions and render them more consistent and specific, notably concerning “employer”, “worker”, and “workplace”. The use of “worker and employer” was preferred over the use of “person” with regard to who is considered a “victim”, so as to distinguish between those engaged in the workplace and others who were present at the time of workplace violence (customers, users, general public). The term “services sectors” was defined in its broadest sense to cover all services sectors, including those specifically listed.
24. On *guiding principles* the Employer experts felt that explanations with regard to *cultural differences, gender equality, discrimination and social dialogue* were not necessary. The Worker and Government experts disagreed, pointing out that for the code to be useful in all member States, some orientation along these lines would be crucial in the context of widespread cultural diversity, enhanced by phenomena such as work-related migration. It was agreed to emphasize the *healthy and safe work environment* as the most important

guiding principle, particularly in regard to prevention of workplace violence, and to accept revised text on the other points which were backed up by terminology from ILO standards as far as possible. A reference to the ILO's Declaration on Fundamental Principles and Rights at Work would strengthen the social dialogue point. It was also agreed to insert a footnote to define "governments" under social dialogue.

Policy

25. The Meeting agreed that cooperation between governments, employers, workers and their representatives was essential to promote *policies*, practices and procedures that help eliminate workplace violence. The proposal of the Worker experts to focus on "consultation" rather than "cooperation" was not retained, as it would be dealt with elsewhere. The *policy values* forming part of the priorities for a constructive workplace culture were listed, and agreement was reached on the need for clear objectives with regard to human resources, emphasis on shared objectives within the organization, and the importance of a clear policy statement on workplace violence to be issued and communicated by top management.
26. The Meeting agreed that a policy on workplace violence should address a minimum number of *core issues* which are listed in section 2.3 of the code. There was a consensus that discretion should be given to the parties regarding the independence of the complaints system mentioned in the article. A provision on equal opportunities desired by the Worker experts was not retained as it appeared in the guiding principles of the code. In terms of the allocation of policy responsibilities, agreement was reached in section 2.4 of the code on a broadened definition to encompass supervisors and managers, individuals or teams and workers, particularly the latter as their involvement was essential to the success of a policy to prevent workplace violence. Policies should be communicated to all those concerned, accompanied by initiatives to raise awareness among the concerned actors, a point especially sought by the Government experts.
27. The Meeting also agreed on the need for *social dialogue* at various levels, in various forms and in ways corresponding to national needs and labour relations systems. Social dialogue should aim at both workplace safety and health and the improvement of services, and the social partners should include workplace violence and its direct adverse consequences among those social and labour issues covered within the scope of social dialogue in services sectors, including joint monitoring and evaluation. The notion of "early involvement" of workers in this process was not retained as it was considered implicit.

Organizing

28. The Meeting agreed, on the basis of a proposal from the Employer experts, to include "application" of interventions among *government roles and responsibilities* and to make *research* the first point under this item, as research should logically precede action under the other listed items. Data should be collected in a way allowing trends to particular sectors or groups of workers to be analysed, reflecting the desire of Worker and Government experts to have the gender dimension reflected in the analysis without the formulation being prescriptive. Although the Employer experts did not feel that a point on *legislation* was appropriate in a non-binding code of practice, Government experts were of the view that it should be retained, as it was proper for governments to provide guidance and facilitate dialogue in reviewing legislation. It was agreed to do so with modifications limiting the point to appropriate contexts. Further modifications were agreed on the points covering *guidelines*, *financial resources*, and *regional and international collaboration* which reduced the scope of their application, while that on *international assistance* was deleted. *Vulnerability* was revised to make it the last point, to delete the reference to

government involvement in prevention programmes, and to move the items “workers in precarious employment” and “children and young people” to the *risk management* section.

29. The Meeting agreed to a number of changes to the heading *employers' responsibilities*, replacing, for instance, employers' “organizations” with employers' “representatives”, and provision and promotion of workplaces “free from violence” with promotion of workplace practices that “help to eliminate workplace violence”. Provisions on addressing the economic and social impact under *risk reduction and management*, and on supporting behaviour change as part of *personnel policies*, were deleted on the proposal of the Employer experts. It was agreed to modify and retain points on *national, sectoral and workplace/enterprise agreements, grievance and disciplinary procedures, and information and training* programmes for workplaces.
30. The Meeting agreed a number of revisions to *workers' responsibilities*, including proposals by Employer experts to add “prevent” among the aims, and to replace “organizations” with “representatives”. A point on cooperation between workers' organizations and employers in occupational safety and health committees was added, with the composition of such committees in accordance with the Occupational Safety and Health Recommendation, 1981 (No. 164). Other points on cooperation with employers for prevention policies and the development of training courses, as well as provision of information on workplace violence prevention, were retained but modified on the proposal of the Employer experts. Though the Employer experts objected to the inclusion of advocacy and information activities in the code, the Worker experts wished to retain this concept, and it was agreed to reconsider it later under the cooperation and partnership provisions of the chapter on *Planning and implementation*.
31. The Meeting accepted there was some merit in associating the *general public, customers and clients* with anti-violence programmes, especially when such violence was client- or customer-related, as long as the discretion to involve the public and the extent of the public's involvement remained with the parties. It was also agreed to revise and limit the text without reference to details on specific points
32. Under *competence, information and training*, beginning with *training for workers*, the Meeting agreed on modifications to the overall approach to policies and programmes on information, education and training of workers, supervisors and managers regarding prevention, enterprise policy and strategies and support for workers, and on how it should be done. At the insistence of the Employer experts, reference to training “by workers' organizations” alone was deleted. With the exception of certain points on formation of a “core group” of workers for workplace interventions, orientation to the workplace environment and management policies and procedures, and competences for certain functions, the Meeting agreed on the possible aims of training to address workplace violence. There was also agreement on the utility of *training for supervisors and managers* provided that it did not refer to “workers' representatives”. The Worker experts explained, nevertheless, that this formed a natural part of their own policies and would be pursued by them.
33. The provisions on *information* were retained with modifications to two points to clarify that information on gender, cultural diversity, discrimination and assistance to victims should be done “as appropriate”. Similarly, *recording and notification at the workplace* proposed by the Government experts was maintained. It was also agreed that a section on *communication* between management and workers and among workers was an important component of the code, but at the request of the Employer experts, provisions on “formal or informal, temporary or permanent” groups of workers and on opportunities for workers to contribute ideas in work planning and organizations were dropped. A Government expert regretted that the reference to “ideas” was not retained. On the proposal of the

Worker experts, a point was added concerning workers' responsibility to report acts of workplace violence.

Planning and implementation

34. The Meeting accepted proposals by the Employer experts to change “evaluate” to “review” so as to avoid an overly broad approach, to replace “incidents” by “acts” and to slightly modify more detailed indicators on identification and assessment of the nature and magnitude of workplace violence. With these changes, the Meeting approved sections on *review* and the *current situation*.
35. With regard to *risk assessment*, the Worker experts proposed eliminating references to what was meant by “aggressive body language” and to the distinction between “internal” and “external” violence, both of which were accepted by the Meeting. The Employer experts proposed to eliminate any reference to protocols for “audits” and “appropriate models” as components of risk assessment. Audits and models were variously too prescriptive, difficult to implement and an administrative nightmare, and the Meeting accepted these proposals. Further proposals were made by the Employer experts to limit different types of workplace violence by changing the definition of behaviour to include “intentional”, as it was important to narrow down the type of unacceptable behaviour, and to eliminate descriptions of “harm” and “violent abuse”, which did not need elaboration. It was agreed not to include “intentional”, to refer to “intense ongoing violent abuse” and to insert a reference to “vulnerable groups”. A request by Government experts to include children and young persons in quotation marks was not accepted since no specific group should be singled out, and child labour was addressed by other ILO instruments. On the proposal of the Worker experts, the Meeting did agree to include “harassment” along with mobbing, bullying, racial and sexual harassment in description of violent abuse, as it was of special relevance to services sectors. The Secretary-General offered a clarification that the formulation would de facto cover harassment as a form of workplace violence.
36. On the proposals of the Employer experts, who pointed out that employers would have to assume the burden of this responsibility, the Meeting agreed on *recording acts of workplace violence* as opposed to “workplace hazards and risks”, to modify the kinds of workplace violence to be recorded in terms of “acts” as the basis for identifying patterns and trends, to limit review to employers as opposed to also including workers and workers' representatives, and to strike references to staff turnover as an indicator to be recorded. *Recording at sectoral, national and international levels* was agreed with the following changes: without reference to “notification”; with a change from “data” to “statistics”; and with the addition of a reference to privacy and confidentiality; the latter points met the concerns of the Employer experts that individuals should not be identified, and that only aggregate data should be collected.
37. The Government experts introduced new text on implementation drawn from the ILO's widely accepted health and management system approach. After much discussion in which the Employer experts objected to an overly prescriptive text which could not be implemented by small enterprises, and the Worker and Government experts insisted that guidance and not impositions were being suggested, the Meeting agreed to limit the text to a narrower reference to adequate implementation of a management system and response on workplace violence without mention of “prevention”.
38. With regard to *control measures*, the Meeting agreed to a section on *developing strategies to tackle violence at the workplace* with minor modifications, and to adopt proposals on *cooperation and partnership on combating workplace violence*. Accordingly, the term “advocacy” was replaced by “raising awareness” to satisfy objection from Employer

experts, while responding to the importance attached to public sensitization in the code by Worker experts. Other changes to reflect the consistent use of “workplace violence” were also incorporated to ensure coherence; it was decided to eliminate the reference to codes of conduct, which the Employer experts considered ineffective, and a reference to partnerships with stakeholder organizations and local communities was dropped.

39. The Meeting agreed to replace *improving work organization* with *preventive measures*, which concerned *communication* and *work practices*. Proposals by the Employer experts to reformulate the sections so as to avoid repetitiveness, excessive prescription and too much operational detail were accepted by the Government and Worker experts, while maintaining the level of technical detail – the “pool of good ideas” – necessary for a good code of practice. In response to concerns of the Government experts that the text had been watered down too much, it was emphasized that that the listed measures were only an indicative menu of good preventive measures rather than a comprehensive list of absolute solutions, and that the reformulation underlined their optional nature.
40. With regard to *improving the work environment*, the Meeting agreed to simplified texts on the *physical environment* and *workplace security design*. The changes reflected concerns of Employer experts to reflect the emphasis on change rather than improvement, and the importance of “access control systems”, while meeting the preoccupations expressed by Worker experts on the need for consultation prior to installation of security systems and the importance of collective security schemes. Worker experts concurred with their Government counterparts that the revised text was too diluted and did not give as much guidance as was provided in the previous formulation; it was agreed upon in the interests of time.
41. *Incident preparedness and response* was agreed on by the Meeting with changes made at the request of the Employer experts as follows: deletion of references to the appendices which would no longer appear in the code; rendering the *response plans* less prescriptive, but also referring to a modified proposal to include “at the level of post-traumatic stress disorder” originally offered by the Worker experts; and altering the text on *management support* to delete “immediate and continuing support” to affected workers, the provisions to “assist with costs” and “address legal issues” in minimizing the impact of workplace violence, “support” to the immediate families of affected workers, and follow-up to cases. Internal investigations were also qualified by inserting “if necessary”.
42. The section on *medical and other interventions* was revised to eliminate mentioning “stress” as proposed by the Employer experts, as were references to “psychological treatment” and “working unsocial hours”, deemed to be too subjective. The Meeting also agreed to delete “short term” before *support*, and to add examples highlighting “counselling and psychological treatment” in the text at the request of the Worker experts. The section on *debriefing* was similarly revised to remove the reference to “critical incidents or post-traumatic stress”, while the text under *mitigation* was changed at the request of the Employer experts to ensure consistency on workplace violence, remove a reference to “related problems” and include a reference to “occupational safety and health systems”.
43. On the proposal of the Government experts to reintroduce text on *grievance and disciplinary procedures*, the Meeting agreed to the proposal of the Employer experts to delete most of the points of the original draft. These changes included removing references to “sexual harassment, bullying and mobbing”, “informal resolution measures” “formal complaint mechanisms” and “disciplinary sanctions”, but retaining the text in the point on a “fair and equitable process” which was judged to encapsulate these points, and adding to it a last sentence to make clear that retaliation against victims or witnesses should not be tolerated.

-
44. On the suggestion of Government experts, it was agreed to revise the text on *privacy and confidentiality*; adding the phrase “in accordance with national laws and regulations” so as to respect provisions of data protection acts; and deleting the reference to special care for victims of sexual offences, which was felt to be inappropriate as it did not relate to workplace violence.

Monitoring and review

45. The Government experts proposed, and the Meeting agreed, to insert a text recommending the conduct of periodic reviews so as to measure effectiveness of workplace violence management systems, how the reviews should be conducted and communicated to “affected parties”. It was also agreed to revise sections on *monitoring and evaluation of workplace violence prevention policies and organizational learning on issues related to violence*. Employer experts argued that such guidance was not needed for larger organizations, and not helpful for smaller ones who lacked the resources to implement such measures. The Worker experts strongly disagreed, as even larger organizations struggled to monitor and evaluate efficiently. The Meeting agreed to maintain the guidance provisions in question, subject to replacing “on a continuous basis, and regular dissemination of” in the first point with the word “regular”.

ILO action

46. A possible text to cover *ILO action* suggested by the Worker experts, including promotion, further research and dissemination of best practices, was deemed unnecessary, as it was held that such action was already being undertaken by the International Labour Office as part of its ongoing activities.

Remaining issues

47. The Meeting decided that a new, shorter preface was required to reflect the substantial changes made to the original draft code of practice. The Meeting also decided that the appendices, including the bibliography, to the original draft code prepared by the ILO would not form a part of the code.
48. The Meeting further agreed that the Governing Body of the ILO should be informed that the experts discussed the issue of stress, and taking into account the complexity of the subject, as well as opposition by some experts, decided to limit guidance in the code to provisions dealing with workplace violence in service sectors and measures to combat this phenomenon. As a result, it was recommended that the ILO could consider undertaking further work on the general issue of workplace stress in services sectors.

Adoption of the code of practice and of the report

49. After examining the text of the draft code of practice on workplace violence in services sectors and measures to combat this phenomenon, the experts adopted the code of practice.
50. After examination of the draft report, the experts adopted it as amended. Thereafter, the experts adopted the report and the code of practice.

Geneva, 15 October 2003.

(Signed) Mr. F. Cruz,
Chairperson.

List of participants
Liste des participants
Lista de participantes

EXPERTS NOMINATED BY GOVERNMENTS
EXPERTS DÉSIGNÉS PAR LES GOUVERNEMENTS
EXPERTOS DESIGNADOS POR LOS GOBIERNOS

ALGERIA ALGÉRIE ARGELIA

M. Omar BOURAS, Sous-directeur de la prévention des risques professionnels, ministère du Travail et de la Sécurité sociale, ALGER

CANADA CANADÁ

Ms. Nancy HARWOOD, Senior Policy Director, Workers' Compensation Board of British Columbia, VANCOUVER

DENMARK DANEMARK DINAMARCA

Ms. Jane M. RAVN, Head of Office, The Danish Working Environment Authority, COPENHAGEN

GERMANY ALLEMAGNE ALEMANIA

Mr. Peter ULLSPERGER, Federal Institute for Occupational Safety and Health, BERLIN

Adviser/Conseiller technique/Consejero técnico

Mr. Valentin KLOTZ, Social Councillor, Permanent Mission of Germany in Geneva

JAPAN JAPON JAPÓN

Mr. Takanori KAWASHIMA, Director, International Office, Planning Division, Department of Industrial Safety and Health, Labour Standards Bureau, Ministry of Health, Labour and Welfare, TOKYO

MALAYSIA MALAISIE MALASIA

Mr. Mohtar MUSRI, Director UNDP/DOSA Project, Department of Occupational Safety and Health, Ministry of Human Resources, SELANGOR

Adviser/Conseiller technique/Consejero técnico

Mr. Wan Setapa WAN ZULKFLI, Labour Attaché, Permanent Mission of Malaysia in Geneva

MAURITIUS MAURICE MAURICIO

Mr. Mariahven CAREMBEN, Senior Labour and Industrial Relations Officer, Ministry of Labour and Industrial Relations, RIVIERE DU REMPART

PERU PÉROU PERÚ

Sr. Juan NAVARRO PANDO, Asesor Viceministro de Trabajo, Ministerio de Trabajo y Promoción del Empleo, LIMA

PHILIPPINES FILIPINAS

Mr. Francisco S. CRUZ, Assistant Secretary, Department of Labor and Employment, MANILA

Adviser/Conseillère technique/Consejera técnica

Ms. Yolanda PORSchWITZ, Labor Attaché, Permanent Mission of the Philippines in Geneva

SOUTH AFRICA AFRIQUE DU SUD SUDÁFRICA

Adviser/Conseillère technique/Consejera técnica

Ms. Lindiwe LUSENGA, Labour Counsellor, Permanent Mission of South Africa in Geneva

UNITED KINGDOM ROYAUME-UNI REINO UNIDO

Prof. Colin MACKAY, Chief Psychologist, Health and Safety Executive, Human Factors Unit, Better Work Environment Division, MERSEYSIDE

UNITED STATES ETATS-UNIS ESTADOS UNIDOS

Ms. Patricia D. BILES, Workplace Violence Program Coordinator/OSHA, United States Department of Labor (USDOL/OSHA), WASHINGTON

Adviser/Conseiller technique/Consejero técnico

Mr. John CHAMBERLIN, Labor Attaché, United States Permanent Mission in Geneva

**EXPERTS NOMINATED BY THE EMPLOYERS
EXPERTS DÉSIGNÉS PAR LES EMPLOYEURS
EXPERTOS DESIGNADOS POR LOS EMPLEADORES**

Sr. Carlos M. ALDAO-ZAPIOLA, Presidente Comisión Recursos Humanos, Director de Relaciones y Comunicación, Unión Industrial Argentina - Grupo FORTABAT, BUENOS AIRES

M. Saleh Mweke Marc ATIBU, directeur du département social, Fédération des entreprises du Congo, KINSHASA/GOMBE

Mr. Garry BRACK, Chief Executive, Employers FIRST, SYDNEY

Ms. Deborah CANNAVINO, Attorney, Tyler Cooper and Alcorn, LLP, STAMFORD, United States

Mr. Normand CÔTÉ, Director, Employee Relations, Bank of Montreal Financial Group, TORONTO, Ontario

Mr. Kris DE MEESTER, Adviser, Health and Safety Affairs, Belgian Federation of Enterprises, BRUSSELS

Sr. Pablo GOMEZ ALBO, Director de Asuntos Laborales, Confederación Española de Organizaciones Empresariales (CEOE), MADRID

Mr. Miroslav JIRÁNEK, Director of the Municipal Hospital in Litomerice, Association of Czech and Moravian Hospitals, LITOMERICE

M. Antoine MONTANT, responsable des affaires sociales, Fédération des entreprises de propriété et services associés, VILLEJUIF

Mr. Shahbaz MUNIR, General Manager, Human Resources, Kohinoor Weaving Mills Ltd., DISTRICT KASUR, Pakistan

Mr. Anders Jost PEDERSEN, Adviser, Safety and Health, Danish Employers' Confederation, COPENHAGEN

Ms. Bongiwe RADEBE, Health Service Manager, Royal Swaziland Sugar Corporation, Swaziland Federation of Employers, SIMUNYE, Swaziland

EXPERTS NOMINATED BY THE WORKERS
EXPERTS DÉSIGNÉS PAR LES TRAVAILLEURS
EXPERTOS DESIGNADOS POR LOS TRABAJADORES

Ms. Frédérique BONI, Education International, BRUSSELS

Ms. Sarah DE JONG, Human Rights and Safety Officer, International Federation of Journalists, BRUSSELS

Mr. Subramania ESWARAN, General Secretary, All India Primary Teachers' Federation, NEW DELHI

Ms. Danielle LEGAULT, Service Employees International Union, Syndicat québécois des employées et employés de services (SQEES), MONTREAL Québec

Mr. Poovendran (Peter) ODAYAN, Emergency Care Practitioner, Emergency Medical and Rescue Services, DURBAN

Sr. Percy OYOLA PALOMA, Secretario General, Coordinadora Latino Americana de Trabajadores de los Servicios Públicos (CLATSEP), SANTAFE DE BOGOTA

Advisers/Conseiller technique/Consejero técnico

Sr. William Huevo MARTINEZ, tercer Vicepresidente - CLATSEP, SAN SALVADOR

Mr. Jon RICHARDS, UNISON, LONDON

Mr. Doug RUSSEL, Health and Safety Officer, Union of Shop, Distributive and Allied Workers (USDAW), MANCHESTER

Mr. James SAUBER, Research Director, National Association of Letter Carriers (NALC), WASHINGTON

Ms. Ulrike TESKE, Referatsleiterin Arbeits - und Gesundheitsschutzpolitik, Vereinte Dienstleistungsgewerkschaft (VERDI), BERLIN

Ms. Irmeli VUORILUOTO, Officer, Tehy Ry, Union of Health and Social Care Services, TEHY, Finland

M^{me} Habiba ZAHI, membre du bureau exécutif de la C.D.T., Confédération démocratique du Travail, CASABLANCA

OTHERS
AUTRES
OTROS

REPRESENTATIVES OF MEMBER STATES PRESENT AT THE SITTINGS
REPRÉSENTANTS D'ÉTATS MEMBRES PRÉSENTS AUX SÉANCES
REPRESENTANTES DE ESTADOS MIEMBROS PRESENTES EN LAS SESIONES

IRELAND IRLANDE IRLANDA

Ms. Patricia MURRAY, Psychologist/Inspector, Health and Safety Authority, DUBLIN

KUWAIT KOWEIT

Mr. Jamal M.-F. AL-DOUSARI, Director of Legal Department, Ministry of Social Affairs and Labour, KUWAIT

LUXEMBOURG LUXEMBURGO

M. Henri THEISEN, attaché de direction, Inspection du travail et des mines, LUXEMBOURG

NORWAY NORVÈGE NORUEGA

Mr. Ola WINSVOLD, Senior Adviser, Direktoratet for Arbeidstilsyner, Norwegian Labour Inspection Authority, OSLO

POLAND POLOGNE POLONIA

Ms. Dorota ZOLNIERCZYK-ZREDA, Psychology Department, National Research Institute, Central Institute for Labour Protection, WARSAW

M^{me} Anna TOMCZYK, directeur du département, général Inspektorat du travail en Pologne, VARSOVIE

SWEDEN SUÈDE SUECIA

Ms. Annika HULTIN, Principal Administrative Officer, Swedish Work Environment Authority, SOLNA

SWITZERLAND SUISSE SUIZA

Dr. Alain KIENER, conseiller en médecine du travail, secrétariat d'Etat à l'Economie (SECO), BERNE

ZIMBABWE

Mr. Kuziwa NYAMWANZA, Legal Adviser, Ministry of Public Service, Labour and Social Welfare, HARARE

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

World Health Organization (WHO)
Organisation mondiale de la santé
Organización Mundial de la Salud

Ms. Evelyn KORTUM-MARGOT, Occupational and Environmental Health, Department of Protection
of the Human Environment, GENEVA

REPRESENTATIVES OF NON-GOVERNMENTAL INTERNATIONAL ORGANIZATIONS
REPRÉSENTANTS D'ORGANISATIONS INTERNATIONALES NON GOUVERNEMENTALES
REPRESENTANTES DE ORGANIZACIONES INTERNACIONALES NO GUBERNAMENTALES

Education International
Internationale de l'éducation
Internacional de la Educación

Mr. Robert HARRIS, Senior Consultant, NYON

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

Mr. Dan CUNNIAH, Director, Geneva Office, GENEVA
Ms. Anna BIONDI, Assistant Director, Geneva Office, GENEVA

International Commission on Occupational Health (ICOH)
Commission internationale de la santé du travail
Comisión Internacional de Medicina del Trabajo

Mr. Renato GILIOLI, MILANO

International Council of Nurses
Conseil international des infirmières
Consejo Internacional de Enfermeras

Ms. Mireille KINGMA, Consultant, Nursing and Health Policy, GENEVA

International Federation of Air Traffic Controllers' Associations (IFATCA)
Fédération internationale des associations de contrôleurs du trafic aérien
Federación Internacional de las Asociaciones de Directores del Tráfico Aéreo

Ms. Sophie BILLAUD, YVERDON-LES-BAINS

International Federation of Business and Professional Women
Fédération internationale des femmes de carrières libérales et commerciales
Federación Internacional de Mujeres de Negocios y Profesionales

Ms. Karin KAUSCH, CULLY

International Federation of Employees in Public Service (INFEDOP)
Fédération internationale du personnel des services publics
Federación Internacional del Personal de los Servicios Públicos

Mr. Bert VAN CAELENBERG, Secretary-General, BRUSSELS
Mr. Michel BEUNEN, BRUSSELS

International Federation of Social Workers (IFSW)
Fédération internationale des assistants sociaux et assistantes sociales
Federación Internacional de Trabajadores Sociales

Ms. Margrit WINDLIN, LUZERN

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

Ms. Barbara PERKINS, Assistant to the Secretary-General, COINTRIN/GENÈVE
Mr. Jean DEJARDIN, Adviser, COINTRIN/GENÈVE

Public Services International (PSI)
Internationale des services publics
Internacional de Servicios Públicos

Mr. Alan LEATHER, Deputy General Secretary, FERNEY-VOLTAIRE

Union Network International

Mr. Philip BOWYER, Deputy Secretary-General, NYON

World Confederation of Labour
Confédération mondiale du travail (CMT)
Confederación Mundial del Trabajo

M. Hervé SEA, représentant permanent, GENÈVE