

INTERNATIONAL LABOUR ORGANIZATION
Sectoral Activities Programme

Final report

**Meeting of Experts to Adopt a Code of Practice on
Safety and Health in Agriculture**

Geneva, 2010

Copyright © International Labour Organization 2011
First edition 2011

Publications of the International Labour Office enjoy copyright under Protocol 2 of the Universal Copyright Convention. Nevertheless, short excerpts from them may be reproduced without authorization, on condition that the source is indicated. For rights of reproduction or translation, application should be made to ILO Publications (Rights and Permissions), International Labour Office, CH-1211 Geneva 22, Switzerland, or by email: pubdroit@ilo.org. The International Labour Office welcomes such applications.

Libraries, institutions and other users registered with reproduction rights organizations may make copies in accordance with the licences issued to them for this purpose. Visit www.ifro.org to find the reproduction rights organization in your country.

Meeting of Experts to Adopt a Code of Practice on Safety and Health in Agriculture. Final report.

ISBN 978-92-2-124611-4 (print)

ISBN 978-92-2-124612-1 (Web pdf)

Also available in French: *Réunion d'experts chargée d'adopter un recueil de directives pratiques sur la sécurité et la santé dans l'agriculture. Rapport final* (ISBN 978-92-2-224611-3), Geneva, 2011, in Spanish: *Reunion sobre el repertorio de recomendaciones practicas sobre seguridad y salud en agricultura. Informe final* (ISBN 978-92-2-324611-2), Geneva, 2011.

The designations employed in ILO publications, which are in conformity with United Nations practice, and the presentation of material therein do not imply the expression of any opinion whatsoever on the part of the International Labour Office concerning the legal status of any country, area or territory or of its authorities, or concerning the delimitation of its frontiers.

The responsibility for opinions expressed in signed articles, studies and other contributions rests solely with their authors, and publication does not constitute an endorsement by the International Labour Office of the opinions expressed in them.

Reference to names of firms and commercial products and processes does not imply their endorsement by the International Labour Office, and any failure to mention a particular firm, commercial product or process is not a sign of disapproval.

ILO publications and electronic products can be obtained through major booksellers or ILO local offices in many countries, or direct from ILO Publications, International Labour Office, CH-1211 Geneva 22, Switzerland. Catalogues or lists of new publications are available free of charge from the above address, or by email: pubvente@ilo.org.

Visit our website: www.ilo.org/publns.

Printed by the International Labour Office, Geneva, Switzerland

Contents

	<i>Page</i>
Introduction	9
Participants	9
Opening addresses.....	9
General discussion of the draft code	10
20. Outreach	10
20.1. Introduction.....	10
20.2. Competent authority	10
20.3. Social partners.....	10
20.4. Tripartite cooperation and collaboration.....	11
1. Objectives and scope	11
1.1. Objective.....	11
2. The characteristics of OSH in agriculture	12
2.1. Employment and OSH	12
2.2. Addressing the challenge	12
3. Developing a national framework for OSH in agriculture	12
3.1. National policy, systems and programmes for OSH.....	12
3.2. Competent authority	12
3.3. Labour inspectorates	13
3.4. Employers	13
3.5. Workers.....	14
3.6. Manufacturers and suppliers.....	15
3.7. Contractors and labour supply agents.....	15
4. Occupational safety and health management systems.....	15
4.1. OSH management systems	15
4.2. Hazard identification and risk assessment	15
4.3. Planning and implementation controls.....	16
4.4. Monitoring, evaluation and improvement.....	16
5. Competence, education and training	16
6. Contingency and emergency preparedness.....	16
7. Machinery and work equipment safety.....	17
7.1. Introduction.....	17
7.2. Tractors	17
7.3. Other agricultural machinery, equipment and tools.....	19
7.4. Control of hazards created by energy sources	20
Checklists.....	21
8. Ergonomics and the handling of materials	21
8.1. Introduction.....	21
8.2. Hazard description	21

8.3.	Ergonomic control strategies	22
9.	Chemicals	24
9.1.	Introduction.....	24
9.2.	Hazard description	25
9.3.	Control strategies	25
9.4.	Transport, storage and disposal of pesticides.....	27
9.5.	Exposure during pesticide handling.....	27
9.6.	Exposure during re-entry	28
9.7.	Medical and health surveillance of workers.....	29
9.8.	Atmospheric and environmental control.....	29
10.	Dusts and other particulate matter and other biological exposures	30
10.1.	Summary	30
10.2.	Dusts	30
10.3.	Animal wastes.....	31
10.4.	Zoonoses	32
10.5.	Needle stick injuries and sharp exposures	32
10.6.	Injuries due to wild animals.....	33
10.7.	Vector-borne diseases and parasitic infections in the agricultural environment.....	34
10.8.	The use of PPE.....	34
11.	Noise.....	34
11.1.	Introduction.....	34
11.2.	Hazard description	34
11.3.	Risk assessment	34
11.4.	Engineering controls	35
11.5.	Safe working systems and procedures and the use of PPE	35
11.6.	Workers health surveillance, training and information.....	35
12.	Vibration.....	35
12.1.	Introduction.....	35
12.2.	Hazard description	35
12.3.	Risk assessment	35
12.4.	Engineering controls	35
12.5.	Safe working systems and procedures and PPE.....	35
12.6.	Workers' health surveillance, training and information	36
13.	Agricultural installations	36
13.1.	Summary	36
13.2.	Risk assessment	36
13.3.	Design, construction and maintenance.....	36
13.4.	Slips, trips and falls.....	36
13.5.	Respiratory hazards.....	37
13.6.	Farm workshop safety.....	37
13.7.	Asbestos and insulation wools	37
13.8.	Fire safety.....	38
13.9.	Spontaneous combustion	38
13.10.	Animal handling.....	38

13.11.	Confined spaces	38
13.12.	Machinery and equipment.....	39
14.	Transport of persons, equipment and materials.....	39
14.1.	General.....	39
14.2.	Hazard identification.....	39
14.3.	Control strategies	39
14.4.	Safe transport on public roads.....	40
15.	Animal production.....	40
15.1.	Animal handling	40
15.2.	Hazard description	40
15.3.	Risk assessment	40
15.4.	Elimination of the hazard.....	40
15.5.	Control of the hazard through engineering controls	41
15.6.	Minimization of hazards by means of systems and protocols	41
15.7.	The use of PPE.....	41
16.	Weather and the environment.....	41
16.1.	Weather and environmental factors	41
16.2.	Thermal exposure	41
16.3.	Other environmental exposure.....	42
17.	Personal protective equipment (PPE).....	42
17.1.	General provisions	42
17.2.	Helmets and other head protection	43
17.3.	Face and eye protection	43
17.4.	Upper and lower limb protection	43
17.5.	Respiratory protective equipment (RPE).....	43
17.6.	Hearing protection	43
17.7.	Protection from falls from height.....	43
17.8.	Hygiene facilities and decontamination.....	43
18.	Welfare facilities	44
18.1.	Water.....	44
18.2.	Toilets	44
18.3.	Food services	44
18.4.	First aid and medical care	44
18.5.	Temporary shelter	44
18.6.	Housing.....	44
18.7.	Day-care facilities	45
	The checklist.....	45
19.	Workplace wellness programmes	45
19.1.	Social protection	45
19.2.	Working hours	45
19.3.	Alcohol- and drug-related problems	45
19.4.	HIV/AIDS.....	45
19.5.	Workplace violence, harassment and bullying	45
19.6.	Smoking at work.....	46

Glossary	46
Bibliography.....	46
Appendices.....	46
Adoption of the code.....	46
1. Objectives and scope.....	47
2. The characteristics of OSH in agriculture.....	47
3. Developing a national framework for OSH in agriculture.....	47
5. Competence, education and training.....	48
6. Personal protective equipment (PPE)	48
7. Contingency and emergency preparedness	48
8. Machinery and work equipment safety.....	48
9. Ergonomics and the handling of materials.....	48
10. Chemicals.....	49
Chapter 10.....	49
Chemicals.....	49
Chapter 11	49
Table 11.4, page 101.....	50
Table 11.3, page 98.....	50
Chapter 12.....	50
Chapter 14.....	50
Chapter 15.....	51
Chapter 20.....	51
Outreach.....	72
Glossary	51
“Incident”, page 176	51
“Point of balance”, page 177	51
“Subsistence farming”, page 178.....	51
Bibliography.....	52
Appendices.....	52
Appendix 6.....	52
Appendix on sexual harassment.....	53
Final adoption of the code.....	53
Evaluation questionnaire	55
List of participants.....	59

Report of the discussion

Introduction

1. At its 307th Session (March 2010), the Governing Body decided to convene a second Meeting of Experts to consider a revised draft code of practice on safety and health in agriculture.

Participants

2. The meeting comprised five Employer and five Worker experts nominated by their respective groups, as well as five Government experts from Costa Rica, Kenya, South Africa, Thailand and United Kingdom.
3. A list of participants is attached to this report.

Opening addresses

4. The meeting was opened by Ms Elizabeth Tinoco, Director of the Sectoral Activities Department, who indicated her pleasure that the ILO was undertaking this important project. She welcomed the Chairperson, Dr Gunderson, the social partners and Government experts, as well as observers.
5. The Chairperson welcomed all the parties and indicated that a short time was available to discuss issues and prepare for the adoption of the report. He thanked all concerned for the time and effort involved. He stressed that the Meeting had a tight agenda and wished all a successful meeting.
6. Ms Tinoco indicated that the draft code of practice on safety and health in agriculture was prepared with a view to ensuring that the specifics of the draft code were compatible with all international labour standards. She indicated that, as a result of consultations, the text has been streamlined extensively to avoid as much as possible repetition and provide for ease of readability. She indicated that the goal was to improve the text, and the ILO had made the unusual step of calling a second meeting of experts, since it was expected that the code would be widely used. She was very confident that consensus could be reached and that the code could be adopted at the end of the five days of deliberations.
7. The Chairperson then called for reports from the social partners as to those elected to lead each group. These were as follows:

Government experts: Bernadine Cooney-West (United Kingdom)
Employer experts: Kenneth Worth (Canada)
Worker experts: Susan Murray (United Kingdom).

8. The Employer spokesperson said that his group wanted to see, at the end of the meeting, that a code be adopted with the common goal to make agriculture safer. The revised code should become a useful, sensible and easily readable document and a widely-used reference. The group wanted safety and health for all in agriculture.

-
9. The Worker spokesperson welcomed Dr Gunderson as Chairperson and Dr Dosman, as well as Ms Ann Herbert and the other members of the secretariat. She pointed out that her group was concerned that the word “must” should be used more often than it was in the draft code submitted. The code should also go beyond just being gender neutral. The Workers’ group wanted a section on sexual harassment to be included, perhaps as an appendix. The Workers’ group also wanted a dedication included at the start of the code and pointed to the ILO code of practice on safety and health in the iron and steel industry that had such a dedication. She expressed her group’s willingness to work on the exact wording. She also referred to the issue of child labour as being very important and asked that the code address the issue of freedom of association.
 10. The Government spokesperson indicated that she was pleased to see many improvements in the code and was looking forward to working to improve it further.
 11. An observer from the International Union of Food, Agricultural, Hotel, Restaurant, Catering, Tobacco and Allied Workers’ Associations (IUF) hoped for the Meeting to succeed in adopting a code, because agriculture was one of the most dangerous industries. The roles of government, industry and workers needed to be spelled out. Agriculture was essential in rural development. Workers’ rights to safety and health needed to be ensured as in other industries: the code should act as a guidance to that end. He referred to the need to protect women, in particular regarding reproductive health. He indicated his concern regarding the current drafting of the outreach chapter and, in particular, section 20.4 of the draft code. The implementation of the code should be in accordance with national law and practice, and should ensure the access of roving safety representatives to agricultural installations. He thanked all concerned and indicated that he was looking forward to adopting an effective code of practice.

General discussion of the draft code

20. Outreach

20.1. Introduction

12. The Worker spokesperson proposed that paragraph 20.1.6 should take account of the Internet and other evolving communications technologies. After some discussion, it was proposed to reword the whole of the paragraph, so that it read “Since this Recommendation was adopted, the use of TV, radio and the Internet has become widespread. Labour inspectorates are encouraged to make good use of evolving communications technologies to broadcast important messages about OSH to a wider audience.” This was agreed, and the remainder of section 20.1 was accepted without amendment.

20.2. Competent authority

13. Section 20.2 was agreed upon without changes.

20.3. Social partners

14. The Government spokesperson requested clarification of the requirement in paragraph 20.3.3(i) for employers to encourage their suppliers to promote safety and health amongst their own workers, and whether this meant suppliers of equipment or of labour or both.

-
15. After some discussion, the Employer spokesperson proposed adding the words “of goods and services” after the word “suppliers”, referring also to section 3.7, where the duties of contractors and labour supply agents were dealt with fully. The meeting accepted the proposed change and section 20.3 was agreed upon without further changes.

20.4. Tripartite cooperation and collaboration

16. The Worker spokesperson questioned whether paragraph 20.4.1 was consistent with ILO Conventions and proposed amending the paragraph so that the competent authority, employers’ and workers’ organizations “must” – rather than “should” – cooperate with each other.
17. The Employer spokesperson preferred the original wording and disagreed with the change, on the grounds that the code could only be a guideline and that there was no recourse if cooperation did not take place.
18. The Worker spokesperson proposed deleting paragraph 20.4.2 on the grounds that there were no employers’ roving safety and health representatives, as far as they were aware.
19. The Government spokesperson requested clarification of the term “regional or district safety and health representatives” in paragraph 20.4.3.
20. The Employer spokesperson agreed that further clarity was needed, adding that they also had concerns over the qualifications of such persons. With regard to paragraph 20.4.4, he expressed grave doubts as to whether it was appropriate to assign such powers to safety and health representatives. Recognizing that labour inspectorates did have legal powers to enter and inspect enterprises within their mandate, he affirmed that other organizations did not have the same rights, referring to concerns about biosecurity in the food production chain and other major issues.
21. The Government spokesperson was concerned about giving safety and health representatives powers of immediate access in the event of serious accidents, as permitted by paragraph 20.4.4, explaining that this could undermine the role of inspectors undertaking their own investigations.
22. The Employer spokesperson expressed the same concerns.
23. The Government spokesperson said that paragraph 20.5.2(i) should be inspirational and proposed adding the words “wherever practicable”, explaining that inspectors might not be able to attend trade fairs and exhibitions. This was agreed.
24. The rest of Chapter 20 was accepted without further amendment.

1. Objectives and scope

1.1. Objective

25. The Worker spokesperson proposed referring to migrant workers at the end of paragraph 1.1.1(d). This was agreed.
26. The Worker spokesperson proposed adding new wording to follow paragraph 1.1.1(e), to the effect that good workplace health and safety practice should be applied to all workers

regardless of age or gender. She also said that there should be a reference to ILO Convention No. 111. This was agreed.

27. The rest of Chapter 1 was agreed without amendment.

2. The characteristics of OSH in agriculture

2.1. *Employment and OSH*

28. The Worker spokesperson questioned the statement in paragraph 2.1.1 that more than a third of the world's labour force was employed in agriculture, implying that the figure was markedly higher. The statement would be checked by the Office. The Worker spokesperson proposed adding, in paragraph 2.1.3, an extra bullet point to refer to exposure to excessive noise and vibration. She also suggested that the final bullet point should include reference to weather conditions. This was agreed.

29. The Government spokesperson considered that, since subsistence farming was outside the scope of the code, the comparison with such in paragraph 2.1.2 was inappropriate. She proposed that the reference should instead be to "labour-intensive farming". This was agreed.

2.2. *Addressing the challenge*

30. The Government spokesperson suggested that, in paragraph 2.2.1, the main issue for labour inspectors was to do with effectiveness and resources, rather than simply about having adequate means of transport. It was accepted that this broader issue needed to be dealt with elsewhere in the code.

31. The Chairperson said that this and other parts of Chapter 2 would be reworded accordingly.

3. Developing a national framework for OSH in agriculture

3.1. *National policy, systems and programmes for OSH*

32. Section 3.1 was accepted without amendment.

3.2. *Competent authority*

33. It was agreed that the issue of resources for labour inspectorates should be dealt with in section 3.2, following earlier discussion regarding Chapter 2.

34. In respect of the requirement in paragraph 3.2.1 for the competent authority to formulate policy, etc., the Worker spokesperson proposed that they should do so in consultation with the employers' and workers' representatives. This was agreed.

35. The Worker experts proposed deletion of the words "consider whether to" in paragraph 3.2.6 since the pre-conditions for prohibition, restriction, etc. by the competent

authority were already given in the paragraph with its reference to serious hazards and unacceptable OSH risks.

36. The Employer spokesperson said that competent authorities could go no further than to consider action, given the voluntary nature of the code.
37. After further discussion, the Government spokesperson proposed replacing the words “consider whether to” with “have systems in place to”, and the Meeting agreed to this.
38. The rest of section 3.2 was agreed without changes.

3.3. Labour inspectorates

39. The Worker spokesperson proposed inserting, in paragraph 3.3.3(b), a reference to training in the recognition of hidden forms of child labour.
40. Government experts considered that referring to this very specific issue at this point would obscure other more significant OSH training needs, affirming that detection of hidden child labour would in any case be part of inspectors’ core training.
41. The Employer spokespersons were also opposed to changing the original text.
42. The Office suggested that the words “adequately trained” should be sufficient to capture the concerns of the Worker experts.
43. After further discussion, the Worker spokesperson withdrew their proposed amendment.
44. The rest of section 3.3 was agreed without change.

3.4. Employers

45. Paragraphs 3.4.1 and 3.4.2 were accepted but it was agreed that the wording of paragraph 3.4.1 could be improved. The Office agreed to give further consideration to this.

OSH policy

46. Paragraphs 3.4.3 to 3.4.5 were agreed without change.

OSH organization and arrangements

47. Paragraphs 3.4.6 to 3.4.10 were also agreed without change.

OSH committees

48. The Employer spokesperson requested clarification of the term “expert” in the second sentence of paragraph 3.4.11.
49. The Government spokesperson pointed out that the word was similar to “competent person”, a term that was defined in the glossary. Several suggestions were made for clarifying the text, including addition of the phrase “shall include competent persons such as” before the word “experts”.
50. The Meeting then considered the degree to which OSH training was provided for workers, and the composition of OSH committees, in terms of whether these should all be experts or whether this was a matter for different countries to decide. The issue of equity of

membership numbers between employers and workers was also raised, as was the issue of worker qualifications to serve on the committee. Different views were expressed and no consensus was reached. The Office would propose appropriate wording later in the Meeting.

51. Paragraph 3.4.12 was agreed without change.

Young workers

52. Paragraphs 3.4.13 to 3.4.15 were agreed without change.

3.5. Workers

53. The Worker spokesperson proposed that in the first line of paragraph 3.5.1, the word “should” be replaced with “shall”.

54. The representative of the ILO Legal Adviser said that, in general, the use of the word “shall” was appropriate in the context of ILO Conventions, but that “should” was commonly used in non-binding codes. If “must” was used in a code of practice, the legal status of the document nevertheless remained the same.

55. The Employer spokesperson recommended that the original text be kept, retaining the word “should”.

56. The Worker spokesperson then proposed that the word “should” be taken out entirely so that the text reads “workers in agriculture have the right ...”.

57. The representative of the Legal Adviser advised against this change and the Worker spokesperson requested a footnote in the code referring to Convention No. 184.

58. Paragraphs 3.5.2 to 3.5.5 were agreed without amendment.

59. The Government spokesperson suggested that there needed to be a mechanism for measuring the effectiveness of worker training programmes, which was the focus of the final sentence of paragraph 3.5.6. She proposed rewording the sentence so that it read “Where workers identify failures in training delivery or content, they should inform their employer and make recommendations to remedy those failures.” This was agreed.

60. Paragraphs 3.5.7 to 3.5.16 were agreed without change.

61. The Worker spokesperson proposed adding the words “or retaliation” after the word “discrimination” in paragraph 3.5.17. This was agreed.

62. The Worker spokesperson proposed deleting the word “should” in paragraph 3.5.19 so that it read “shall have the right”.

63. The Employer spokesperson disagreed with this, claiming that such a change would significantly alter the sense of the sentence.

64. The representative of the Legal Adviser advised retaining the original text with a footnote reference to Convention No. 184. This was agreed.

3.6. *Manufacturers and suppliers*

65. Paragraphs 3.6.1 to 3.6.4 were accepted without amendment.

3.7. *Contractors and labour supply agents*

66. Paragraphs 3.7.1 to 3.7.3 were accepted without change.

4. *Occupational safety and health management systems*

4.1. *OSH management systems*

67. The Worker spokesperson proposed that there should be a reference to prevention in paragraph 4.1.1, to which there was general agreement.

68. In a subsequent discussion, with regard to paragraph 4.1.1, the Government spokesperson proposed amplifying the first sentence so that it referred separately to the elimination of hazards and reduction of risks.

69. The proposed changes were agreed to by the Employer spokesperson.

70. However, the Worker spokesperson raised the issue of prevention as part of the approach to the elimination of hazards and reduction of risks, not only for paragraph 4.1.1 but also in paragraph 4.2.3. It was decided to replace the first sentence to include the notion of recognition and elimination of hazards, prevention and reduction of risk, and enhanced productivity.

71. Paragraphs 4.1.2 and 4.1.3 were accepted without change.

4.2. *Hazard identification and risk assessment*

72. The Worker spokesperson proposed that the first sentence of paragraph 4.2.1 referred to issues such as gender, age, disability and reproductive health and this was generally agreed.

73. The Government spokesperson queried the inclusion of the final sentence of the paragraph and it was agreed to place it under section 4.3.

74. The Worker spokesperson proposed including older workers in paragraph 4.2.2(c) and this was agreed.

75. With regard to paragraph 4.2.3, following subsequent discussion, it was decided that fabrication, installation, and commissioning should refer to plant and equipment, whereas handling and disposal should refer to materials. It was further decided that paragraphs (i) and (ii) would become (d) and (e).

76. With regard to paragraph 4.2.4, discussion centred around the statement in the second sentence that referred to many established methods and techniques for the purpose of risk assessment.

-
77. The Employer spokesperson indicated that the language in the checklist was not consistent with the language in paragraph 2.2.4 and proposed that alternate language be used, to which the Worker spokesperson agreed.
78. The Government spokesperson indicated in turn that there were various methods such as the checklists, and a number of approaches to accomplishing the same end. It was agreed that the secretariat would prepare a short text describing a step-by-step approach to risk assessment and would include a graphic illustration.

4.3. Planning and implementation controls

79. Paragraphs 4.3.1 and 4.3.2 were accepted without change.
80. The Worker spokesperson agreed with the tone of the statement, but did not agree with the term “last resort”.
81. The Government spokesperson explained that the statement including “last resort” ensured workers’ protection.
82. The Chairperson pointed out that paragraph 4.3.2 represented a hierarchy of control and that paragraph 4.3.3 should be regarded in that light.
83. The Worker spokesperson pointed out that they had not yet had a chance to fully review the material and may need to come back to this section.
84. The Government spokesperson indicated that there was information in the glossary, that additional wording around the hierarchy of control might be helpful, and that the table in paragraph 4.3.4 be moved to paragraph 4.3.3.
85. The Worker spokesperson proposed a detailed change to paragraph 4.3.3 but the Government spokesperson proposed yet another version, pointing out that there are several references to PPE in the various sections.
86. The Employer spokesperson pointed out that PPE is often part of a suite of provisions but is still important and useful. The secretariat will prepare a statement to this end.

4.4. Monitoring, evaluation and improvement

87. Paragraphs 4.4.1 and 4.4.2 were accepted without discussion.

5. Competence, education and training

88. This chapter was accepted without amendment.

6. Contingency and emergency preparedness

89. The Employer spokesperson reiterated that for the code to be practical and useful to governments and farmers it needed to be couched in terms of what “should” be done. He considered that there was a risk that governments and employers might ignore the code if it advised what “must” be done and affirmed that the text should always use the word “should”.

-
90. The Government experts were concerned that the code would not be adopted because of lack of agreement on this issue, leading to a lack of protection for workers. The code could not be legally binding and this status would not be altered because the text included the word “must”, but the Government group would be prepared to accept the draft code however it was worded on this particular point.
91. The Worker spokesperson, however, insisted that it was necessary to use the word “must” in some cases. She expressed the group’s concern that the draft text presented to the Meeting in 2009 included many requirements for what “must” be done, all of which had been changed to say what “should” be done. As precedents, they cited examples of previous ILO codes of practice that included requirements for what “must” be done. They proposed deferring discussion on the matter till later in the Meeting and this was agreed upon.

7. Machinery and work equipment safety

7.1. Introduction

92. The Government spokesperson thought that the first sentence in paragraph 7.1.3 needed rewording since the competent authority was not always able to establish such standards, and she proposed some new text. She also proposed deletion of the final sentence. This was agreed upon.
93. Other paragraphs under section 7.1 were agreed without change.

7.2. Tractors

94. The Worker spokesperson, supported by Government and Employer experts, said that there was a need to distinguish all terrain vehicles (ATVs) from tractors and proposed adding a new section which dealt specifically with ATVs. Although tractors and ATVs increasingly shared common functions, they were distinct and should be treated separately in the code.

7.2.1. Hazard description

95. The Government spokesperson said that use of the term “tree limbs” in paragraph 7.2.1.4 gave rise to some difficulties in translation and proposed substituting it with “branches”. This was agreed upon.
96. Other paragraphs in section 7.2.1 were agreed without change.

7.2.2. Risk assessment

97. The Government spokesperson said that paragraph 7.2.2.1 needed to be reworded to take into account the fact that ATVs were generally not designed to have rollover protective structures (ROPS) and seat belts fitted to them, and that it might actually be unsafe to fit them. In this regard, it was also necessary to consider the manufacturers’ instructions deciding this issue. New wording would be provided for this paragraph and this would be introduced under section 7.2.4 on engineering controls.
98. Other paragraphs in section 7.2.2 were agreed without change.

7.2.3. Elimination of the hazard

99. This was agreed without change.

7.2.4. Engineering controls

100. The Government spokesperson said that the words “where appropriate” should be inserted after the words “should ensure” in paragraph 7.2.4.1, for the same reasons as given above in connection with paragraph 7.2.2.1. This was agreed upon.
101. For the same reason, the Government spokesperson considered that the first sentence in paragraph 7.2.4.6 was unsuitable, explaining that the issue was one of training and competence rather than fitting ROPS.
102. The Worker expert from Australia mentioned a simple device that was being used for ATVs in his country, but such devices were unacceptable in other countries and manufacturers were still considering the issue.
103. The Government spokesperson proposed new wording for the paragraph, which also included the need to ensure that tyre pressures were maintained to the right level of inflation. This was agreed.
104. Other paragraphs in section 7.2.4 were agreed without change.

7.2.5. Safe working systems and procedures

105. The Employer spokesperson said that it would be very onerous for employers to ensure that operators were psychologically and physiologically capable of operating tractors or ATVs, as required by paragraph 7.2.5.3.
106. The Government spokesperson said that ATVs were usually designed for operators of specific anthropomorphic sizes, hence the reference to physiological capability.
107. However, both she and the Worker spokesperson agreed that the requirement to ensure that operators were psychologically capable was excessive, and it was agreed to delete that reference and retain the other. It was also agreed to reword the paragraph to say that ATVs should be of a suitable size for operators and vice versa.
108. The Worker spokesperson requested insertion of a reference to “rear-saddle” chemical tanks in the first set of examples given in paragraph 7.2.5.6; this was accepted.
109. The Employer spokesperson asked whether the “one seat–one rider” rule in paragraph 7.2.5.11 applied to the use of trailers or wagons for transporting persons as well as tractors. The Meeting agreed that it did not.
110. The Worker spokesperson proposed adding a further paragraph after paragraph 7.2.5.11 to say that children who were below the minimum working age must not be allowed to ride on tractors or ATVs.
111. The Government spokesperson agreed to this.
112. The Employer spokesperson agreed with the proposal, except to use the word “should” instead of “must”, so as to retain consistency with the rest of the code. It was agreed to leave the decision as to whether to use “must” or “should” in this additional paragraph until the Meeting had agreed how to proceed with this language issue more generally.
113. The Government spokesperson suggested shortening the final sentence of paragraph 7.2.5.14 by omitting the phrase that included a reference to the risk of entanglement.

-
114. However, a Worker expert explained that this risk needed to be included somewhere in the code.
115. The Employer spokesperson then proposed extending the same sentence so that it referred to other equipment in addition to PTO shafts, since there was risk of entanglement with many types of machinery. It was agreed to retain the original wording and to extend it as proposed by the Employer experts.

7.3. Other agricultural machinery, equipment and tools

7.3.1. Hazard description

116. With regard to paragraph 7.3.1.1, the Government spokesperson indicated her view that the term “many other tasks” at the end of the sentence be changed since it did not translate well into Spanish. However, the secretariat assured her that when the Spanish translation was conducted, this matter would be taken into consideration, and the Government spokesperson relented. The paragraph was agreed upon.
117. Paragraphs 7.3.1.2 to 7.3.1.6 were agreed upon.
118. The Government spokesperson proposed replacing the word “tractor” with “vehicle” in paragraph 7.3.1.7. This was agreed upon.

7.3.2. Risk assessment

119. Paragraph 7.3.2.1 was agreed upon without change.

7.3.3. Elimination of the hazard

120. The Government spokesperson proposed replacing the word “impossible” with “difficult” in paragraph 7.3.3.1. This was agreed upon.
121. Paragraphs 7.3.4.1 and 7.3.4.2 were agreed upon without change.
122. The Government spokesperson proposed adding the words “normally guarded in operation” in paragraph 7.3.4.3. In addition, she proposed that the second sentence in paragraph 13.6.3.2 be added as a closing sentence in paragraph 7.3.4.3. This was agreed upon.
123. The Government spokesperson also proposed that the entirety of paragraph 13.6.3.2 be moved to become paragraph 7.3.5.14, with the remaining items from paragraph 7.3.5.14 onward being renumbered as appropriate. This was agreed upon.
124. Paragraphs 7.3.4.4 to 7.3.4.6 were agreed upon without change.

7.3.5. Safe working systems and procedures

125. Paragraphs 7.3.5.1 to 7.3.5.5 were agreed upon without change.
126. The Government spokesperson proposed adding the words “maintained in an efficient state, in good repair and in good working order” in paragraph 7.3.5.6. This was agreed upon.
127. Paragraphs 7.3.5.7 and 7.3.5.8 were agreed upon without change.

-
128. The Government spokesperson proposed adding the words “The employer should ensure that” to the beginning of the first sentence in paragraphs 7.3.5.9, 7.3.5.10 and 7.3.5.11. This was agreed upon.
 129. Paragraphs 7.3.5.12 and 7.3.5.13 were agreed upon without change.
 130. The Government spokesperson proposed that the entirety of paragraph 13.6.3.2 be moved to become paragraph 7.3.5.14, with the remaining items from paragraph 7.3.5.14 onward being renumbered as appropriate. This was agreed upon.
 131. Paragraph 7.3.5.14 was renumbered to become paragraph 7.3.5.15 and was agreed upon without change.
 132. The Worker spokesperson proposed changing the word “must” with “should” in paragraph 7.3.5.15, renumbered to become paragraph 7.3.5.16. This was agreed upon.
 133. Paragraphs 7.3.5.16 and 7.3.5.17, now renumbered to become paragraphs 7.3.5.17 and 7.3.5.18, respectively, were agreed upon without change.
 134. The Government spokesperson proposed to move the examples in the middle of the sentence to the end of the sentence in paragraph 7.3.5.18, now renumbered to become 7.3.5.19.
 135. However, the Worker spokesperson proposed using a new sentence at the end of the paragraph to describe the examples. This was agreed upon.

7.3.6. The use of PPE (see also Chapter 17)

136. An Employer expert proposed that the term “residual risk” in paragraph 7.3.6.1, be defined under the category of risk assessment or in the glossary. The secretariat agreed to undertake this action.

7.4. Control of hazards created by energy sources

7.4.1. Hazard description

137. The Government spokesperson proposed to move the first sentence in the paragraph to become a clause in the second sentence after the words “energy sources” and be preceded by the words “such as” in paragraph 7.4.1.1. This was agreed upon.
138. Paragraph 7.4.1.2 was agreed upon without change.
139. The Worker spokesperson proposed a new paragraph 7.4.1.3 to embody the concept of unknown hazards resulting from energy and energy forms that are not known at the present time. This was agreed upon.

7.4.2. Assessment of risk

140. Paragraph 7.4.2.1 was agreed upon without change.

7.4.3. Elimination of the hazard

141. An Employer expert proposed that the term “impossible” be replaced with the term “difficult” in paragraph 7.4.3.1. In addition, the Employer expert proposed that the initials “SWP” be defined. This was agreed upon.

7.4.4. Engineering controls

142. Paragraphs 7.4.4.1 and 7.4.4.2 were agreed upon without change.
143. The Government spokesperson proposed to add the word “overhead” before the word “power” in the first sentence of paragraph 7.4.4.3, and she also proposed adding a new sentence at the end of the paragraph, alluding to marking of power lines.
144. The Worker spokesperson proposed adding the words “or cane harvesters” after the word “augers” in the second sentence. This was agreed upon.
145. An Employer expert suggested striking a subcommittee to deal with minor editorial changes, but the Government spokesperson and the Worker spokesperson disagreed. At this point, it was decided to continue dealing with the changes in the plenary session.

7.4.5. Safe working systems and procedures

146. The Employer spokesperson indicated that all of Chapter 7 was agreed by the Employer experts.
147. Paragraphs 7.4.5.1 to 7.4.5.11 were agreed upon without change.

7.4.6. The use of PPE

148. Paragraph 7.4.6.1 was agreed upon without change.

Checklists

149. A Worker expert proposed that a separate checklist be provided for ATVs and was willing to provide the list. This was agreed upon.
150. The Government spokesperson proposed that in the checklist for general machinery, in item (1) the word “decal” be replaced with the words “health and safety warning signs”. This was agreed upon.

8. Ergonomics and the handling of materials

8.1. Introduction

151. The Worker spokesperson pointed out that paragraph 8.1.1 referred to five ergonomic factors whereas there were only four. The text would be corrected. The Worker spokesperson also requested that in paragraph 8.1.2 the words “continuum from arduous to sedentary” should be replaced by “range of tasks”.

8.2. Hazard description

8.2.1. Routes of exposure

152. The Government spokesperson queried the source of the weight limit of 23 kg in paragraph 8.2.1.5, as this did not come from any known international standard. The Office would investigate this.

-
153. The Employer spokesperson said the word “unreasonable” in paragraph 8.2.1.10 implied a value judgement and proposed deleting it. After some discussion this was agreed upon.
 154. The Worker spokesperson proposed a text alteration in paragraph 8.2.1.11, omitting the word “predispose”, and this was agreed upon.
 155. The Government spokesperson said that the Spanish version of “non-neutral posture” in paragraph 8.2.1.11 was not clear. It was agreed that this would be addressed at the translation stage.
 156. The Worker spokesperson proposed deleting paragraph 8.2.1.12 on the grounds that this amounted to public health advice, which was outside the scope of this code. She noted that the paragraph had not been included in earlier drafts of the code. After some discussion the proposal was agreed upon. The Worker spokesperson considered that paragraph 8.2.1.13 implied some criticism of workers and should be deleted, with which the Government spokesperson agreed.
 157. The Employer spokesperson suggested retaining the paragraph with some rewording, since job dissatisfaction might contribute to musculoskeletal pain and injury.
 158. The Worker spokesperson added that stress and fatigue might also result. It was agreed to retain the paragraph with new wording and it would be left to the Office to provide this. Other paragraphs in this section were agreed upon without change.

8.2.2. Principal health effects

159. The source of the 23 kg weight limit was queried again, this time in connection with paragraph 8.2.2.1. Other paragraphs in this section were agreed upon without change.

8.2.3. Special risks to consider

160. The Worker spokesperson said that paragraph 8.2.3.3 should refer to “women” and not to “females”. This was agreed upon. The Worker spokesperson proposed rewording paragraph 8.2.3.4 so that it read “Excessive task rates or low piece-rates may increase the risk of workers contracting musculoskeletal disorder as they are forced to maximize their work pace”.
161. The Employer spokesperson could not agree to the use of the word “forced”. Several suggestions were made for rewording and it was agreed to accept the Worker experts’ proposal but to end the sentence after “musculoskeletal disorder”. The three other paragraphs in this section were agreed upon without change.

8.3. Ergonomic control strategies

8.3.1. General principles

162. The Worker spokesperson said that paragraph 8.3.1.2 should refer to “gender” instead of “sex”. This was agreed upon. She also proposed deleting “resort to” in the final sentence of paragraph 8.3.1.4. This was agreed upon. She proposed inserting “and their representatives” after “workers” in paragraph 8.3.1.5. This too was agreed upon. The other paragraphs in this section were agreed upon without change.

8.3.2. Elimination of ergonomic hazard through engineering controls or substitution

163. In paragraph 8.3.2.3, the Government spokesperson considered it was the competent authority's task to ensure that manufacturers took the measures stipulated, and she proposed some rewording.
164. The Employer spokesperson added that purchasers also had a duty in this respect, but it was pointed out that the measure listed subsequently in the paragraph would not be appropriate for a purchaser and it was decided only to refer to the role of the competent authority. This was agreed upon.
165. The Government spokesperson stated that in paragraph 8.3.2.4(c) an "ergonomically safe speed" was not defined, adding that it might be hard to do so. Alternative wording of "speed suitable for the task" was suggested instead.
166. The Worker spokesperson did not wish to restrict the list in paragraph 8.3.2.4 and proposed adding "and other products". This was agreed upon.
167. The Government spokesperson proposed that in paragraph 8.3.2.5 "suitable" should be inserted before "rehydration liquids" and "of drinking quality" after "including water". This was agreed upon. Other paragraphs in this section were agreed upon without change.

8.3.3. Control of ergonomic hazards through engineering and administrative minimization of impact

168. The Worker spokesperson proposed inserting "and their representatives" after "workers" in paragraph 8.3.3.4. This was agreed upon. Other paragraphs in this section were agreed upon without change.

8.3.4. Minimization of ergonomic hazard through information and training of workers

169. The Employer spokesperson said that the acronym "SWP" in paragraph 8.3.4.1(f) should be explained at some point in the text.

8.3.5. Minimization of ergonomic hazard through use of PPE

8.3.5.1. *General principles*

170. The Worker spokesperson agreed that PPE was used as a last resort, as paragraph 8.3.5.1.1 stated, but she proposed substituting the wording of paragraph 10.3.6.1 (regarding PPE) in place of it so as to achieve greater consistency on this issue. A lengthy discussion ensued, in which Employer experts explained that PPE was not actually used as a last resort in practice but often used in conjunction with other preventive measures. It was finally decided to reorder paragraphs 8.3.5.1.1 and 8.3.5.1.2 so that the principles in the latter were placed first. It was also agreed to amend the text so that it was clear that PPE should always be available to workers when required.
171. The Government spokesperson proposed adding a second sentence in paragraph 8.3.5.1.3 to the effect that PPE should be replaced in accordance with manufacturers' instructions.
172. An Employer expert said that such instructions were not always available and in any case could not be relied upon. After some discussion, it was agreed not to include such an addition.

173. The Worker spokesperson requested substitution of “must” for “should” in paragraph 8.3.5.1.6. Other paragraphs in this section were agreed upon without change.

8.3.5.2. *Minimization of the hazard*

174. The Worker spokesperson requested substitution of “must” for “should” at the top of paragraph 8.3.5.2.4 and in paragraph 8.3.5.2.4(b). She also requested the substitution of “or” for “and” in the first sentence.

175. Employer experts and Government experts had reservations about use of the word “or” since agricultural workforces were often widely dispersed and it was often necessary to use all means available to inform workers. It was finally agreed to use the term “and/or”.

176. The Worker spokesperson also proposed adding a last subparagraph (e) to paragraph 8.3.5.2.4, to say “when to replace PPE”. This was agreed upon. The Worker spokesperson requested addition of “and other body” before “hygiene” in paragraph 8.3.5.2.6. This was agreed upon. The other paragraphs in this section were agreed upon without change.

9. Chemicals

177. The Employer expert from the United States said that major advances had been made in agrochemical safety in recent years and he doubted whether it was true that the use of such chemicals posed serious health risks, as the current draft stated.

178. The Worker spokesperson wished to retain the wording of the current draft, since this reflected reality in the Worker experts’ view.

179. The Government spokesperson suggested emphasizing the control of agrochemicals, and after further discussion it was agreed to reword the introduction to read as “could pose serious risks ...”.

9.1. *Introduction*

180. The Worker spokesperson considered that paragraph 9.1.2 might imply that fertilizers were not hazardous when in fact they were, and she proposed some rewording.

181. An Employer expert insisted that many fertilizers were not hazardous and suggested that reference was made instead to fertilizers that had been classified as hazardous. However, others pointed out the difficulty with fertilizers that were hazardous but that had not yet been so classified.

182. The Worker spokesperson emphasized that care should be taken in selection of fertilizers.

183. It was agreed that the Office would provide some additional text in section 9.1 to take these issues into account and also the environmental impact of hazardous chemicals, currently addressed in paragraph 9.3.1.10.

184. The Worker spokesperson proposed replacing “or” with “and” in the second line of paragraph 9.1.6. This was agreed upon. She also proposed inserting “should be used” instead of “may be useful” in paragraph 9.1.7.

185. The Government spokesperson said that the original wording would allow technological development and it was agreed not to change the text. The other paragraphs in this section were agreed upon without change.

9.2. Hazard description

9.2.1. Routes of exposure

186. The Worker spokesperson suggested including a reference to paragraph 9.3.6.1 at the end of the paragraph in 9.2.1.3 to indicate that responsibility for providing adequate washing facilities rested with the employer. This was agreed upon. The other paragraphs in this section were agreed upon without change.

9.2.2. Principal health effects

9.2.2.1. *Acute health effects*

187. The Government spokesperson noted that in paragraph 9.2.2.1.7 paraquat was mentioned as having particularly disastrous and lethal effects, and added that this hazard should be highlighted by bringing it to the top of the section. She also stated that the competent authority had a role in banning its use, and that employers should be required to remove all stocks of the substance from their workplaces.

188. The Worker spokesperson asked how workers might know whether chemicals were hazardous and proposed deleting “which they have reason to believe might be harmful” from the final part of the last sentence in paragraph 9.2.2.1.7. This was agreed upon. The other paragraphs in this section were agreed upon without change.

9.2.2.2. *Chronic (long-term) health effects*

189. All paragraphs in this section were agreed upon without change.

9.2.3. Risks to special populations

190. The Worker spokesperson requested the substitution of “must” for “should” in the final sentence of paragraph 9.2.3.2, and again in paragraphs 9.2.3.5 (second sentence) and 9.2.3.6.

191. With regard to paragraph 9.2.3.2, the Employer spokesperson said that this was impractical but the Worker spokesperson insisted that “must” must be used in paragraph 9.2.3.1. The other paragraphs in this section were agreed upon without change.

9.3. Control strategies

9.3.1. General principles

192. The Government spokesperson proposed inserting “and other relevant leaflets” after “pesticide labels” in paragraph 9.3.1.4 since this was the only way of conveying information in some countries. The start of the second sentence would be modified accordingly. The other paragraphs in this section were agreed upon without change.

9.3.2. Elimination/substitution

193. Paragraph 9.3.2.1 was agreed upon without change.

-
194. The Employer spokesperson proposed modifying the first phrase of paragraph 9.3.2.2 so that it referred to pesticides, etc. that “have to be used”.
 195. The Government spokesperson did not accept the change, saying that there was a choice to be made and other measures could be used instead.
 196. The Worker spokesperson agreed with this.
 197. The Employer spokesperson instead proposed “Where pesticides ... are used”, which was agreed upon.

9.3.3. Engineering and administrative controls

198. The Worker spokesperson proposed replacing “as soon as possible” in paragraph 9.3.3.3 with “immediately” to ensure that employers took action immediately to remedy any defects found by an examination. Discussion then centred on who would undertake the thorough examination and test described in paragraph 9.3.3.2. As the text stood, it was believed that this would be the competent person, but it was also open to the employer to undertake such an examination or test. It was agreed that the Office would reword these paragraphs so as to take account of the discussion. The Worker spokesperson withdrew their proposal.
199. The Employer spokesperson proposed inserting “knowingly” before “allow” in paragraph 9.3.3.6, explaining that employers might not know when one of their workers became pregnant.
200. The Worker spokesperson proposed replacing the whole of the paragraph with “Pregnant or breastfeeding workers must not be exposed to pesticides”. After further discussion, it was agreed to accept a new paragraph which read “Employers should put in place procedures to ensure that pregnant or breastfeeding workers are not knowingly exposed to pesticides”. The other paragraphs in this section were agreed upon without change.

9.3.4. Information and training

9.3.4.1. *General principles*

201. The Employer spokesperson requested insertion of “known” before “hazards” in paragraph 9.3.4.1.1 and this was agreed upon.
202. The Worker spokesperson requested the substitution of “must” for “should”. The other paragraphs in this section were agreed upon without change.

9.3.4.2. *Review*

203. All paragraphs in this section were agreed upon without change.

9.3.5. Personal protection – All sections

204. The Worker spokesperson requested substitution of “must” for “should” in paragraphs 9.3.5.1.3, 9.3.5.1.4 (twice), 9.3.5.1.5, 9.3.5.1.7, 9.3.5.1.8, 9.3.5.2.3, 9.3.5.3.1, 9.3.5.3.3, 9.3.5.3.4, 9.3.5.4.1, 9.3.5.4.2, 9.3.5.4.3, 9.3.5.4.5 and 9.3.5.4.7.
205. The Employer spokesperson commented that modern PPE was so constructed that if it failed there would be no imminent threat to life. The Employer spokesperson considered that “RPE” in paragraph 9.3.5.4.5 should read “PPE”.

206. The Government spokesperson requested an addition in paragraph 9.3.5.4.9 to say that at the end of its working life PPE must be safely disposed of by the employer. This was agreed upon. The other paragraphs in this section were agreed upon without change.

9.3.6. Workplace and worker hygiene

207. The Worker spokesperson requested deletion of the reference to introducing protocols in paragraph 9.3.6.6, to simplify the requirement. She also requested adding a reference to applicable regulatory requirements at the end of the paragraph. The changes were both agreed upon. The other paragraphs in this section were agreed upon without change.

9.3.7. Emergency procedures and first aid

208. The Worker spokesperson requested substitution of “must” for “should” in paragraphs 9.3.7.1.1 and 9.3.7.2.1. The other paragraphs in this section were agreed upon without change.

9.4. *Transport, storage and disposal of pesticides*

209. The Government spokesperson proposed strengthening the final sentence of paragraph 9.4.1 so as to prohibit the transfer of pesticides into unlabelled containers. This was agreed upon. The Government spokesperson requested reordering of paragraph 9.4.2 so as to follow a logical sequence, and this was agreed upon.

210. The Worker spokesperson requested substitution of “must” for “should” in paragraph 9.4.4 on the grounds of public safety. They also proposed deletion of “in no event” in the final sentence and insertion of “must not”. The other paragraphs in this section were agreed upon without change.

9.5. *Exposure during pesticide handling*

9.5.1. Mixing and loading

9.5.1.1. *Hazard description*

211. Paragraphs 9.5.1.1.1 and 9.5.1.1.2 were agreed upon without change.

212. The Government spokesperson proposed adding the word “cloud” after the word “dust” in paragraph 9.5.1.1.3. This was agreed upon.

213. Paragraphs 9.5.1.1.4 to 9.5.1.1.9 were agreed upon without change.

9.5.1.2. *Control strategies*

214. Paragraphs 9.5.1.2.1 to 9.5.1.2.4 were agreed upon without change.

215. The Worker spokesperson proposed changing the word “should” with “must” in paragraph 9.5.1.2.5. This was agreed upon.

216. Paragraph 9.5.1.2.6 was agreed upon without change.

217. The Worker spokesperson proposed changing the word “should” with “must” in paragraph 9.5.1.2.7. This was agreed upon.

218. Paragraphs 9.5.1.2.8 to 9.5.1.2.10 were agreed upon without change.

219. The Worker spokesperson proposed adding the words “provided and” prior to the word “worn” in the first sentence of paragraph 9.5.1.2.11. This was agreed upon.

220. Paragraphs 9.5.1.2.11 to 9.5.1.2.13 were agreed upon without change.

9.5.2. Application

9.5.2.1. *Hazard description*

221. Paragraph 9.5.2.1.1 was agreed upon without change.

222. The Government spokesperson proposed adding an additional sentence after the last sentence in paragraph 9.5.2.1.2 that referred to the concept that an understanding of breakthrough times would aid in the selection of suitable PPE. This was agreed upon.

223. Paragraphs 9.5.2.1.3 to 9.5.2.1.9 were agreed upon without change.

9.5.2.2. *Control strategies*

224. Paragraphs 9.5.2.2.1 to 9.5.2.2.5 were agreed upon without change.

225. The Government spokesperson proposed adding an additional sentence after the existing paragraph 9.5.2.2.6 that referred to the concept that temperature and relative humidity be taken into account when selecting the time of the day and the duration of spraying. This was agreed upon.

226. Paragraph 9.5.2.2.8 was agreed upon without change.

227. The Worker spokesperson proposed changing the word “should” with “must” in paragraph 9.5.2.2.9. This was agreed upon.

228. Paragraphs 9.5.2.2.10 and 9.5.2.2.11 were agreed upon without change.

229. The Worker spokesperson proposed changing the word “should” with “must” in paragraph 9.5.2.2.12, and the Government spokesperson proposed adding an additional phrase after the existing paragraph which read “and should not be used.” This was agreed upon.

230. Paragraphs 9.5.2.2.13 to 9.5.2.2.21 were agreed upon without change.

9.6. *Exposure during re-entry*

9.6.1. Normal re-entry into sprayed areas

9.6.1.1. *Hazard description*

231. All paragraphs in this section were agreed upon without change.

9.6.1.2. *Control strategies*

232. All paragraphs in this section were agreed upon without change.

9.6.2. Early re-entry into sprayed areas

9.6.2.1. *Hazard description*

233. All paragraphs in this section were agreed upon without change.

9.6.2.2. *Control strategies*

234. All paragraphs in this section were agreed upon without change.

9.7. *Medical and health surveillance of workers*

9.7.1. General principles

235. All paragraphs in this section were agreed upon without change.

9.7.2. Use of results

236. All paragraphs in this section were agreed upon without change.

9.7.3. Keeping medical records

237. All paragraphs in this section were agreed upon without change.

9.7.4. Cholinesterase monitoring

9.7.4.1. *Decision to conduct cholinesterase monitoring*

238. All paragraphs in this section were agreed upon without change.

9.7.4.2. *Monitoring procedures*

239. Paragraph 9.7.4.2.1 was agreed upon without change.

240. The Worker spokesperson requested clarification of the word “handlers” in paragraph 9.7.4.2.2. After some discussion it was agreed that the Office would prepare a clarification to this effect.

241. Paragraphs 9.7.4.2.3 to 9.7.4.2.7 were agreed upon without change.

242. The Government spokesperson proposed adding an additional paragraph 9.7.4.2.8 referring to the concept that a record of monitoring should be kept in accordance with national standards and practice. This was agreed.

9.8. *Atmospheric and environmental control*

9.8.1. Aerial spraying and the off-target movement of pesticides

9.8.1.1. *Hazard description*

243. All paragraphs in this section were agreed upon without change.

9.8.1.2. *Control strategies*

244. Paragraphs 9.8.1.2.1 to 9.8.1.2.4 were agreed upon without change.

245. The Worker spokesperson proposed adding the words “have aerial spraying only when” prior to the word “wind” in the first sentence of paragraph 9.8.1.2.5. This was agreed.

246. Paragraphs 9.8.1.2.6 to 9.8.1.2.8 were agreed upon without change.

9.8.2. Protection of water sources and the general environment

247. All paragraphs in this section were agreed upon without change.

248. The checklists following Chapter 9 were agreed upon without change.

10. **Dusts and other particulate matter and other biological exposures**

10.1. *Summary*

249. Paragraph 10.1.1 in this section was agreed upon without change.

10.2. *Dusts*

10.2.1. Hazard description

250. Paragraph 10.2.1.1 was generally agreed upon; however, the Worker spokesperson and a Worker expert raised the issue of silica penetration of the skin of the feet as a hazard. The Worker spokesperson undertook to provide a statement on this issue for the Office for inclusion in paragraph 10.2.1.1. This was agreed upon.

251. Paragraphs 10.2.1.2 to 10.2.1.4 were agreed upon without change.

10.2.2. Risk assessment

252. All paragraphs in this section were agreed upon without change.

10.2.3. Elimination of the hazard

253. All paragraphs in this section were agreed upon without change.

10.2.4. Engineering controls

254. All paragraphs in this section, with the inclusion of table 10.1, were agreed upon without change.

10.2.5. Safe working systems and procedures

255. All paragraphs in this section were agreed upon without change.

10.2.6. The use of PPE

256. Paragraphs 10.2.6.1 to 10.2.6.3 were agreed upon without change.

257. Paragraph 10.2.6.4 in this section was agreed upon without change except with the addition of an Employer expert suggesting that the bracketed information (see section 8.3.5.2.1) be added at the end of the paragraph.

-
258. An Employer expert proposed that an additional sentence be added to paragraph 10.2.6.5 that addressed the concept stating that the use of PPE is the last phase of protection and it is not always completely effective. This was agreed upon.
259. An Employer expert proposed that table 10.2 be accepted as listed with the exception that the column showing “Approximate cost” be deleted. This was agreed upon.

10.3. Animal wastes

10.3.1. Hazard description

260. Paragraphs 10.3.1.1 to 10.3.1.3 were agreed upon without change.
261. An Employer expert suggested that paragraph 10.3.1.4 was acceptable with the exception that there appeared to be an inconsistency with table 10.1 with regard to levels of H₂S. The Office undertook to review this issue. This was agreed upon.
262. Paragraphs 10.3.1.5 and table 10.3 were agreed upon without change.
263. The Government spokesperson proposed adding an additional statement at the end of paragraph 10.3.1.6 referring to the concept that the infections referred to were zoonotic infections. This was agreed upon.
264. Paragraph 10.3.1.7 in this section was agreed upon without change.

10.3.2. Risk assessment

265. Paragraphs 10.3.2.1 and 10.3.2.2 were agreed upon without change.
266. The Worker spokesperson proposed changing the word “should” to “must” in paragraph 10.3.2.3. This was agreed upon.

10.3.3. Elimination of the hazard.

267. All paragraphs in this section were agreed upon without change.

10.3.4. Engineering controls

268. All paragraphs in this section were agreed upon without change.

10.3.5. Safe working systems and procedures

269. Paragraphs 10.3.5.1 to 10.3.5.5 were agreed upon without change.
270. The Worker spokesperson proposed changing the word “should” to “must” in paragraphs 10.3.5.6 and 10.3.5.7. This was agreed upon.
271. Paragraphs 10.3.5.8 and 10.3.5.9 were agreed upon without change.

10.3.6. The use of PPE

272. Paragraphs 10.3.6.1 to 10.3.6.3 were agreed upon without change.
273. The Worker spokesperson proposed changing the word “should” to “must” in paragraph 10.3.6.4. This was agreed upon.

10.4. Zoonoses

10.4.1. Hazard description

274. All paragraphs in this section were agreed upon without change.
275. An Employer expert suggested that the title to table 10.4 be altered to include that the list presented was given only as an example and was therefore not exhaustive. This was agreed.
276. In addition the Worker spokesperson proposed that leptospirosis be shown as being a hazard to pregnant women and that chlamydia be included in the table. This was agreed upon.

10.4.2. Risk assessment

277. All paragraphs in this section were agreed upon without change.

10.4.3. Elimination of the hazard

278. All paragraphs in this section were agreed upon without change.

10.4.4. Engineering controls

279. The paragraph was agreed upon without change.

10.4.5. Safe working systems and procedures

280. All paragraphs in this section were agreed upon without change, with the exception of paragraph 10.4.5.2 where the Worker spokesperson proposed changing the word “may wish to” to “should” and adding the words “at no cost to the worker”, and paragraph 10.4.5.5(e) where the Worker spokesperson proposed deleting the words “where this is needed” from the sentence. This was agreed upon.

10.4.6. The use of PPE

281. Paragraph 10.4.6.1 was agreed upon without change.
282. The Worker spokesperson proposed changing the word “should” to “must” in paragraph 10.4.6.2. This was agreed upon.

10.5. Needle stick injuries and sharp exposures

10.5.1. Hazard description

283. All paragraphs in this section were agreed upon without change.

10.5.2. Risk assessment

284. All paragraphs in this section were agreed upon without change.

10.5.3. Elimination of the hazard

285. The paragraph in this section was agreed upon without change.

10.5.4.Engineering controls

286. All paragraphs in this section were agreed upon without change.

10.5.5.Safe working systems and procedures

287. All paragraphs in this section were agreed upon without change.

10.5.6.The use of PPE

288. The Worker spokesperson proposed changing the word “should” to “must” in paragraph 10.5.6.1. This was agreed upon.

10.6. Injuries due to wild animals

289. The paragraph in this section was agreed upon without change.

10.6.1.Hazard description

290. The paragraphs in this section were agreed upon without change but the Worker spokesperson proposed a paragraph which would outline the risks caused not only by snake bites but from other animals like warthogs for example. She agreed to provide the Office with a new paragraph (10.6.1.3) on that topic.

10.6.2.Risk assessment

291. The paragraph in this section was agreed upon without change.

10.6.3.Engineering controls

292. All paragraphs in this section were agreed upon without change.

10.6.4.Safe working systems and procedures

293. The Worker spokesperson proposed changing the word “should” to “must” in paragraph 10.6.4.1, and adding the words “where possible” after the words “snake bites” in the second sentence. This was agreed upon.

294. The Worker spokesperson proposed beginning paragraph 10.6.4.2 with the phrase “Employers should keep”. In addition, an Employer expert suggested adding the words “according to national law and practice” at the end of the sentence. This was agreed upon.

295. Paragraphs 10.6.4.3 and 10.6.4.5 in this section were agreed upon without change, but the Worker spokesperson proposed to add words to the end of the sentence in paragraph 10.6.4.4 to the effect that workers be trained to respond appropriately in the event of a snake bite. This was agreed upon.

10.6.5.The use of PPE

296. The Worker spokesperson proposed changing the word “should” to “must” in paragraph 10.6.5.1. This was agreed upon.

297. The remainder of the paragraphs in this section were agreed upon without change.

10.7. Vector-borne diseases and parasitic infections in the agricultural environment

10.7.1. Hazard description

298. All paragraphs in this section were agreed upon without change.

10.7.2. Risk assessment

299. The first two paragraphs in this section were agreed upon without change except for the Worker spokesperson's suggestion to change the word "should" to "must" in paragraph 10.7.2.3.

10.7.3. Elimination of the hazard

300. All paragraphs in this section were agreed upon without change.

10.7.4. Engineering controls

301. All paragraphs in this section were agreed upon without change.

10.7.5. Safe working systems and procedures

302. All paragraphs in this section were agreed upon without change.

10.8. The use of PPE

303. The Worker spokesperson proposed changing the word "should" to "must" in paragraph 10.8.1. This was agreed upon.

304. The Worker spokesperson proposed changing the substance of paragraph 10.8.2 to embody the concept that where workers are at risk of splashing, employers must provide suitable PPE including boots, gloves, glasses and face shields and that the workers shall be obliged to use the PPE provided.

11. Noise

11.1. Introduction

305. Paragraphs 11.1.1 and 11.1.2, including table 11.1, were agreed upon without change.

11.2. Hazard description

306. Paragraphs 11.2.1 and 11.2.2 were agreed upon without change.

307. An Employer expert proposed that an additional paragraph be added as paragraph 11.2.3, that addressed the concept that noise is generally measured over an eight-hour exposure time and that work experiences of more than eight hours will reduce the allowable noise for that extended time frame. This was agreed upon.

11.3. Risk assessment

308. All paragraphs in this section were agreed upon without change.

11.4. Engineering controls

309. All paragraphs in this section were agreed upon without change with the exception of paragraph 11.4.4 where the Government spokesperson proposed adding an additional statement after the word “equipment” in the first sentence that read “as part of phased programme of maintenance”. This was agreed upon.

11.5. Safe working systems and procedures and the use of PPE

310. All paragraphs in this section were agreed upon without change with the exception of paragraph 11.5.1 where, on the one hand, the Government spokesperson proposed adding an additional statement after the word “high” in the first sentence that read “after engineering controls”.

311. On the other hand, the Worker spokesperson proposed a statement at the end of the sentence that read “in consultation with workers and their representatives”. This was agreed upon.

11.6. Workers health surveillance, training and information

312. All paragraphs in this section were agreed upon without change with the exception of a proposed new paragraph 11.6.6 where the Government spokesperson proposed adding an additional statement addressing the concept that the employer be obliged to keep records of audiometric testing for a period of 40 years, according to national law and standards.

12. Vibration

12.1. Introduction

313. All paragraphs in this section were agreed upon without change with the exception of paragraph 12.1.3 where the Government spokesperson pointed out that the word “vibration” had been omitted from the Spanish translation.

12.2. Hazard description

314. All paragraphs in this section were agreed upon without change.

12.3. Risk assessment

315. All paragraphs in this section were agreed upon without change.

12.4. Engineering controls

316. All paragraphs in this section were agreed upon without change.

12.5. Safe working systems and procedures and PPE

317. All paragraphs in this section were agreed upon without change.

12.6. Workers' health surveillance, training and information

318. All paragraphs in this section were agreed upon without change.

13. Agricultural installations

13.1. Summary

319. All paragraphs in this section were agreed upon without change.

13.2. Risk assessment

320. All paragraphs in this section were agreed upon without change.

13.3. Design, construction and maintenance

13.3.1. Hazard description

321. All paragraphs in this section were agreed upon without change.

13.3.2. Engineering controls

322. All paragraphs in this section were agreed upon without change with the exception of paragraph 13.3.2.2 where the Government spokesperson recommended word changes according to the concept that contractors should always use contracting firms that conform to requirements where they have been set out by the competent authority. In addition, the Government spokesperson also recommended a new paragraph 13.3.2.7 concerning the concept that racking and shelving should be appropriately managed to ensure stability and freedom from being struck by vehicles. This was agreed upon.

13.4. Slips, trips and falls

13.4.1. Hazard description

323. All paragraphs in this section were agreed upon without change.

13.4.2. Risk assessment

324. All paragraphs in this section were agreed upon without change.

13.4.3. Engineering controls

325. All paragraphs in this section were agreed upon without change.

13.4.4. Safe working systems and procedures

326. All paragraphs in this section were agreed upon without change with the exception of paragraph 13.4.4.7 where the Government spokesperson recommended adding a table with various international standards in addition to those listed for the American Society of Agricultural Engineers (ASAE). This was agreed upon and the Office will undertake to provide the table.

13.5. Respiratory hazards

327. All paragraphs in sections 13.5.1, 13.5.2, and 13.5.3 were agreed upon without change.

13.6. Farm workshop safety

13.6.1. Hazard description

328. All paragraphs in this section were agreed upon without change.

13.6.2. Risk assessment

329. All paragraphs in this section were agreed upon without change.

13.6.3. Elimination of the hazard and engineering controls

330. All paragraphs in this section were agreed upon without change with the exception of where the Government spokesperson recommended adding a new paragraph 13.6.3.10 with regard to lifting equipment. This was agreed upon.

13.7. Asbestos and insulation wools

13.7.1. Hazard description

331. The Worker spokesperson proposed deletion of paragraph 13.7.1.2 and moving the content to paragraph 13.7.1.1 to be inserted after the first sentence. The Worker spokesperson also proposed substituting the word “serious” for the word “important” in the first sentence of paragraph 13.7.1.1. This was agreed upon.

332. Paragraph 13.7.1.3 was agreed upon without change and became paragraph 13.7.2.

13.7.2. Risk assessment

333. This paragraph was agreed upon without amendment.

13.7.3. Elimination of the hazard and engineering controls

334. The Worker spokesperson proposed changing the word “should” to “must” in paragraphs 13.7.3.1 to 13.7.3.6, moving paragraph 13.7.3.6, to precede the original paragraph 13.7.3.1, appropriately renumbering all paragraphs. This was agreed upon. In the original paragraph 13.7.3.3, now renumbered to become paragraph 13.7.3.4, the Worker spokesperson proposed adding at the end of the last sentence the words “and protected against exposure”. See also chapter on PPE. This was agreed upon.

335. In original paragraph 13.7.3.4, renumbered to become paragraph 13.7.3.5, the Government spokesperson proposed to add the phrase “or where it is maintained safely in place” after the word “encapsulation” in the first sentence. This was agreed upon.

13.7.4. Safe systems of work and procedures

336. The paragraph in this section was agreed upon without change.

13.8. Fire safety

13.8.1. Hazard description

337. The paragraphs in this section were agreed upon without change except that the Government spokesperson proposed to add a new paragraph 13.8.1.4 concerning the risks from fertilizers, and thus the previous 13.8.1.4 became 13.8.1.5. This was agreed upon.

13.8.2. Risk assessment

338. The paragraph in this section was agreed upon without change.

13.8.3. Engineering controls and safe working procedures

339. The Government spokesperson proposed to conduct a major reorganization of this section by firstly moving paragraph 13.8.3.2 to the top of the page, thus becoming paragraph 13.8.3.1, and then truncating the former paragraph 13.8.3.1, now paragraph 13.8.3.2, after the word “possible”, and then beginning with a new (a) stating “use non-combustible building materials”, and renumbering all the remaining paragraphs by small case letters from (b) to (h). This was agreed upon.

340. The Worker spokesperson proposed changing the word “should” to “must” in the former paragraph 13.8.3.2, now paragraph 13.8.3.1. This was agreed upon.

341. Also, an Employer expert proposed an additional phrase be added to the former paragraph 13.8.3.5, now paragraph (d), that addressed the concept of flashing lights. This was agreed upon.

342. The Government spokesperson proposed in the former paragraph 13.8.3.8, now renamed as (g), that the words at the end of the paragraph “certified installer” be replaced by the words “competent person”. This was agreed upon. The Government spokesperson suggested that the last paragraph in the section be reviewed with regard to the Spanish translation, of which the Office took note.

13.9. Spontaneous combustion

343. All the paragraphs in this section were agreed upon without change.

13.10. Animal handling

344. All the paragraphs in this section were agreed upon without change.

13.11. Confined spaces

345. All the paragraphs in this section were agreed upon without change.

13.11.1. Hazard description

346. All the paragraphs in this section were agreed upon without change.

13.11.2. Risk assessment

347. All the paragraphs in this section were agreed upon without change.

13.11.3. Engineering controls and safe working procedures

348. All the paragraphs in this section were agreed upon without change with the exception of paragraphs 13.11.3.1, 13.11.3.6, and 13.11.3.10 in which the Worker spokesperson proposed changing the word “should” to “must”; and the Government spokesperson suggested that in paragraph 13.11.3.6 the words “to stay” be placed after the word “co-workers”. This was agreed upon.

13.12. Machinery and equipment

13.12.1. Hazard description

349. All the paragraphs in this section were agreed upon without change.

13.12.2. Elimination of the hazard and control strategies

350. All the paragraphs in this section were agreed upon without change.

351. All of the checklists at the end of Chapter 13 were agreed upon without change.

14. Transport of persons, equipment and materials

14.1. General

352. Both paragraphs in this section were agreed upon without change.

14.2. Hazard identification

353. The Government spokesperson noted that section 14.2 only covered vehicles used for transporting persons, equipment and materials. She proposed that beasts of burden should also be mentioned and provided some wording for a new paragraph 14.2.4. This also included a reference to Chapter 15 where the subject was dealt with more fully. The Meeting agreed to this addition.

354. Other paragraphs in this section were agreed upon without change.

14.3. Control strategies

14.3.1. Training and information

355. The Worker spokesperson requested substitution of “must” for “should” in paragraph 14.3.1.1.

356. Other paragraphs in this section were agreed upon without change.

14.3.2. Design considerations

357. The Worker spokesperson requested substitution of “must” for “should” in paragraph 14.3.2.1 and also proposed deleting “likely to be”.

358. The Government spokesperson proposed a new text after paragraph 14.3.2.6 to say that suitable helmets should be provided for drivers of ATVs without rollover protection. This was agreed upon.

359. Other paragraphs in this section were agreed upon without change.

14.3.3. Prevention and control

360. The Employer spokesperson considered that “fail-safe” in paragraph 14.3.3.7 should read “fail-to-safe”, and this was agreed upon.

361. Other paragraphs in this section were agreed upon without change.

14.3.4. Work organization

362. All paragraphs in this section were agreed upon without change.

14.4. Safe transport on public roads

363. All paragraphs in this section were agreed upon without change.

15. Animal production

15.1. Animal handling

364. All paragraphs in this section were agreed upon without change.

15.2. Hazard description

365. An Employer expert proposed replacing “or” with “and/or” before “during the mating season” in paragraph 15.2.5.

366. In paragraph 15.2.6 she also proposed referring to the “aggressive tendency” of a mother animal instead of its tendency to become aggressive. Both these changes were agreed upon.

367. The Government spokesperson proposed inserting a new paragraph after paragraph 15.2.7 about the temperamental problems of certain animals and how they should be controlled. She provided a comprehensive new text, which was agreed upon.

368. Other paragraphs in this section were agreed upon without change.

15.3. Risk assessment

369. The Government spokesperson proposed a new paragraph 15.3.4 about the risk of increasing unpredictable animal behaviour because of long working hours, and offered a new text. This was agreed upon.

370. Other paragraphs in this section were agreed upon without change.

15.4. Elimination of the hazard

371. An Employer expert proposed new wording in paragraph 15.4.3 to refer to control strategies in the animal breeding facilities. This was agreed upon.

372. The Government spokesperson proposed a new paragraph 15.4.4 about the selection of draught animals based on their temperament and the need for veterinary checks. This was agreed upon.

373. Other paragraphs in this section were agreed upon without change.

15.5. Control of the hazard through engineering controls

374. All paragraphs in this section were agreed upon without change.

15.6. Minimization of hazards by means of systems and protocols

375. All paragraphs in this section were agreed upon without change.

15.7. The use of PPE

376. All paragraphs in this section were agreed upon without change.

16. Weather and the environment

16.1. Weather and environmental factors

377. The Government spokesperson advised referring to “agricultural activity” in the first line of this section for the sake of consistency with the rest of the document. This was agreed upon.

16.2. Thermal exposure

16.2.1. Hazard description

378. An Employer expert said that this section should refer to the five main heat stress disorders, namely: heat stroke, heat exhaustion, heat syncope (fainting), heat cramps and heat rashes. This was agreed upon.

379. Otherwise, the paragraphs in this section were agreed upon without change.

16.2.2. Assessment of risk

380. All paragraphs in this section were agreed upon without change.

16.2.3. Control strategies

16.2.3.1. Training and information

381. All paragraphs in this section were agreed upon without change.

16.2.3.2. Work organization

382. The Worker spokesperson proposed replacing “sex” with “gender” in paragraph 16.2.3.2.1, and this was agreed upon.

16.2.4. Thermal comfort: Heat stress

383. The Government spokesperson thought that the reference to canteens in paragraph 16.2.4.2.7 should also refer to drinking bottles. She offered some new text, saying that further details were given in Chapter 18. This was agreed upon.

384. Other paragraphs in this section were agreed upon without change.

16.2.5. Thermal comfort: Cold stress

385. The Government spokesperson proposed replacing “to dermatological areas” with “by skin exposure” in paragraph 16.2.5.2.2.1 since this specified risk more clearly. This was agreed upon.

386. The Worker spokesperson proposed a new paragraph 16.2.5.2.2.1(f) about providing adequate rest periods for workers exposed to inclement weather conditions, to tie in with other changes to the text. This was agreed upon.

387. Other paragraphs in this section were agreed upon without change.

16.3. Other environmental exposure

16.3.1. Ultraviolet light (UV) radiation

388. The Government spokesperson said that none of the Government experts were aware of any UV exposure standards referred to in paragraph 16.3.1.3.2(c). An Employer expert said that such standards were in fact established by health institutions such as the American Cancer Society. The Office agreed to provide some more data in tabular form.

389. The Worker spokesperson questioned how workers could carry out their own skin checks in practice (paragraph 16.3.1.4.1.1(e)).

390. The Government spokesperson said that some national guidance existed on how to do this and the Employer spokesperson thought that medical associations would also be able to give advice. It was believed that there might also be some ILO information on the subject. Relevant guidance would be referred to in a footnote to this paragraph.

391. Other paragraphs in this section were agreed upon without change.

17. Personal protective equipment (PPE)

392. The Government spokesperson observed that, given the importance of PPE, it could usefully be placed nearer to the beginning of the code, possibly designating it as Chapter 6. This would make more logical sense as PPE was mentioned in many of the chapters.

17.1. General provisions

393. The Worker spokesperson considered that placing paragraph 17.1.2 before paragraph 17.1.1 would provide better ordering, and this was agreed upon.

394. It was generally agreed that the wording of paragraph 17.1.12 was misleading, as manufacturers’ data concerning the length of time for which PPE might be used were not the only criteria to be taken into account when deciding when to replace PPE. An Employer expert said that there were many variables that affected how long PPE might be

properly used, such as the kinds of uses to which it was put, the environment, any misuse and other factors.

395. The Government expert said that the functional life of PPE should be determined by individual assessment for which the manufacturers' data may provide a helpful point of reference. It was agreed to reword the paragraph accordingly.

396. Other paragraphs in this section were agreed upon without change.

17.2. Helmets and other head protection

397. The Worker spokesperson requested substitution of "must" for "should" in paragraph 17.2.5.

398. Other paragraphs in this section were agreed upon without change.

17.3. Face and eye protection

399. All paragraphs in this section were agreed upon without change.

17.4. Upper and lower limb protection

400. All paragraphs in this section were agreed upon without change.

17.5. Respiratory protective equipment (RPE)

401. The Worker spokesperson requested substitution of "must" for "should" in paragraph 17.5.6.

402. Other paragraphs in this section were agreed upon without change.

17.6. Hearing protection

403. All paragraphs in this section were agreed upon without change.

17.7. Protection from falls from height

404. The Worker spokesperson requested substitution of "must" for "should" in paragraphs 17.7.1 and 17.7.3. She also requested deletion of "normally" in paragraph 17.7.1.

405. Other paragraphs in this section were agreed upon without change.

17.8. Hygiene facilities and decontamination

406. The Worker spokesperson proposed adding "at the workplace" which should be inserted after "should be provided" in paragraph 17.8.5, for the sake of clarity. This was agreed upon.

407. Other paragraphs in this section were agreed upon without change.

18. Welfare facilities

18.1. Water

408. The Government spokesperson suggested to delete the last phrase of the final sentence, so that it ended with “for personal use”. This was agreed upon.
409. The Worker spokesperson requested substitution of “must” for “should” in paragraph 18.1.5.
410. Other paragraphs in this section were agreed upon without change.

18.2. Toilets

411. The Government spokesperson proposed expanding paragraph 18.2.4 so that it also referred to providing sanitary paper. This was agreed upon.
412. Other paragraphs in this section were agreed upon without change.

18.3. Food services

413. The Worker spokesperson requested substitution of “must” for “should” in paragraph 18.3.6. The Employer spokesperson asked how employers could determine whether food was wholesome, as this paragraph would require. In the following discussion it became clear that the subject was of growing concern to many countries and a Government expert referred to new national guidance on the provision of food for forestry workers. Reference was also made to similar provisions in ILO standards such as the Maritime Labour Convention, 2006 and the code of practice on safety and health in forestry. It was agreed that food provided for workers needed to be nutritious and fit for human consumption. The Office would reword this paragraph accordingly.
414. Other paragraphs in this section were agreed upon without change.

18.4. First aid and medical care

415. All paragraphs in this section were agreed upon without change.

18.5. Temporary shelter

416. All paragraphs in this section were agreed upon without change.

18.6. Housing

417. The Worker spokesperson was concerned that the application of chemicals should not affect workers’ living accommodation and she proposed a new paragraph 18.6.9 to this effect.
418. The Government spokesperson accepted the principle but said that some exception would have to be made for chemicals used for vermin control and other legitimate reasons.
419. The Worker spokesperson agreed and a suitable exception clause was accepted by the Meeting.

18.7. Day-care facilities

420. The Government spokesperson proposed replacing “consider providing” with “provide” in paragraph 18.7.1. This was agreed upon.
421. The Worker spokesperson noted that paragraph 18.7.2 raised a new topic, namely occupational health services, and suggested it be given a separate heading. This was agreed upon.
422. Other paragraphs in this section were agreed upon without change.

The checklist

423. The Worker spokesperson commented that the “Emergency response” checklist currently placed at the end of Chapter 18 seemed to be more appropriate to Chapter 6.

19. Workplace wellness programmes

424. The Worker spokesperson requested that “sexes” should be replaced by “genders”; this was agreed upon.

19.1. Social protection

425. All paragraphs in this section were agreed upon without change.

19.2. Working hours

426. All paragraphs in this section were agreed upon without change.

19.3. Alcohol- and drug-related problems

427. All paragraphs in this section were agreed upon without change.

19.4. HIV/AIDS

428. All paragraphs in this section were agreed upon without change.

19.5. Workplace violence, harassment and bullying

429. The Worker spokesperson requested substitution of “must” for “should” in paragraph 19.5.3, and that a reference to Convention No. 111 should be added.
430. Referring to paragraph 19.5.4, she also highlighted the importance of cooperation between the competent authority and social partners in developing legislation on the elimination of workplace violence and harassment. She proposed additional wording, which was agreed upon.
431. The Worker spokesperson proposed that the subject of sexual harassment, presently addressed in paragraph 19.5.5, should be amplified and that there should be a model policy on the subject attached as an appendix to the code. The Workers’ group would provide

appropriate texts and the Office would find out what other sources of information were available.

432. Other paragraphs in this section were agreed upon without change.

19.6. Smoking at work

433. All paragraphs in this section were agreed upon without change.

Glossary

434. It was agreed that the following terms needed to be defined: “residual risk”, “confined space”, “tripartite” (if used in Chapter 20) and “subsistence farming”. Employer experts had submitted appropriate wording for the first of these terms, and the Office would work to develop appropriate definitions for all of them.

Bibliography

435. The bibliography was agreed upon without change.

Appendices

436. The Government spokesperson said that there were many European standards (EuroNorms or ENs) now currently available for agricultural machinery and it would be useful to refer to these in Appendix III as well as ISO standards.

437. The tables at Appendix VI were generally considered to be useful but it was agreed that some modifications were needed, such as changing from degrees Fahrenheit to Celsius and some more explanations of terms used. Some introductions may also be helpful.

Adoption of the code

438. Mr George Dragnich, the Executive Director (DIALOGUE), opened the last plenary session of the final day of the Meeting with a speech, prior to the adoption of the Code. He recognized the good work of the meeting on revising the code and noted that it would be a major contribution towards continuous building and strengthening of a preventative safety and health culture at the workplace. He noted that the next challenge was the implementation of the code and the follow-up activities that could contribute to achieving decent, safe and healthy working conditions in practice. The shift of emphasis from the mere prescription of protection measures to preventative measures had been an important step in the implementation of the ILO’s Safety and Health in Agriculture Convention, 2001 (No. 184), and its supplementing Recommendation (No. 192), and provided further guidance for their application in practice, he further observed. It was noted that this code complemented this effort. In terms of follow-up activities, Mr Dragnich highlighted that effort would be made to link the code to the International Labour Conference 2008 resolution on rural employment for poverty reduction, which was adopted at its 97th Session, in June 2008, in Geneva, especially in relation to the conclusion on promoting rural employment for poverty reduction. Furthermore, he noted that, in June 2009, the ILO became a member of the High-level Task Force on Global Food Security (HLTF), which, since 2008, has been coordinating the joint action of the 22 UN system agencies, funds, programmes and financial institutions engaged in helping

government to build national strategic responses, in partnership with non-governmental organizations and the private sector. Against this backdrop and as a contribution to the HLTF, he indicated that the ILO would run national capacity-building workshops on food security, from an ILO perspective, in four selected African countries and that these workshops would also incorporate elements of the code.

439. At the end of Mr Dragnich’s speech, the Chair tabled the revised code for further consideration, on a chapter-by-chapter basis, prior to its adoption. The following chapters and paragraph contents were brought to the fore.

1. Objectives and scope

1.2.3

440. A Government expert felt that the definition of subsistence farming in the glossary implied that these farmers employed people when, in fact, they did not necessarily have the status of an employer. It was stated that subsistence farming should be confined to a much simpler definition and to this end, the given definition would need to be reconsidered. It was agreed that this would be dealt with when referring back to the glossary.

2. The characteristics of OSH in agriculture

2.1.1

441. A Worker expert was unsure of the use of the figure of “a third” in this paragraph and asked for clarification.
442. Ms Herbert, one of the two Executive Secretaries of the Meeting, pointed out that the statistics used indicated 34.7 per cent, which is slightly over a third. This was agreed.

3. Developing a national framework for OSH in agriculture

3.5.17

443. A Worker expert indicated that there should be an “and” after the word “discrimination”. This was agreed.

3.3.2

444. A Government expert stated that they were unsure of the use of the words “gender-sensitive manner” and its appropriateness in the given context, and that this might have implications for delivery.
445. It was indicated by the Coordinator of the Meeting that these words were used in this context just as a reminder to take specific gender-sensitive issues into account, when implementing the code, given that gender mainstreaming is a key concern in agriculture, where the majority of farmers or producers are women, and whose roles remained largely unrecognized. In light of this clarification, the Government expert agreed to retain the wording as it stood in the text.

5. Competence, education and training

5.1.7

446. A Worker expert recalled that amendments were suggested to this text, in a previous session, which called for the deletion of the full stop of the first sentence and the beginning of the second sentence “To the extent possible” and to replace it with “and”. It was also suggested that the beginning of the third sentence “If this is not possible” should also be deleted, therefore starting the sentence with “Timing”. These suggested amendments were agreed.

5.3.3

447. A Government expert stated that this paragraph dealing with chemical data sheets did not fit in this section with the newly tailored 5.3.4. Therefore, it was suggested to look at the chemical sections to see if it dealt with this point and, if it did, then 5.3.3 could be deleted – if not, then a more appropriate place should be found for this paragraph to be placed.

448. An Employer expert concurred with the comments of the Government expert that this paragraph should be placed elsewhere.

449. After consultation, the Chairperson suggested that this paragraph should be placed in Chapter 10 dealing with chemicals. This was agreed.

6. Personal protective equipment (PPE)

450. A Worker expert expressed concern as to the order of the following paragraphs. They noted that paragraph 6.1.3 on page 33 and paragraph 10.3.5.1.3 on page 73 referred to the same issue under the use of a different language. In order to ensure consistency, it was therefore suggested that paragraph 10.3.5.1.3 be merged with paragraph 6.1.3. This was agreed.

7. Contingency and emergency preparedness

451. A Worker expert asked for clarification on paragraph 7.1.3 as it was understood that this paragraph was to be amended to read “Alarms should be capable of being seen and/or heard by everyone”.

452. The Coordinator of the Meeting read out a proposed text that was drafted accordingly, which read as follows: “Alarms, blinking/flashing lights and/or other technological devices should be capable of being seen and heard by everyone”. This was agreed.

8. Machinery and work equipment safety

453. There was doubt expressed about where paragraph 8.2.5.12 should be placed. It was indicated that when additional paragraphs were added to this section it moved to paragraph 8.2.5.14. The numbers changed because of the paragraph changes. This was agreed.

9. Ergonomics and the handling of materials

454. An Employer expert indicated that their group had requested for some form of text regarding the organization of work to reduce above shoulder height work, however, it is not to be found in the revised code.

-
455. A Worker expert highlighted the reference to measurement on page 64 and it was agreed to footnote this reference.

10. Chemicals

10.3.4.1.1

456. It was agreed that “should” be replaced with “must” in this paragraph.

10.2.3.2

457. An Employer expert pointed out that it was agreed to add the wording “according to label recommendations” in the fourth sentence after “Special care must be taken ...”.

10.5.2.1.2

458. It was proposed by an Employer expert that the word “penetration” in the second sentence of the paragraph be replaced with “saturation”. This was agreed.

10.2.2.1.7

459. It was suggested that the wording of this paragraph needed to be changed to better reflect the related facts on paraquat. It was suggested that the second sentence be rephrased, and that the last two sentences be amended to read as follows: “Workers should be informed of their right to refuse to apply any banned chemicals. The competent authority needs to act to ensure that such bans are respected, that existing stocks are safely disposed of and that employers remove such banned chemicals from the workplace.”

460. A Government expert stated that the paragraph should not lose sight of the fact that this chemical was banned worldwide. After further discussion it was proposed that the second sentence be replaced with “Paraquat is a chemical banned in most countries worldwide” and that the sentence following on should be deleted. This was agreed.

Chapter 10

Chemicals

Introduction

10.1.2

461. The Government spokesperson noticed that a comment made yesterday had been left out. The paragraph should read (amendment in capital letters): “FERTILIZERS CLASSIFIED AS TOXIC cause skin irritation and [...] (it follows as before)”.
462. Employers and Workers agreed on this amendment.

Chapter 11

463. The Government spokesperson observed that there were some typographical errors, and that they were going to be discussed later on.

Table 11.4, page 101

464. The Worker spokesperson pointed out that an addition to the table had been previously suggested. As this was discussed at last year's Meeting of Experts, some of the products/materials listed could also cause reproductive hazards and harm women and unborn children, in particular those suffering from cryptosporidiosis and leptospirosis. The medical expert should be consulted on this and the harmful effects should be made explicit.
465. Moreover, the Worker spokesperson added that it would be useful to add the word "some" at the beginning of the title of the table, in order to be consistent with the note added in the footnote. This was agreed.

11.3.2.3

466. The Coordinator of the Meeting, made a technical comment and said that the word "should" in this paragraph should be changed into "must", as previously agreed upon.

Table 11.3, page 98

467. The Government spokesperson noticed that the numerical indicators had been removed from the table. Although she understood that they had to be reviewed, she felt that they should be in the table, at least either the table or the text should provide an indication on the scales.
468. The Chairperson responded by pointing out that the different standards for each gas enumerated in the table, might complicate such a task. Nonetheless, it was agreed that attempts would be made to reinsert the numerical indicators.

11.3.1.6

469. The Government spokesperson said that the outcome of E. coli and choliforms could result in death, as well. Therefore, she suggested adding the words "and may result in death" at the end of the paragraph. This was agreed.

Chapter 12**12.6.6**

470. The Government spokesperson noticed that the sentence included the insertion previously proposed, but she said that the sentences should be inverted. The paragraph would then read: "A record of audiometric testing should be kept for a period of 40 years or in accordance with national laws and regulations."

Chapter 14**14.7.3.5**

471. The Coordinator of the Meeting, made a technical comment and said that the word "should" in this paragraph should be changed into "must", as previously agreed upon.

14.7.3.1

472. The Government spokesperson suggested adding the word “with” to the paragraph, at the end of the second line. The second sentence would then read (insertion in capital letters): “In countries where asbestos is allowed, the employer should nonetheless substitute WITH less hazardous materials.”

Chapter 15

15.3.2.7

473. The Worker spokesperson suggested inserting the words “drivers of” after “[...] provided for” and before “vehicles [...]”. This was agreed.

Chapter 20

Outreach

20.1.6

474. The Worker spokesperson said that in previous sessions it was agreed on considering also other technologies among the ones listed in the paragraph.
475. The Coordinator of the Meeting made a technical comment and said that the paragraph had been already amended through the insertion of “evolving communication technologies”, in order to consider the comments made previously. This was agreed.

Glossary

“Incident”, page 176

476. A Worker expert put forward the point that in his opinion incidents might be determined not only by unsafe occurrences, therefore he would put “An occurrence” instead of “An unsafe occurrence”.

“Point of balance”, page 177

477. A Worker expert suggested “in most cases” be added at the end of the paragraph.

“Subsistence farming”, page 178

478. The Government spokesperson queried about the definition given to “Subsistence farming”, on the ground that it connotes the notion of employment as well, which may not always be the case. A discussion ensued.
479. Ms Herbert, the Executive Secretary of the Meeting, said that the word “employment” in this context does not imply that somebody is hiring somebody else, given that it also refers to self-employment.
480. The Government spokesperson intervened by giving the example of the UK labour legislation which extends the definition of subsistence farming to self-employment as well.

481. In light of the undergoing discussion, Ms Herbert finally proposed to remove the words “while providing employment”, in the definition. This was agreed upon.

Bibliography

482. The Governments, Workers and Employers were in agreement on the text.

Appendices

483. The Governments, Workers and Employers were in agreement on the text.

Appendix 6

484. The Coordinator of the Meeting, drew the attention of the Meeting that this appendix required some more work before it could be finalized, as this is indicated in the given footnotes.

485. The Worker spokesperson suggested attaching Convention No. 184 as an appendix to the code. After consultations within the groups, a discussion ensued as to the pros and cons of appending the said Convention to the code.

486. The Employer spokesperson expressed his disagreement to this suggestion, on the ground that Convention No. 184 was already referenced in the bibliography, in addition to which it was easily accessible online. In his opinion the suggested Convention to be appended would have no added significance.

487. The Worker spokesperson, while showing her appreciation to the Employers’ comment, pointed out that many people to whom this code was addressed did not have any access to the Web. In addition, she referred to the mandate of the code itself which was to “complement and not substitute” Convention No. 184, hence the need for the latter to be made available to the users of the code.

488. The Chairperson gave the floor to the Coordinator of the Meeting for a technical comment pertaining to this issue, who observed that the code of practice on safety and health in coal mines gave rise to a similar discussion. The problem was that appending a Convention along with its relative Recommendation would increase the amount of text and thereby contributing to raise the costs of publication in addition to translation costs.

489. The Employers agreed on the Coordinator’s comment. However, the Workers’ group seemingly remaining unconvinced that additional costs and volume could be a prohibitive factor, elaborated further on the pros of having the Convention appended to the code through the intervention of a Worker expert, who argued that the suggested appendix would not necessarily add so much volume to the publication. For that matter, a hard copy would be preferable for users who did not have an easy access to the Internet, as testified by the 200,000 or so Mexicans who worked illegally in Canada on the farms and did not have any access to the Web. For this reason, appending the Convention to the code was justified as it would give workers direct access to the Convention.

490. The Government spokesperson took the floor. While recognizing the usefulness of a clear reference to Convention No. 184, the code should nevertheless remain a stand-alone document, she argued, under the understanding that countries which did not ratify the Convention might be induced to shun away from the code, should they see the Convention as being part of the document.

Appendix on sexual harassment

491. A Worker expert raised the issue about the missing appendix, in the text, on sexual harassment and inquired as to the procedure that would be followed to include it.
492. In response to this query, Ms Tinoco asked for the floor to clarify the issue at stake. She indicated that the office would carefully look into this in view of coming up with a most appropriate appendix on sexual harassment in agriculture, which could then be inserted in the text. It was a matter of looking for a text which had already been agreed upon at the tripartite level, she added.

Final adoption of the code

493. Before the Chair turned to invite the floor to adopt the code, the Worker spokesperson came up with a proposal to add a dedication to the document, which would read as: “The code is dedicated to the farmers and agricultural workers who feed the world in the expectation that it will improve occupational safety and health in agriculture”. This was agreed.
494. The Chair then moved for the adoption of the code. All three parties agreed to adopt the code.
495. The floor was handed over to Ms Tinoco, for her words of thanks. She expressed her pleasure to see the text adopted adding that the Office was confident to see the experts present at this Meeting as the active promoters and implementers of the text. She underscored the commitment of the Office to actively promote the code in all activities related to agriculture, even more so in the context of the resolution concerning the promotion of rural development for poverty reduction that was adopted at the International Labour Conference at its 97th Session, 2008.
496. Ms Tinoco emphasized the determinant role played by social dialogue which was instrumental in the adoption of the code. She expressed her conviction that maintaining the voices of workers, governments and employers must remain the building blocks of consensus. She finally extended her special thanks to Dr James Dossman, the Senior Technical Adviser on the text; the Chair, Mr Paul Gunderson; and to Mr Martin Hahn, the Coordinator of the Meeting.
497. The Chair then gave the floor to the Employer spokesperson, who thanked the ILO staff for their guidance on the text. He expressed his hope that the document would save some lives and concluded by extending his thanks to the experts, from the Government and Workers’ groups, for their cooperation.
498. Taking over the floor, the Worker spokesperson, in turn, thanked the Office and the colleagues from the Workers’ and Employers’ groups for their guidance.
499. The Government spokesperson equally thanked the colleagues from the other groups and the Office for its tireless effort exercised in the preparation of the code.
500. The Chair handed the floor to the Coordinator for a final technical note. The Coordinator recalled that the Office would revise the code which would be presented, along with a report, to the Governing Body, in March 2011, and added that both the code and the report would be circulated to the participants for comments.

501. The floor was then handed over to the Chair who expressed his words of thanks to the participants, at which point he closed the five-day Meeting of Experts on the Code of Practice on Safety and Health in Agriculture.

Evaluation questionnaire

Evaluation questionnaire

Meeting of Experts to Adopt a Code of Practice on Safety and Health in Agriculture Geneva, 25–29 October 2010

The Office, in an ongoing effort to evaluate sectoral meetings, is seeking the opinions of participants in order to have basic data for assessing the quality, usefulness and effectiveness of these meetings. As the success of such an exercise is critically dependent on an adequate rate of response, we should appreciate it if you would take time to answer the questions below and submit any other comments that you may have concerning the meeting.

1. How do you rate the meeting as regards the following? (tick one box in each case)

	Excellent (5)	Good (4)	Satisfactory (3)	Poor (2)	Unsatisfactory (1)	Average score
The choice of agenda item (subject of the meeting)	2	2	1			4.2
The points for discussion	2	2	1			4.2
The quality of the discussion	1	3	1			4.0
The meeting's benefits to the sector	4		1			4.6
The conclusions	1	3	1			4.0
Opportunity for networking	2	2	1			4.2

2. How do you rate the quality of the report in terms of the following? (tick one box in each case)

	Excellent	Good	Satisfactory	Poor	Unsatisfactory	Average score
Quality of analysis	2	3				4.4
Objectivity	2	2	1			4.2
Comprehensiveness of coverage	3	2				4.6
Presentation and readability	1	4				4.2
Amount and relevance of information	2	3				4.4

3. How do you consider the time allotted for discussion? (tick one box in each case)

	Too much	Enough	Too little
Discussion of the report		4	1
Presentations		3	1
Group meetings		4	1

4. How do you rate the practical and administrative arrangements (secretariat, document services, translation, interpretation)? (tick one box)

Excellent	Good	Satisfactory	Poor	Unsatisfactory	Average score
3	2				4.6

5. In what capacity did you attend the meeting?

	Delegate/s	Adviser/s	Observer/s	IGO/NGO observer/s
Government	2			
Employer	1			
Worker	1			

6. Other observations

Website of the Agricultural Sector of Sectoral Activities Department:
(<http://www.ilo.org/public/english/dialogue/sector/techmeet/mesha10/index.htm>)

7. Are you aware that the Fishing Sector of the Sectoral Activities Department has a website that provides information on the sector and the activities of the ILO, related to the sector?

Yes 3 No 2

8. If yes, please indicate how you would rate the design and content of the site?

Excellent	Very good	Good	Needs improvement	Unsatisfactory
	1	1	1	

9. If unsatisfactory or needs improvement, how would you suggest that the design and content of the site be improved?

10. Were you aware that the Sectoral Activities Department website had a section that provided information on this meeting?

Yes 3 No 2

11. If you consulted the web page of this meeting, did you download any of the documents available from it?

Yes 2 No – Viewed but did not download 1

Thank you for your cooperation

List of participants
Liste des participants
Lista de participantes

Representative of the Governing Body of the International Labour Office
Représentant du Conseil d'administration du Bureau international du Travail
Representante del Consejo de Administración de la Oficina Internacional del Trabajo

Mr Paul Gunderson
Director
Dakota Center for Technology Optimized Agriculture (DCTOA)
Devills Lake
United States

Advisers/Conseillers techniques/Consejeros técnicos

Dr James Dosman
Senior Scientific Advisor
Saskatoon
Canada

Mr Malcolm Gifford
Sparrows Farm House
Cockfield
United Kingdom

Members representing Governments
Membres représentant les gouvernements
Miembros representantes de los gobiernos

COSTA RICA

Sra. Elizabeth Chinchilla Vargas
Coordinadora Área de Agricultura
Consejo de Salud Ocupacional
Ministerio de Trabajo y Seguridad Social
San José

KENYA

Mr Justus Karuga Mugane
Deputy Director
Directorate of Occupational Safety and Health Services
Nairobi

SOUTH AFRICA AFRIQUE DU SUD SUDÁFRICA

Ms Dinah Jabulile Mhlophe
Manager
Department of Labour
Pretoria

THAILAND THAÏLANDE TAILANDIA

Ms Karnchana Karnviroj
Director
Occupational Safety and Health Bureau
Department of Labour Protection and Welfare
Ministry of Labour
Bangkok

UNITED KINGDOM ROYAUME-UNI REINO UNIDO

Ms Bernardine Cooney-West
HM Inspector of Health and Safety
Agriculture Operational Policy Health and Safety Executive (HSE)
London

**Members representing the Employers
Membres représentant les employeurs
Miembros representantes de los empleadores**

Ms Brenda Cuthbert
Chief Executive Officer
Jamaica Employers' Federation
Kingston
Jamaica

Mr Kenneth Forth
Chair, Agriculture Labour Issues Coordinating Committee
Canadian Employers Council
Ontario
Canada

Mr Paul Douglas Jarvie
Manager Occupational Health and Safety
Employers and Manufacturers' Association Northern (EMACN)
Auckland
New Zealand

Mr Zeeshan Malik
Assistant Manager (Development & Projects)
Mitchell's Fruit Farms Limited Factory & Farms
Renala Khurd
Pakistan

Mr Douglas Nelson
Executive Vice-President
General Counsel & Secretary
Croplife America
Washington, DC
United States

**Members representing the Workers
Membres représentant les travailleurs
Miembros representantes de los trabajadores**

Sra. Luisa Isolina Mele
Asesora
Unión Argentina de Trabajadores Rurales y Estibadores (UATRE)
Buenos Aires
Argentina

Ms Susan Murray
Head of Health and Safety
T&G Section Unite the Union
Transport House – Unite House
London
United Kingdom

Mr Rodney George Stockham
Northern District Secretary
Vice-President Queensland Branch
The Australian Workers' Union of Employers
Queensland
Australia

M. Adama Traoré
Syndicat national des travailleurs de l'environnement, du tourisme et de l'hôtellerie (SYNTETH)
Ouagadougou
Burkina Faso

Mr Baldemar Velasquez
President
Farm Labor Organizing Committee, AFL – CIO (FLOC)
Ohio
United States

Representatives of the United Nations, specialized agencies
and other official international organizations
Représentants des Nations Unies, des institutions spécialisées
et d'autres organisations internationales officielles
Representantes de las Naciones Unidas, de los organismos especializados
y de otras organizaciones internacionales oficiales

European Commission
Commission européenne
Comisión Europea

Mr Christian Dufour
UN Affairs Officer
Delegation of the European Union
Geneva
Switzerland

Mr Matthew Heppleston
Director-General
Employment and Social Affairs
European Commission
Luxembourg

Food and Agriculture Organization of the United Nations (FAO)
Organisation des Nations Unies pour l'alimentation et l'agriculture (FAO)
Organización de las Naciones Unidas para la Agricultura y la Alimentación (FAO)

Mr Ali Arslan Gürkan
Acting Director
Geneva Liaison Office
Switzerland

Representatives of non-governmental international organizations
Représentants d'organisations internationales non gouvernementales
Representantes de organizaciones internacionales no gubernamentales

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

Ms Janet Asherson
Adviser
Environment Health and Safety
Geneva
Switzerland

**International Trade Union Confederation (ITUC)
Confédération syndicale internationale (CSI)
Confederación Sindical Internacional**

Ms Raquel González
Director
Geneva Office
Switzerland

Ms Esther Busser
Assistant Director
Geneva Office
Switzerland

**International Union of Food, Agricultural, Hotel, Restaurant, Catering,
Tobacco and Allied Workers Associations (IUF)**

**Union internationale des travailleurs de l'alimentation, de l'agriculture,
de l'hôtellerie-restauration, du tabac et des branches connexes (UITA)**

**Unión Internacional de Trabajadores de la Alimentación, Agrícolas,
Hoteles, Restaurantes, Tabaco y Afines (UITA)**

Ms Susan Longley
Agricultural Coordinator
Petit-Lancy
Switzerland

Mr Omara Amuko
Occupational Health, Safety & Environment Coordinator
Geneva
Switzerland

Ms Anja Westberg
National Officer
Stockholm
Sweden

World Federation of Trade Unions (WFTU)
Fédération syndicale mondiale (FSM)
Federación Sindical Mundial (FSM)

M^{me} Osiris Oviedo de la Torre
Représentante permanente
Genève
Suisse

M^{me} Souad Mahmoud
Centre du comité directeur d'UIS Afrique
Union internationale des syndicats en agroalimentaire (UISTAACT)
Fédération mondiale syndicale (FSM)
Montreuil
France