



Final report

**Tripartite Meeting of Experts for the Review and the
Adoption of ILO Guidelines on Training in the Port Sector**
(Geneva, 21–25 November 2011)

Final report

**Tripartite Meeting of Experts for the Review and the
Adoption of ILO Guidelines on Training in the Port Sector**
(Geneva, 21–25 November 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. 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.

Tripartite Meeting of Experts for the Review and the Adoption of ILO Guidelines on Training in the Port Sector:
Final report: Geneva, 21–25 November 2011 / International Labour Organization, Sectoral Activities Department-
Geneva: ILO, 2012

1 v.

ISBN 978-92-2-126014-1 (print)

ISBN 978-92-2-126015-8 (Web pdf)

Also available in French: *Réunion tripartite d'experts chargés d'élaborer et d'adopter des directives de l'OIT sur la formation dans le secteur portuaire*, Genève, 21-25 novembre 2011: *Rapport final*, ISBN 978-92-2-226014-0 (print), 978-92-2-226015-7 (web pdf) Geneva, 2012, and in Spanish: *Reunión tripartita de expertos para la elaboración y adopción de pautas de la OIT sobre la formación en el sector portuario*, Ginebra, 21-25 de noviembre de 2011: *Informe final*, ISBN 978-92-2-326014-9 (print), 978-92-2-326015-6 (web pdf), Geneva, 2012.

training / safety training / competency based training / port / docker / role of ILO / good practices /
teaching material

06.01

ILO Cataloguing in Publication Data

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.

Contents

	<i>Page</i>
Introduction	1
Consideration of the draft ILO <i>Guidelines on training in the port sector</i>	3
Abbreviations and acronyms	3
Explaining the ILO <i>Guidelines on training in the port sector</i>	3
Section 1. Background	5
Section 2. Competency-based training in a supportive environment	8
Introduction	8
Section 3. Portworker training	11
Glossary of terms used in the Guidelines	15
Follow-up activities	16
Dissemination and promotion	17
Technical assistance	17
Supporting materials	18
Training	18
Funding and resources	18
Summary remarks	19
Adoption of the ILO <i>Guidelines on training in the port sector</i>	19
Closing of the Meeting	20
Evaluation questionnaire	23
List of participants	27

Introduction

1. The Tripartite Meeting of Experts for the Review and the Adoption of ILO Guidelines on Training in the Port Sector was held in Geneva from 21 to 25 November 2011 in accordance with a Governing Body decision taken at its 304th Session (March 2009).
2. The Meeting was attended by 23 experts from Governments, seven experts from the Employers' group of the Governing Body, and nine experts from the Workers' group of the Governing Body. There were four observers from intergovernmental organizations and international non-governmental organizations.
3. The purpose of the Meeting was to review and adopt ILO Guidelines on training in the port sector.
4. The Meeting had before it draft ILO *Guidelines on training in the port sector* (TMEPS/2011), prepared by the Office with the support of an informal tripartite working group comprised of experts from port operators, portworker unions, governments, relevant intergovernmental and international non-governmental organizations, port training centres, other specialized institutions and individual specialists. The Guidelines would provide a competency-based framework for portworker training methods.
5. The Officers of the Meeting were:

<i>Chairperson:</i>	Dr Brian Thomas (United Kingdom)
<i>Vice-Chairpersons:</i>	Mr Harri Halme (Government, Finland)
	Mr Pierre du Randt (Employers' group)
	Mr Frank Leys (Workers' group)

6. The Secretary-General, Ms Alette van Leur, Director, ILO Sectoral Activities Department, announced that the ILO *Guidelines on training in the port sector* would be submitted to the Governing Body in March 2012 following their review and adoption by the Meeting. She explained that training in the port sector was an important issue for the ILO and that the development of the draft Guidelines was initiated in 2009. An informal group of experts, comprised of numerous industry stakeholders and port experts, undertook the drafting work. The port sector was vital to economic development and required ongoing improvements in efficiency, competitiveness and safety. The implementation of appropriate training programmes for portworkers was therefore essential. Training in the port sector was well developed in some countries and in a number of port organizations; however, it frequently did not meet the changing needs and expectations of the port sector. International guidelines were necessary due to new industry requirements for safety, performance and employment profiles. They would facilitate the recognition of qualifications which could enhance portworkers' mobility. Addressing training in the port sector would support improving the living and working conditions of portworkers and the development of port operations globally.
7. The Chairperson stated that the international port transport industry had undergone unprecedented technological change in recent times, which demanded a range of different skills, new knowledge and an improved attitude from employees. Expenditure on training in the industry remained at under 1 per cent of turnover. A large number of employees in the port sector still did not receive adequate training to perform their tasks safely and efficiently as required under Article 38 of the Occupational Safety and Health (Dock Work) Convention, 1979 (No. 152). The ILO had played a prominent role in this process

through its technical assistance programmes such as the Portworker Development Programme. There was still considerable work to be done to establish effective human resource development policies and practices and good quality training materials in the industry. He concluded that the draft Guidelines provided a practical guide to establishing competency-based training methods which was a prerequisite for creating a skilled and motivated workforce.

8. The Executive Secretary, Mr Marios Meletiou, introduced the draft ILO *Guidelines on training in the port sector* that formed the basis for the discussions during the Meeting. They were based on the findings of extensive research and field visits to a number of ports and port training centres or institutes in several countries. He explained that they did not make any explicit or direct reference to any particular country or port when presenting a competency-based framework for portworker training. The draft Guidelines were intended to offer generic guidance and were intended for global use.
9. The Employer Vice-Chairperson recognized that there had been fundamental changes in the port sector and that the training required for portworkers had changed dramatically. Emphasis needed to be placed on how workers could be trained to comply with the industry requirements. He indicated that standardization had occurred in port operations such as those resulting from containerization. ILO guidelines would allow organizations to standardize training practices. Flexibility was important because of unique circumstances and the draft Guidelines accounted for this diversity. The model of training presented transferred the ownership of training from organization to individual which was the purest definition of empowerment. Standardizing approaches to training internationally would assist with competition between companies. There was a need to consider social dialogue where private training providers were involved to ensure that they also applied competency-based training. The recognition of prior learning was significant due to the many skills involved in port work and the skills shared with other industries.
10. The Worker Vice-Chairperson remarked that the world was changing and ports were facing a second revolution. The first revolution had been containerization and the second revolution was the automation of handling operations. This second revolution had an effect on the workforce. He asserted that portworkers had been calling for improved training for a long time because ports were a dangerous working environment. Training was necessary for all workers. Every person entering a port to work should be trained. Portworkers should be professionals in the interests of health, safety and productivity. Non-professionals had no place in ports. Training should be developed in the spirit of, and involving, social dialogue while avoiding a “top-down” approach. The output of the Meeting would improve health and safety in ports for workers and improve efficiency in the interest of employers.
11. The Government Vice-Chairperson stated that the draft Guidelines contained good practice and knowledge. He expressed a desire that the Guidelines would contribute to improving training in the port sector for many years to come.
12. The expert from the Government of Senegal announced that the initiative to develop the *Guidelines on training in the port sector* was timely. He noted that employers in ports around the world had been seeking to ensure the safety of equipment and workers. He explained that industry competitiveness meant that the shipping industry expected portworkers to have the same competencies everywhere. Standardization of training was important and Senegal had committed itself to and was also willing to ensure that the Guidelines would represent a useful tool for portworker training in Senegal.
13. The observer from the European Commission stated the importance the European Commission attached to the issue of training in the port sector. He noted that ILO instruments such as the Maritime Labour Convention, 2006 (MLC, 2006), had been transferred into European law through a European Council directive. A White Paper was

published in March 2011 highlighting that well-trained portworkers were essential for the safe, secure and efficient functioning of ports. Similarly, a regulation proposal was made recently for the development of a trans-European transport network to connect European facilities. The demand for maritime transport was projected to increase and a trained workforce in ports was essential. A skilled and motivated workforce was key to ensuring safe, secure and efficient functioning of ports. New types of work would require new skills to be developed through training. Training would help to increase the attractiveness of port work and solve the shortages faced in Europe. He asserted that the Guidelines would be adapted at the European level upon review and adoption by the Meeting.

14. The observer from the International Safety Panel of the International Cargo Handling Coordination Association (ICHCA) International Limited stated that a well-trained workforce had an impact on health and safety and the occurrence of accidents in ports. He expressed appreciation for work carried out on the draft Guidelines and felt that they could be valuable to the port sector. An important emphasis on health and safety was contained in the draft Guidelines.
15. A Worker expert emphasized that the Meeting was seeking to produce a concrete product. He stressed that a common understanding of the intended product was crucial to a successful meeting.

Consideration of the draft ILO *Guidelines on training in the port sector*

Abbreviations and acronyms

16. The Meeting decided to include the following in the list of abbreviations and acronyms: ID (identification) and RO/RO (roll-on-roll-off), RPL (recognition of prior learning) and IMO (International Maritime Organization).

Explaining the ILO *Guidelines on training in the port sector*

Paragraph 2

17. The Worker Vice-Chairperson suggested adding the words “and health” to the word “safety” in line 3. Both the Employers’ group and the Government group endorsed the amendment.
18. The Meeting agreed to use this formulation throughout the text.

Paragraph 4

19. After lengthy discussion and suggestions made by the experts from the Governments of Senegal and Papua New Guinea and various observers, the Chairperson proposed that the text be kept as it was written in the draft, as the wording was supported by the Workers’ and Employers’ groups. The only amendment that would be made was to replace “apply equally” with “is applicable”.

-
20. The observer from the International Safety Panel of the ICHCA International Limited expressed concern about the use of “container boxes” and “stuffing/loading”, as he thought that this could be misleading.
 21. The Worker Vice-Chairperson suggested that, instead of “loading” which was not clear, the term “packing of” should be used. It was agreed that, instead, the following terms would be used throughout the text: “freight containers” and “packing and unpacking”.
 22. The expert from the Government of Senegal stated that the Guidelines should be clear from a legal point of view.
 23. The Chairperson agreed that the text should have the necessary clarity but recalled that the Guidelines would not be mandatory.

Paragraph 5

24. The Chairperson stated that the Office wished to delete the whole sentence starting “Further information ...” referring to information to be provided on the ILO website.
25. The Executive Secretary explained that the website could change in the future and it would be unrealistic for the Office to commit itself on the contents of its future web pages.
26. After some discussion, the Employers’ and Workers’ groups agreed that some reference to the ILO should be made in the paragraph. It was agreed that an amendment would be made to read “Materials may be obtained by contacting the ILO.”

Paragraph 8

27. After some discussion, it was agreed to amend the second sentence of paragraph 8 to read as follows: “Its purpose is to introduce the reader to the various elements constituting a competency-based training system for portworkers, which can be set within a national qualifications framework ...”

Paragraph 10

28. The Employer Vice-Chairperson raised two points. First, he suggested removing the word “port’s” in the sentence starting with “At the heart of the cycle” (line 6), so that the sentence would read as follows: “At the heart of the cycle is the training policy, an explicit statement of intent ...”
29. An Employer expert from Panama noted that there was a translation issue in the Spanish version of the draft Guidelines.
30. The expert from the Government of Senegal also raised issues with the French version of the draft Guidelines.
31. The Chairperson noted that these would be corrected in the final version of the Guidelines.

Section 1. Background

Paragraph 13

32. After lengthy discussion regarding the insertion of the word “safe” before the word “workplace” in the first bullet point and as to the standardization of training as proposed by the expert from the Government of Senegal, the Chairperson recommended not to make any modifications to the text but stated that these issues were recognized and the Office would attempt to find an appropriate place in the Guidelines to emphasize these points.

Paragraph 14

33. The Meeting discussed alternative wording for the word “revolution” in the first sentence of paragraph 14.
34. The Chairperson asked for alternative words and asked the Meeting to think specifically about what was being discussed in the paragraph, whether it was technology, application or skills. It was finally agreed by the Meeting to adopt the first line to read, as amended, “In ports around the world there is now a demand for significant change in skills development.”

Paragraph 15 and table 1

35. The Employer Vice-Chairperson made comments regarding the mention of a qualifications system. He felt that the second sentence of the paragraph might not be correct as it referred to different methods of work. This did not mean a change in the qualification system but rather a change in the approach. He also commented that reference to “Certified training” in the table was not very descriptive as it did not explain who had to certify the training and that would cause doubts about the certification in some countries.
36. The Worker Vice-Chairperson highlighted that some ports did not have specialized operations given that labour was inexpensive and there was no pressure to provide specialized training. He also mentioned that hiring of casuals was still continued in ports (without any form of training). He then referred to the table and said that the term “Management-directed” was not clear.
37. An expert from the Office explained that not all ports were at the same stage. The table should be seen to represent continuous change with objectives on the right-hand column. He mentioned that in the table heading “To” would be replaced by “Towards”. He went on to state that “Management-directed teams” meant that in ports employees worked in teams that needed direction and they wanted to capture broad developments from the old days of “gang work” to the present time. Regarding the “Certified training”, he mentioned that the term denoted “Formalized training” methods in contrast to informal on-the-job training.
38. During discussion of table 1, the Chairperson stated that the table could thus take the form of a continuum from left to right. Different ports were at different stages of evolution and arrows could be inserted into the table to show a movement towards what was on the right-hand side of the table. Further suggestions as to changes of wording were made as well as editorial changes.

Paragraph 16

39. The Employer Vice-Chairperson highlighted a minor but critical issue in the second sentence of the paragraph. He stated that job analysis was still the approach used by many employers and the paragraph could perhaps instead say that there was a shift in the emphasis towards this approach. He also noted that the words “In recent years” could be deleted as it was debatable as to what this could mean in different countries.

Paragraph 18 and table 2

40. The Worker Vice-Chairperson drew attention to table 2. He emphasized the role of social dialogue in facilitating consultations, negotiations and agreements of competencies by the social partners, but did not call for any changes in the text.
41. The expert from the Government of Senegal emphasized the need to carry out practical, on-the-job training.
42. The Chairperson highlighted that an essential part of competency-based training was an assessment, which would take place in an environment compatible with, or similar to, the working environment.
43. The Deputy Secretary-General of the Meeting pointed out that the comment by the expert from the Government of Senegal was due to the translation into French of the word “apprenticeship”. This was addressed.

Paragraph 20 and figure 1

44. The Employer Vice-Chairperson opened up discussion on the expression “port training policy” which was in the second line of paragraph 20 and in figure 1.
45. After some discussion, the Meeting agreed to replace that expression with “training policy”.

Paragraph 21

46. The Worker Vice-Chairperson noted that there was sensitivity on how “competency profiling” would be seen by the workforce even though the Workers’ group knew that there was a need for a change in the approach to training.
47. It was agreed to retain this terminology.

Paragraph 23

48. The Employer Vice-Chairperson had a comment regarding footnote 4 and the term “not yet fully competent”; his view was that a person could only be either competent or not yet competent.
49. The Executive Secretary noted that the term “not yet fully competent” was used to avoid the negative impression of using the word “incompetent”, because if a person did not pass a competency test, it would be demotivating to use the term “incompetent”, as the person might have some of the required competencies and thus be partly competent but not yet fully competent.

-
50. An expert from the Office from the Skills and Employability Department noted that proper wording would depend on the context in which the term “competency” was used; in the context of competency-based training, he supported the Executive Secretary’s view and that, if the term “incompetent” was to be avoided, using the term “not yet fully competent” would make sense. He noted that the Employers might have referred to the term “competency” in a different context. For example, if the context was not referring to knowledge, skills and attitudes (KSA) but referred to competency as a way to do something independently and holistically, maybe then it would not be useful to say “not yet fully competent” because in this case it would be difficult to measure the extent of the competence.
 51. The Worker Vice-Chairperson noted that there had indeed been an immense change for many portworkers and he appreciated what the Executive Secretary had said. He noted that, where changes and automation had been introduced, telling a worker that he/she was no longer competent might lead to confrontation. The term “not yet fully competent” instead gave an opportunity to look forward to become fully competent.
 52. The Employer Vice-Chairperson said he was of the opinion that the word “incompetent” should never be used, except, possibly, in rare cases where a person could not be trained. He agreed that the word “incompetent” had no place in the Guidelines. He finally noted that the term “not yet competent” was used in most of the vocational education and training (VET) systems but that the Employers’ group could accept the term “not yet fully competent”.
 53. Referring to the footnotes in the draft Guidelines, an Office expert suggested that only the footnotes with sources should be kept. The other footnotes should be incorporated into the text or deleted.
 54. The Employer observer from Canada supported the suggestion.
 55. The Meeting accepted those proposals.
 56. Following a discussion on the role of social dialogue in training, the Chairperson explained that social dialogue would be a part of the whole process, and noted that the wording referring to competency-based training needed to be handled sensitively.
 57. The expert from the Government of Senegal also highlighted a problem with the use of the word “gap” throughout the French version of the draft Guidelines.

Paragraph 24

58. The expert from the Government of Papua New Guinea proposed that the word “physical” in the first sentence of the paragraph be replaced by the word “capital”.
59. The Employer Vice-Chairperson noted that the use of the word “capital” would be too restrictive.
60. The original wording was retained.

Section 2. Competency-based training in a supportive environment

Introduction

Paragraph 27

- 61.** The expert from the Government of Papua New Guinea proposed that towards the end of the paragraph, in the sentence that started with the words “In ports where ...”, the word “dockworker” be replaced with the word “portworker”.
- 62.** The Chairperson explained that the reference to dockworkers was based on an ILO document that had been adopted many years previously. It was agreed that the word “portworker” would be changed in the whole text, except where it was a quote from other documents such as ILO Conventions.

Paragraph 28

- 63.** The expert from the Government of Senegal expressed reservations regarding the use of the term “aptitude” in figure 2 in the French version of the draft Guidelines.
- 64.** The observer from the International Association of Ports and Harbours (IAPH) pointed out that the reference made in the first sentence of the paragraph concerned figure 2 and not table 2 and suggested that the necessary change be made to the text.
- 65.** It was agreed that the paragraph would be modified accordingly.

Paragraph 31

- 66.** The Employer Vice-Chairperson suggested that the expression “inter alia” should be replaced by simpler language.
- 67.** It was decided that more appropriate wording would be used.
- 68.** The expert from the Government of Papua New Guinea suggested that the word “competency” in figure 2 should be qualified.
- 69.** The Chairperson explained that the title read “Dimensions of competency”, and that the wording was taken from another ILO document. It was decided not to make any change in figure 2.

Paragraph 33

- 70.** The Worker Vice-Chairperson clarified that, when the term “different stakeholders” was used, it was understood that it encompassed both employers’ and workers’ representatives.
- 71.** The Chairperson explained that the interpretation of “stakeholder” would include any organization that interfaces with the port, including workers’ and employers’ representatives. He suggested that the term “stakeholder” could be added to the glossary section.

-
72. The Worker Vice-Chairperson also suggested that the abbreviation “PPE” meaning “personal protective equipment” be added to the list of abbreviations.
 73. The Meeting agreed on the proposals.

Paragraph 35

74. The Employer Vice-Chairperson raised the issue of whether “digital technology” was a soft skill. IT skills were no longer soft skills and had become a critical part of work in ports. He proposed that either “soft skills” be removed or another term be used. These were skills that could be acquired through prior learning as well as across jobs and industries.
75. An expert from the ILO Skills and Employability Department explained that the ILO frequently used the term “core skills” to refer to both soft skills and IT skills.
76. The expert from the Government of Senegal said that other competencies could be called “complementary competencies”.
77. The Worker Vice-Chairperson proposed to remove “(soft skills)” since the text that followed referred to skills whether they were “soft” or not.
78. The Chairperson noted that the possession of all the skills listed would be evidence of prior learning. It was agreed to delete “(soft skills)”.
79. The Employer Vice-Chairperson questioned whether “initiative and enterprise” could be learned.
80. The expert from the Government of Senegal proposed replacing the word “desirable” with “necessary”.
81. The Worker Vice-Chairperson remarked that “necessary” raised the standard and restricted employability.
82. The Chairperson explained that the proposal could be interpreted to mean that the skills should be included in the training and not that a person was required to have the skills. It was agreed that “initiative and enterprise” would be deleted and “desired” would be replaced by “necessary”.
83. Paragraph 35 was agreed, with the first two sentences amended as follows: “In many instances, broader employability skills are necessary, such as communications, team working, problem solving, self-management, capacity to learn and the increasing use of (digital) technology. These are skills that can be transferred across jobs, and indeed across industries, especially when they are based on prior learning.”

Paragraphs 36–38

84. It was suggested that paragraphs 36–38 be arranged in a tabular format to improve presentation and ease of reading. The precise formatting was left to the discretion of the Office.
85. The observer from the IAPH noted the importance of the commitment of trainees to the success of competency-based training. He proposed that paragraph 36 could be amended to read as “The full commitment of the trainee is conditional for the success of skill

development programmes. In such programmes, three distinct but interrelated levels can be considered, namely, macro, meso and micro.”

86. The Worker Vice-Chairperson and the expert from the Government of Senegal observed that the proposed text put considerable onus on the trainee. The commitment of both trainees and trainers was part of successful training and should be mentioned.
87. The Employer Vice-Chairperson concurred that commitment was required by those involved at all levels but noted that the focal point of learning was the learner. He proposed to insert the phrase “the full commitment of management and trainees” and remove the second bullet point from paragraph 38 concerning the involvement of senior management. The proposal was accepted by the Meeting.
88. The Employer Vice-Chairperson proposed that “paid leave for training” in paragraph 38 be qualified with the insertion of “recognized” or “relevant”.
89. The Worker Vice-Chairperson supported the proposal but suggested a different term could be employed.
90. The secretariat recommended using “appropriate” and paragraphs 36–38 were agreed as amended.

Paragraph 39

91. The expert from the Government of Papua New Guinea proposed to change “the provision of training facilities today” to “the provision of current training facilities”.
92. The Chairperson and the Worker Vice-Chairperson acknowledged that this proposal would ensure the Guidelines remained contemporaneous. It was agreed to make the change and to pay attention to other instances found during editing.
93. The Employer Vice-Chairperson proposed that boxes 2 and 3 would be better suited as appendices to the Guidelines.
94. The Worker Vice-Chairperson felt that the boxed text was necessary because it provided clarification regarding training facilities and trainers.
95. An Employer observer from Canada stated that he did not know the source of the boxed text nor why it was included in a box.
96. The secretariat emphasized the importance of deciding on a consistent style for referencing. Paragraph 39 was agreed as amended and the boxes would be moved to the appendices.

Paragraph 40

97. An Employer expert from Singapore proposed to insert the text: “Traditional trainers need to undergo training to understand the concept of outcome-based competency training. They also need to know how to assess and evaluate the participants’ competency during the training session.” She suggested that this content should also be included in box 3.
98. The expert from the Government of Papua New Guinea thought that the word “traditional” should be replaced with “all”. Paragraph 40 was agreed as amended.

-
99. A Worker expert from Mexico suggested that “need to understand learning difficulties” should be included in a bullet in box 3. He referred to the importance of distinguishing learning difficulties and teaching persons with learning difficulties. There was a need to understand learning difficulties, different models and training to allow for diverse learning difficulties. Teaching required specialization and training to ensure quality. “Learning by doing” was one of the most effective methods of learning.
 100. The Chairperson commented that the point should identify that the trainees might have difficulties and that trainers should have the skills to manage trainees with learning difficulties. Any good training had a built-in evaluation process which would clarify the effectiveness of training strategy and materials. He proposed that the point be separated to address learning difficulties in one point and the evaluation of quality in another.
 101. The expert from the Government of Argentina agreed and remarked that the ability to recognize difficulties was a primary diagnostic skill and an important component of effective training. Box 3 was agreed as amended and moved to the appendices.

Section 3. Portworker training

Paragraph 58

102. The Employer Vice-Chairperson was concerned that the reference to two ILO instruments in box 4 rendered the text too prescriptive, though he acknowledged that the instruments could be seen as good practices.
103. The Executive Secretary remarked that these instruments had been adopted by the International Labour Conference and that application of their provisions did not require ratification. Both instruments were being used within the industry selectively and on a voluntary basis even when not ratified.
104. An Employer observer from Canada noted that very few countries had ratified the instruments. He proposed the insertion of “relevant” to qualify reference to the standards in the instruments. This was supported by the observer from the IAPH.
105. The Worker Vice-Chairperson proposed to insert “management” into box 4 because it was important that both employers and workers were safety conscious and involved in occupational safety and health training. The paragraph was agreed as amended, with the box incorporated into the text.

Paragraph 61

106. The Chairperson said it was ILO policy to address HIV/AIDS issues in the workplace.
107. The Worker Vice-Chairperson noted that during the preparation of the draft Guidelines it was agreed to retain text on HIV/AIDS and an explanation of ILO policy in this regard.
108. The Government Vice-Chairperson registered his support for the inclusion of HIV/AIDS.
109. The Employer Vice-Chairperson acknowledged that HIV/AIDS was an important issue, but suggested it be included in an appendix. The paragraph was agreed without change, with formatting and placement to be left to the discretion of the Office.

Paragraph 66

- 110.** The Worker Vice-Chairperson remarked that, where there were no recognized trade unions, there was no social dialogue.
- 111.** The Chairperson proposed that the text refer to “stakeholders”. The paragraph was agreed as amended.

Paragraph 71

- 112.** The Employer Vice-Chairperson explained that there was a problem with the inclusion of workers’ representatives in the “sign off” process. He felt that consultation with workers’ representatives would be suitable.
- 113.** The Worker Vice-Chairperson emphasized that workers’ representatives had been singled out as it was important for workers’ representatives to be involved. He was concerned that the competencies required for a job could be changed so that a worker no longer had the competencies needed. This was why social dialogue and agreement was important.
- 114.** The expert from the Government of Papua New Guinea felt that the text could be drafted to reconcile the requirements of the Employers and Workers.
- 115.** The Worker Vice-Chairperson explained that “shall” was a binding term and the term “should” provided flexibility. He proposed that “stakeholders should agree on” would satisfy the reservations of the Employers.
- 116.** The Employer Vice-Chairperson further proposed to replace the word “will” with “could” in accordance with the sentiment accorded in the rest of the paragraph. The paragraph was agreed as amended.

Paragraph 85

- 117.** The Employer Vice-Chairperson remarked that a “licence” was typically a document issued by a government. He proposed the term “certification” or “qualification” could be employed.
- 118.** The Worker Vice-Chairperson stated that there had been difficulty with using “certificates” following issues encountered in the European Union. Further problems could be encountered due to the notion of transferability that accompanied “certificates”.
- 119.** The Chairperson noted that a person could be qualified but not necessarily certified and thus using the term “qualification” could be more appropriate.
- 120.** The Government Vice-Chairperson supported the use of “qualification” over “certification” because a certificate often had a cost.
- 121.** The Employer Vice-Chairperson noted that the term “qualification” was used in a different context in certain VET systems but was suitable for the text. The paragraph was agreed as amended.

Paragraph 86

122. The Worker Vice-Chairperson questioned whether, in the event that an assessment revealed gaps, the worker would be able to appeal the decision. The assessment of competencies needed to be completed in good faith.
123. The Employer Vice-Chairperson acknowledged that the appeal process was linked to the assessment process and all good assessment systems included an appeal process. He highlighted that moderation and verification should be included in the training and assessment policy.
124. The Chairperson noted that ideally the assessment was communicated and the right to appeal would be available to the person concerned. This was beyond the scope of the example of an individual learning plan.
125. The Employer Vice-Chairperson noted that figure 9 should be called an “example” of an individual learning plan. The Meeting accepted the insertion and the paragraph was agreed as amended.

Paragraph 90

126. The Employer Vice-Chairperson suggested that the text should clarify that figure 10 was an “example” of training. The paragraph was agreed as amended.

Paragraph 92

127. The Employer Vice-Chairperson suggested that the reference to the “port training institute” be removed because these institutes did not exist for all port operations. The paragraph was agreed as amended.

Paragraph 93

128. The Worker Vice-Chairperson expressed concern about the term “systematic”. He proposed that a further point suggesting that assessment be undertaken in a “consistent” manner to avoid any unfair practices be inserted. The paragraph was agreed as amended.

Paragraph 94

129. An Employer expert from the United States proposed to revise the text to read that “assessment criteria are fair and appropriate to the job and should not be used to exclude any groups”. She added that the sentiment could be strengthened by replacing “should” with “must”. The paragraph was agreed as amended.

Paragraph 95

130. The Worker Vice-Chairperson was concerned that the process of identifying “suitable candidates” could have led to the unfair exclusion of workers. The aim was to choose the most appropriate candidate with the most appropriate qualifications and skills.
131. The Employer Vice-Chairperson endorsed the principle that employers must be allowed to identify suitable candidates prior to major investments in training.

132. A Worker expert provided an example illustrating the importance of selecting a suitable candidate. If this was to be based exclusively on one parameter, it could exclude workers who could have done the work but were not considered from the outset. A broad scope in the identification of candidates was required.

133. The Chairperson explained that scope had been advocated throughout the text and that it did not imply that the identification and selection process had a narrow scope. He further noted that paragraph 94 already stressed a principle of non-exclusion and that paragraphs 94 and 95 ought to be read in conjunction. The paragraph was agreed without any amendment.

Paragraph 97

134. The Employer Vice-Chairperson proposed that it was more appropriate to provide guidance that practical skills “should” be assessed by observation. The paragraph was agreed as amended.

Paragraph 98

135. The Employer Vice-Chairperson suggested that it was preferable to refer to “qualified” assessors rather than “registered” assessors. He further proposed that “organization” be inserted as an alternative where circumstances meant there was not an education and training quality assurance body.

136. The Government Vice-Chairperson and the Chairperson noted that the application of the guidance on accreditation would be costly. The paragraph was agreed as amended.

Paragraph 99

137. The Employer Vice-Chairperson suggested two changes to this paragraph. First, to amend the first sentence to read “On completion of the training cycle, portworkers should be issued with a recognized qualification (e.g. certificate of competence), and their personnel files updated accordingly.” Secondly, he proposed that all the bullet points be transferred into an appendix. The paragraph was agreed as amended.

Paragraph 100

138. Both the Worker Vice-Chairperson and the Employer Vice-Chairperson agreed that they had an issue with identification (ID) cards.

139. The Employer Vice-Chairperson stated that, due to different practices in ports around the world, the Guidelines should not prescribe ID cards. He noted that this was rather the responsibility of human resources departments in different ports.

140. It was therefore agreed to delete paragraph 100 as the issue referred to in this paragraph could be resolved by social dialogue at the individual port level.

141. The Worker Vice-Chairperson drew attention to the fact that since the Meeting had agreed to delete paragraph 100, the abbreviation ID would have to be withdrawn from the list of abbreviations and acronyms.

142. The Employer Vice-Chairperson drew attention to figure 9, noting that the number used there was just an employee number and was not related to ID cards.

143. The Chairperson noted that this change would be reflected.

Paragraph 101

144. The Employer Vice-Chairperson proposed that the wording “preferably with the government’s assistance and support” be deleted. The paragraph was agreed as amended.

Glossary of terms used in the Guidelines

145. Discussion took place as to the definitions listed in the glossary and the possibility of new additions.

146. The Employer Vice-Chairperson suggested that, due to the number of port-related terms, a reference to the PDP Glossary could be useful and that it could be incorporated at the end or as a footnote.

147. The Chairperson noted that the PDP Glossary only became available once a licence had been purchased. Therefore, the Glossary was not in the public domain, which put limitations on its use. It was also brought to the attention of the Meeting that the PDP Glossary was not available in French.

148. The expert from the Government of Senegal suggested the addition of new words such as: safety, health, security, portworker.

149. The Chairperson advised the Meeting that these words were defined in ILO Conventions or codes of practice.

150. The Executive Secretary stated that the subject of the Guidelines was training and that it was not to define port-related terms. If the Office were to define words such as “safety” they would then have to consult other departments within the ILO to make sure it was compatible with their definition. He was of the opinion that it was not necessary to be inclusive as he expected that the person who was to read the Guidelines would have knowledge of these words. He further pointed out that there was a list in Appendix I of all the sources one could consult to obtain definitions.

151. The Chairperson noted that the word “stakeholder” had been used during the Meeting and that this definition had to be included. It was agreed by the Meeting that this was the only addition that would be introduced into the glossary.

152. The Employer Vice-Chairperson highlighted that the definition for “Assessment” was not precise. The strict definition would result in the word “performance” being replaced with “competence” as this word grasped both performance and behavioural aspects and this was very important to note.

153. The expert from the Office from the Skills and Employability Department agreed with the view of the Employers’ group, as he thought that if one referred to “assessment” it would be suitable to replace “performance” with “competence” as the Guidelines were referring to competency-based training. However, he noted that in other contexts when one was not referring to competency-based training, “performance” was a valid word to use as it was more general. The glossary was agreed as amended.

Appendix I

- 154.** Lengthy discussion took place as to the use of references to other sources.
- 155.** The observer from the International Safety Panel of ICHCA International Limited asked whether it was possible to make reference to other international guidelines that were available on the industry and in particular those produced by the IMO.
- 156.** The Executive Secretary reminded the Meeting that the Governing Body had decided that no reference to other documents by other organizations should be made, as these documents were not a result of a tripartite process. He acknowledged that a list of documents would be highly appreciated. He stated that legal advice would be needed if any reference were to be made, in order to make sure that the documents listed were in line with ILO standards.
- 157.** The Meeting agreed that another appendix with a list of references would be beneficial and that, if reference to other guidelines/sources were to be made, it was necessary to seek legal advice before incorporating these amendments into the Guidelines.
- 158.** The observer from the International Safety Panel of ICHCA International Limited clarified that what he had intended to suggest was that a list of sources, for example a list of other international organizations that could provide additional data, be incorporated into a new appendix and that he was not requesting a list of documentation.
- 159.** The Chairperson stated that a list of alternative sources could be added if the Meeting was of the view that this would be beneficial. He suggested that a list of organizations that could provide documentation would be added as a footnote to paragraph 2.
- 160.** The Employer Vice-Chairperson noted that paragraph 2 of Appendix I was totally irrelevant and not consistent with ILO standards. He was of the view that other references should not be linked to this paragraph and suggested that there should be reference to the ILO website.
- 161.** The Chairperson stated that the change to be made to box 4 would read “Other sources may contain valuable information on safety and health. Further information is provided on the ILO website.” Appendix I was agreed as amended.

Appendix VII

- 162.** The Employer Vice-Chairperson reminded the Meeting that the content of box 9 on pages 38–39 would be moved to the appendices. Therefore, he suggested that the contents of Appendix VII be moved to box 9.

Follow-up activities

- 163.** The session on follow-up activities and technical assistance for the application of the Guidelines generated considerable debate among delegates and raised several practical suggestions for future activities. Specific suggestions made by participants for future activities are set out below under the headings of dissemination and promotion, technical assistance, supporting materials, training, and funding and resources.

Dissemination and promotion

164. The Worker Vice-Chairperson stated that the adoption of the Guidelines was not the end of the exercise. The success of the Guidelines was dependent on their dissemination and promotion. An information campaign, with involvement from the industry, was needed.
165. The Government Vice-Chairperson suggested that promotion should start at the national level and that governments had an important role.
166. The Worker Vice-Chairperson remarked that the actual dissemination and promotion of the Guidelines could be executed in many ways, such as a website or an e-newsletter. The ILO should have a role in providing tools and further guidance on adapting available training resources and promoting good practices.
167. The Deputy Secretary-General agreed that a website on training in ports would be helpful. It could host materials and serve as a platform for linking all stakeholders as well as exchanging the relevant information. Reactivity and flexibility of such a tool meant that it should be independent of the ILO.
168. An Employer expert from the Netherlands noted that the International Port Training Conference was a potential venue to improve dissemination of the Guidelines and discuss developments of good practices.
169. The observer from the International Safety Panel of ICHCA International Limited noted that his organization would disseminate the Guidelines to all their members and that ILO support in their enterprise would be helpful.
170. The Employer Vice-Chairperson stated that the success of the PDP was due to its training of trainers, updates to information and ability to communicate with other port operators through the ILO. This was more important than the technical content of the PDP itself. Guidelines could not be successful without similar ILO support in terms of quality assurance and assistance as in the PDP.
171. The expert from the Government of Senegal concurred that a global tool such as the PDP was the type of tool required for the Guidelines.
172. The Executive Secretary acknowledged that lessons could be learned from the PDP, however it dealt exclusively with portworkers in container terminals.
173. An Employer observer from Canada suggested that the best way to disseminate and promote the Guidelines was to capitalize on the credibility and position of the ILO.
174. The Employer Vice-Chairperson emphasized the importance of the ILO and its social agenda in the follow-up activities to the Guidelines.

Technical assistance

175. The Employer Vice-Chairperson stated that it was the small ports in small countries that must be remembered when planning follow-up activities.
176. He further suggested that the provision of technical assistance to governments was a vital part of the follow-up, especially in countries with significant port activity. Although traditional training methods had involved time and experience, training needed to involve

social dialogue. The ILO needed to engage in tripartite activities, national seminars, and provide technical assistance to governments and to the port sector.

- 177.** The experts from the Government of Gambia and the Government of Senegal recommended that a regional approach could be taken by the ILO and its constituents. It was stressed that the assistance would support the inclusion of all the stakeholders, training for trainers, and essential infrastructure, such as training materials and facilities.

Supporting materials

- 178.** The Employer expert from Singapore noted that the attraction of competency-based training was that it was objective. The modular structure meant that a country could assemble the appropriate elements for their circumstances. She informed that competency-based training was a lengthy process and that efficiency could be improved if there was a “common library” from which to borrow training units. There could be savings of time and costs.
- 179.** Several speakers agreed that, despite difficulties or costs, the establishment of competency-based training was beneficial for the port sector. The lengthy process of establishing competency-based training meant that it was important to develop training in small manageable progressions and work together as social partners and as an industry to build up capacity.

Training

- 180.** The Worker and Employer Vice-Chairpersons stated that the training of portworkers was important to the industry to ensure safety and profitability. The discussion acknowledged crucial aspects to be considered regarding activities pertaining to training; the understanding of competency-based training, the training of trainers, networking between ports and the diversity of port operations.

Funding and resources

- 181.** The Meeting recognized the financial implications of the application of the Guidelines and in improving training in the port sector in general. It was understood that the financial resources of the ILO were limited but the support of the ILO was important in the implementation of the Guidelines.
- 182.** The Worker Vice-Chairperson and an Employer observer from Canada expressed concern that the ILO might not be able to support the follow-up activities for the Guidelines.
- 183.** An Employer expert from the United States stated that competency-based training and the implementation of the Guidelines would need consideration efforts by the ports and that the success of the Guidelines would need the support of the ILO, especially in developing countries.
- 184.** The Executive Secretary explained that the ILO had a record of providing valuable technical assistance when there was a budget available from the ILO member State concerned or from donors. The ILO was obliged to operate within its financial and human resources constraints. He registered optimism that the resources to fund training in the port sector were available even in developing countries.

185. The Secretary-General informed the Meeting that the mandate of the ILO was to promote decent work for all, including in the port sector. This added value of the ILO involved bringing together the tripartite constituents for the development and effective implementation of policies, standards, guidelines and tools. She noted that there were elaborate supervisory mechanisms to implement standards and that, for the implementation of guidelines, the ILO supported its tripartite constituents at a national level. It was beyond the ILO's mandate to actually implement training guidelines in each and every member State. Discussion had occurred as to the possibility of using the ILO-ITC to aid in dissemination and training. The feasibility of ILO involvement in the implementation of the Guidelines was a matter of mandate and not only of resources. She stated that the Office would continue to promote decent work for portworkers and that the Guidelines would be brought to the attention of the Governing Body.

Summary remarks

186. The Chairperson closed the session by summarizing the main conclusions to emerge from the discussions. In brief, delegates' principal concerns were: the identification of effective means of disseminating the Guidelines to stakeholders in the port sector; the need for support and assistance to strengthen capacity building in training at the national, port and terminal levels; and the provision of appropriate training materials and assistance to upgrade the skills of local instructors in competency-based training.

187. More specifically, delegates recommended that the ILO explore every opportunity (e.g. international organizations, newsletters, workshops) to disseminate the Guidelines to a global audience, including the establishment and maintenance of an ILO website to collect, collate and distribute relevant materials. There was strong support for the preparation and distribution of practical guidance manuals and related training materials and other tools (possibly using the PDP philosophy and methodology) to assist in strengthening capacity development in the port sector and the delivery of regional or local workshops. Finally, delegates requested that the ILO explore every opportunity to raise funds from external sources to support these activities.

Adoption of the ILO *Guidelines on training in the port sector*

188. A revised draft of the ILO *Guidelines on training in the port sector* was presented to the meeting for its consideration. Two amendments were proposed.

189. Both the Employer and Worker Vice-Chairpersons commented on the omission of the word "teams" in table 1 on page 6.

190. The Government Vice-Chairperson asked for clarification of the wording "work under real-time instruction" in the fifth row of the table.

191. The Chairperson explained that the industry was moving from a rather ad hoc loose gang arrangement to teamwork on a terminal. That meant a shift from working in close proximity to working in teams spread over a large terminal, with no eye contact but using electronic communication. He noted the difference between the characteristics of gangs and those of teams. He pointed out a translation issue in the French version of the Guidelines.

-
- 192.** A member of the secretariat explained that in French the translation of “gangs” and “teams” was essentially the same, even though in English there was a distinction between the two terms.
- 193.** The Meeting agreed to delete the phrase “work under real-time instruction” in the fifth row of the table.

The ILO *Guidelines on training in the port sector* were adopted as amended.

Closing of the Meeting

- 194.** The Employer Vice-Chairperson highlighted the importance of the Guidelines, but emphasized that the effectiveness of competency-based training would only be achieved when a real change in the attitudes of people was seen in the industry. The challenges would not be discouraging for large organizations, but rather for small port operators. He acknowledged the added value and contribution of participants at the Meeting from smaller ports. He expressed concern regarding the possible lack of follow-up support following initial enthusiasm. The critical roles of the ILO and experts were important in implementing the provisions of the Guidelines and changing the way the industry worked.
- 195.** The Worker Vice-Chairperson stated that producing the Guidelines had been a long and difficult process. He hoped they would encourage ports to become safer and more productive working environments. He felt that it constituted a positive step towards attracting workers to safer ports, and not just to larger world-renowned ports but also to smaller ports where there was still a lot of work to be done. The ILO had a large role to play.
- 196.** The Government Vice-Chairperson asserted that promoting decent training was one element of decent work. He noted the excellent work and efforts of his group and wished great success to the Guidelines.
- 197.** The Secretary-General of the Meeting stated that the adoption of the Guidelines by the Meeting had been a great achievement, since the Guidelines were the very first of their sort in the port industry. She explained that the Guidelines would help to promote more decent work in the port sector, and in that endeavour the Meeting was not the end, but only the beginning of efforts. She informed the Meeting that the Guidelines would be brought to the attention of the Governing Body in March 2012 for endorsement for publication, and explained that the endorsement by the Governing Body would be a good opportunity to help disseminate the document. She further emphasized that the ILO was eager to see the Guidelines fully implemented, and therefore urged the constituents to follow up on agreed recommendations. She explained that, although the ILO would be willing to help, it was beyond the scope of its activities to provide training. She supported and agreed with the follow-up suggestions put forward by the constituents for creating a website and launching information campaigns.
- 198.** The Chairperson recognized that the Guidelines were the product of extensive deliberations conducted in a professional manner and were tangible evidence of social dialogue. Structured and systematic training schemes for portworkers had to be supported within a strong human resources development framework with recognized career development patterns and qualifications. Effective training was reliant on appropriate, well-designed and delivered teaching strategies.
- 199.** The Meeting exposed the merits and many benefits of competence-based training and its relevance and applicability to the port sector. The Guidelines, if implemented, would make a significant contribution to improving the quality of training in the port sector and to

upgrading the skills and status of portworkers. With support, commitment and adequate resources, the Guidelines would be an important contribution to training in the port sector.

Evaluation questionnaire

Evaluation questionnaire

A questionnaire seeking participants' opinions on various aspects of the Meeting was distributed before its last sitting. The following is an analysis of their responses.

1. How do you rate the Meeting as regards the following?

	Excellent (5)	Good (4)	Satisfactory (3)	Poor (2)	Unsatisfactory (1)	Average
The choice of agenda item (the subject of the Meeting)	14	11	–	–	–	4.56
The points for discussion	9	13	3	–	–	4.23
The quality of the discussion	10	12	3	–	–	4.28
The Meeting's benefits to the sector	12	10	1	1	–	4.38
The conclusions	8	12	3	1	–	4.33
Opportunity for networking	9	8	6	–	–	4.13

2. How do you rate the quality of the report in terms of the following?

	Excellent (5)	Good (4)	Satisfactory (3)	Poor (2)	Unsatisfactory (1)	Average
Quality of analysis	11	12	1	–	–	4.42
Objectivity	12	11	1	1	–	4.36
Comprehensiveness of coverage	7	14	3	–	–	4.17
Presentation and readability	12	9	4	–	–	4.32
Amount and relevance of information	10	15	–	–	–	4.40

3. How do you consider the time allotted for discussion?

	Too much	Enough	Too little
Discussion of the report	4	20	1
Presentations	4	21	–
Group meetings	7	17	1

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

Excellent (5)	Good (4)	Satisfactory (3)	Poor (2)	Unsatisfactory (1)	Average
16	7	1	–	–	4.63

5. Respondents to the questionnaire

Government	Employers	Workers	Observers	No indication	Total	Respondents rate (%)
10	8	5	1	1	25	83

6. Participants at the Tripartite Meeting of Experts (including advisers)

	Government	Employers	Workers	Observers
Total	12	8	6	4
Male	11	5	6	4
Female	1	3	0	0

Website of the Sectoral Activities Service (www.ilo.org/sector)

7. **Are you aware that the Sectoral Activities Service has a website that provides information on its activities and meetings?**

Yes 16 **No** 8

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

Excellent (5)	Good (4)	Satisfactory (3)	Needs improvement (2)	Unsatisfactory (1)
2	6	6	–	–

9. **If you consulted the website, did you download any of the documents available from it?**

Yes 5 **No** 6 **Viewed but did not download** 6

List of participants
Liste des participants
Lista de participantes

Chairperson

Président

Presidente

Dr Brian Thomas, Cardiff, United Kingdom.

Government experts

Experts des gouvernements

Expertos de los gobiernos

ARGENTINA ARGENTINE

Dr Víctor Antonio Solazzo, Coordinador fiscalización trabajo portuario y marítimo, Ministerio de Trabajo de la Nación Argentina, Buenos Aires.

FINLAND FINLANDE FINLANDIA

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

JORDAN JORDANIE JORDANIA

Mr Walid Fahad Qaramseh, Manager of Training and Development Department, the Ports Corporation AQABA-JORDAN, Aqaba.

**PAPUA NEW GUINEA PAPOUASIE-NOUVELLE-GUINÉE
PAPUA NUEVA GUINEA**

Mr Kamit Nanadai Koia, Deputy Chief Operations Officer (Policy and Planning), PNG Ports Corporation Limited, Operations Department, Port Moresby.

SENEGAL SÉNÉGAL

M. Amadou Yaya Sarr, Chef du Département des Ressources Humaines, Port Autonome de Dakar (PAD), Dakar.

Employer experts

Experts des employeurs

Expertos de los empleadores

Ms Soh Hoon Chua, Training Manager, Leadership and Organisation Development Manager, PSA Corporation Ltd, Singapore.

Mr Pierre du Randt, Capacity Planning Manager, Transnet Port Terminals, Durban, South Africa.

Sr. Aurelio Linero Mendoza, Asesor de la Comisión Laboral, Consejo Nacional de la Empresa Privada (CONEP), Ciudad de Panamá, Panamá.

Mr Peter van der Sluis, Senior Advisor, Working Conditions and Labour Relations AWWN (General Employers Organization), Barendrecht, Netherlands.

Ms Susan Winfree, Director of Workforce Development & Safety, New York Shipping Association (NYSA), Elizabeth, United States.

Employers' advisers

Conseillers techniques des employeurs

Consejeros técnicos de los empleadores

Mr John Beckett, Vice President, Training, Safety & Recruitment, British Columbia Maritime Employers Association (BCMEA), Vancouver, Canada.

Mr Stéphane Morency, Director, Labour Relations and Manpower, Maritime Employers Association, Montreal, Canada.

Ms Yelitza Suarez, General Secretary, Venezuelan Shipowners' Chamber, Caracas, Venezuela.

Worker experts

Experts des travailleurs

Expertos de los trabajadores

Sr. Marco Antonio Cervantes Quinto, Presidente, Unión de Estibadores y Jornaleros del Puerto de Veracruz, Veracruz, México.

Mr Frank Leys, Section Secretary, International Transport Workers' Federation, London, United Kingdom.

Mr Mohammed Haneef Panduvallil Moosakutty, Working President/General Secretary, the Cochin Port Staff Association, All India Port & Dock Workers Federation, Kerala, India.

Mr Joost van der Lecq, Representative, FNV Bondgenoten, Rotterdam, Netherlands.

Mr Charles Wambui, Executive Board Member, Dock Workers' Union, Mombasa, Kenya.

Workers' advisers

Conseillers techniques des travailleurs

Consejeros técnicos de los trabajadores

Mr Theo Serraarens, Union Representative, FNV Bondgenoten, Rotterdam, Netherlands.

Governments participating as observers

Gouvernements participant en qualité d'observateurs

Gobiernos que participan en calidad de observadores

CROATIA CROATIE CROACIA

Mr Ivan Čule, Executive Secretary Port Association, Croatian Chamber of Economy, Association of Ports, Rijeka.

Adviser/Conseiller technique/Consejero Técnico

Mr Arsen Randić, Human Resources and Legal Department Manager, Rijeka.

GAMBIA GAMBIE

Mr Ousman Jobarteh, Director of Traffic Operations, Gambia Ports Authority, Banjull.

GREECE GRÈCE GRECIA

Ms Aimilia Papachristou, Adviser, General Secretary of Ports and Port Policy, Ministry of Development, Competitiveness and Shipping, Piraeus.

KAZAKHSTAN KAZAJSTÁN

Mr Bakhtiyar Omarov, Specialist, Aktau International Sea Trade Port, Astana.

**PAPUA NEW GUINEA PAPOUASIE-NOUVELLE-GUINÉE
PAPUA NUEVA GUINEA**

Adviser/Conseiller technique/Consejero técnico

Mr Mulai Ninihili-Vui, Human Resources Manager, PNG Ports Corporation Limited, Human Resources Department, Port Moresby.

**UNITED REPUBLIC OF TANZANIA RÉPUBLIQUE-UNIE DE TANZANIE
REPÚBLICA UNIDA DE TANZANÍA**

Adviser/Conseiller technique/Consejero técnico

Mr Lucas P. Mganga, Human Resources Development Manager of the Tanzania Ports Authority, Dar es Salaam.

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 Roberto Ferravante, Deputy Head of Unit, Directorate General for Mobility and Transport, Ports and Inland Navigation, Brussels, Belgium.

Representatives of non-governmental international organizations

Representants d'organisations internationales non gouvernementales

Representantes de organizaciones internacionales no gubernamentales

**International Safety Panel (ISP) of ICHCA International Ltd
International Safety Panel (ISP) de l'Association internationale
pour la coordination de la manutention des marchandises
Plan Internacional de Seguridad de la Asociación Internacional
de Coordinación del Transporte de Carga (ICHCA)**

Mr Mike Compton, Technical Advisor and Chairman, International Safety Panel, ICHCA International Ltd, Romford Essex, United Kingdom.

International Association of Ports and Harbours (IAPH)

Association internationale des ports (AIP)

Asociación Internacional de Puertos (AIP)

Mr Ferdinand van de Laar, Managing Director, International Association of Ports and Harbors, Tokyo, Japan.

International Organisation of Employers (IOE)

Organisation internationale des employeurs (OIE)

Organización Internacional de Empleadores (OIE)

M. Jean Dejardin, Conseiller, Organisation internationale des employeurs (OIE), Genève, Suisse.