

INTERNATIONAL LABOUR ORGANIZATION
Sectoral Activities Programme

Final report

**Global Dialogue Forum on Safety in the Supply Chain
in Relation to Packing of Containers**
(Geneva, 21–22 February 2011)

Geneva, 2011

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. The International Labour Office welcomes such applications.

Libraries, institutions and other users registered in the United Kingdom with the Copyright Licensing Agency, 90 Tottenham Court Road, London W1T 4LP [Fax: (+44) (0)20 7631 5500; email: cla@cla.co.uk], in the United States with the Copyright Clearance Center, 222 Rosewood Drive, Danvers, MA 01923 [Fax: (+1) (978) 750 4470; email: info@copyright.com] or in other countries with associated Reproduction Rights Organizations, may make photocopies in accordance with the licences issued to them for this purpose.

Global Dialogue Forum on Safety in the Supply Chain in Relation to Packing of Containers. Final report.

ISBN 978-92-2-125143-9 (print)

ISBN 978-92-2-125144-6 (Web pdf)

Also available in French: *Forum de dialogue mondial sur la sécurité dans la chaîne d'approvisionnement concernant le remplissage des conteneurs. Rapport final* (ISBN 978-92-2-225143-8 (print), Geneva, 2011, in Spanish: *Foro de diálogo mundial sobre la seguridad en la cadena de suministro en relación con el embalaje de los contenedores. Informe final.* (ISBN 978-92-2-325143-7), Geneva, 2011

Safety / occupational safety / cargo / container / packaging / value chains

15.06

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 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 web site: www.ilo.org/publns.

Printed by the International Labour Office, Geneva, Switzerland

Contents

	<i>Page</i>
Report of the discussion	1
Introduction	1
Opening remarks	1
Point 1: Reasons that lead to the application of poor practices in the packing of containers	3
Point 2: Compliance to standards on packing of containers	6
Point 3: Training on packing of containers and reaching out to all stakeholders for the dissemination and application of common standards and good practices	10
Point 4: Recommendations for a common approach throughout the supply chain for the correct application of the appropriate standards and good practices in packing of containers and follow up activities	13
Panel discussion: “The inspection of freight containers”	14
Consideration and adoption of Forum consensus points	16
Closing remarks	16
Points of consensus and conclusions of the Forum	19
Introduction	19
Theme 1: Reasons that lead to the application of poor practices in packing of containers	19
Points on which consensus was reached	19
Points on which consensus was not reached	20
Theme 2: Compliance to standards on packing of containers	20
Points on which consensus was reached	20
Theme 3: Training on packing of containers and reaching out to all stakeholders for the dissemination and application of common standards and good practices	21
Points on which consensus was reached	21
Points on which consensus was not reached	22
Theme 4: Recommendations for a common approach throughout the supply chain for the correct application of the appropriate standards and good practices in packing of containers and follow-up activities	22
Points on which consensus was reached	22
Evaluation questionnaire	23
List of participants	27

Report of the discussion

Introduction

1. The Global Dialogue Forum on Safety in the Supply Chain in Relation to Packing of Containers was held at the International Labour Office in Geneva from 21 to 22 February 2011. The Governing Body of the ILO first approved the convening of this Forum at its 304th Session (March 2009) with a final approval being made at its 309th Session (November 2010). The purpose was to focus on the safe packing of containers, so as to reach conclusions and points of consensus to address the poor practices in this sector and to also provide an opportunity to discuss the dissemination and application of common standards and good practices, in order to improve the safety of persons and property as well as the efficiency of transport operations.
2. At its 304th Session (March 2009) the Governing Body proposed a two-day forum to take place in 2011 on container safety in the supply chain and in packing of containers, based on research to be undertaken in 2010 in relation to the identification, adoption and promotion of good practices for implementing existing relevant standards on container safety. It was decided that the Forum would have six Employer and six Worker participants, representatives of interested governments, and observers from relevant organizations at their own cost. In November 2010, the Governing Body at its 309th Session proposed that the decision made in March 2009 at the 304th Session of the Governing Body, should be amended to a two-day GDF rather than a global technical workshop as it would be more appropriate for the scope of discussion. It was noted that the purpose of the meeting as decided by the Governing Body in March 2009 would remain unchanged and the composition of the meeting would remain the same.
3. The Forum was chaired by Mr Seiichi Tajima, First Secretary of the Permanent Mission of Japan, Geneva. The group coordinators of the Forum were elected as follows:

Government group coordinator: Mr Keith Bradley (Government of United Kingdom)
Employers' group coordinator: Mr Damian John Viccars
Workers' group coordinator: Mr Mike Gibbons
4. The Forum was attended by Government representatives from Argentina, Azerbaijan, Cameroon, China, Republic of Congo, Dominican Republic, Ecuador, Haiti, Japan, Jordan, Madagascar, Morocco, Nigeria, Pakistan, Panama, Qatar, Slovenia, South Africa, Thailand, Trinidad and Tobago, Turkey and United Kingdom. Eleven Employer representatives and 12 Worker representatives also attended. In addition, representatives of the United Nations Economic Commission for Europe (UNECE), International Safety Panel (ISP) of ICHCA International Limited, The International Union of Marine Insurance (IUMI), International Organisation of Employers (IOE) and International Trade Union Confederation (ITUC).

Opening remarks

5. Mr George Dragnich, Executive Director of the ILO Social Dialogue Sector welcomed the participants to the Forum. He noted that the Sectoral Activities Department was responsible for the sectoral dimension of ILO's work and addressed all aspects of work including the transportation sector. The sectoral approach offered better insight into the world of work as a result bringing together constituents at the national, regional and

international level. Additionally, this strategy allowed all four of the ILO's strategic objectives to be addressed and allowed for practical outcomes to the work of the ILO across specific sectors. The Sectoral Activities Department promoted social dialogue in combination with research, meetings, national activities, action programmes and standards related activities as well as a number of inter-sectoral activities. The GDF was an excellent example which would have direct impact on the sector concerned.

6. The Secretary-General, Ms Alette Van Leur, in her opening speech raised the question of whether or not these accidents could have been prevented. The ILO and its constituents firmly believed that accidents of that nature could indeed be prevented. The purpose of the Forum was to provide a platform for discussion on the safety of packaging of containers so as to reach conclusions and points of consensus to address poor practices within this sector. Although it was important to ensure efficiency within this sector, it was equally as important to ensure safety of the workers and others involved. Efforts to address safety within this sector needed to be intensified, as safety and health were integral components of improving the supply chain. She expressed hope that the Forum could produce points of consensus and conclusions that would help to improve efficiency and effectiveness of the supply chain operations and ensure the safety of workers within the supply chain. She concluded by saying that the GDF was a trust building process acknowledging and respecting the differences between cultures, countries, and participants and that the most important aspect of the Forum was to reach consensus so as to promote and help implement good practices in the packing of containers.
7. An overview of the background report for discussion at the Forum, prepared by Mr Bill Brassington on behalf of the ILO, was presented by the Executive Secretary. The report had been prepared as part of a Sectoral Activities Programme and was based on the findings of a relevant research study that was undertaken by Mr Bill Brassington of ETS Consulting. The report had benefited from inputs from many experts in the field, and several international organizations such as the United Nations Economic Commission for Europe (UNECE), the International Transport Workers' Federation (ITF), the International Association of Ports and Harbours (IAPH), the International Road Transport Union (IRU), the Global Shippers' Forum (GSF), the International Chamber of Shipping (ICS) and the Government Regional Coordinators in Geneva had given valuable comments throughout the programme. The report was completed in October 2010, and thus did not include any pertinent developments since then.
8. The Employers' group coordinator highlighted the importance of this critically important subject. He listed briefly the parties that were involved in the supply chain from carriers to ports that handled the cargo. The employers' role and responsibility to protect the employees was clear. It was important to discuss what measures could both be realistically and effectively implemented in order to eliminate unsafe practices. There should be education and training towards safe practices. It was necessary to find a consensus on how to accomplish this. It was key not to apportion blame, but rather that the information should be available to everyone who needed it.
9. The Workers' group coordinator pointed out that numerous accidents had occurred because of containers being overweight and unevenly stowed. Education and training were essential and the persons involved should know whether cargo had moved in the container and how much the latter weighed. There was no monitoring on this subject and lack of training was common. The situation would only get worse as global trade increased constantly. He requested for international rules and standards on the safe packing of containers.
10. The Government group coordinator stated that the group had identified four areas that needed to be addressed in the Forum. Firstly, the responsibilities of the parties who pack containers should be specified. Secondly, it should be identified what kind of cargo is

packed in the containers. Thirdly, the focus should be on worker safety. Fourthly, there should be risk assessment techniques, and general awareness of these techniques. Loading issues, spillage and control issues were mentioned. He stated that the report did not include a statement on child labour. The availability of training material, which should be simple and concise, was emphasized.

11. The Government representative of Japan highlighted his country's interest in the theme, and appreciated the effort to hold the Forum. The report was informative and brought out important points. Japan would be in a consultation process with stakeholders in order to draft guidelines.
12. The Government representative of Trinidad and Tobago stated that it was the employers' responsibility to ensure there were no accidents. The employer should be able to show that everything was done to avoid accidents.
13. The Government representative of Ecuador thanked the Government group coordinator for bringing up the issue of child labour and wanted to recall this issue with respect to ensuring it was referenced in the points of consensus.

Point 1: Reasons that lead to the application of poor practices in the packing of containers

14. The Executive Secretary introduced the first point for discussion. The purpose of this point was to enable identification and a better understanding of the main reasons that lead to poor practices, and to pave the way for the identification of appropriate measures to eliminate these.
15. The Workers' group coordinator referred to training, or lack of it, as a key element for carriage of unsafe containers around the world. Guidance did exist but it was not reaching those that required it. The production of a simple guide and adequate training was necessary. The cost of publications was a hindrance as many could not afford them.
16. The Employers' group coordinator stated that the report detailing the causes of accidents demonstrated that more data needed to be gathered. Dissemination of guidelines was crucial as the existence of guidelines was not an issue, but rather how to actually obtain them was the main obstacle to overcome. The understanding of causes of accidents had to be improved as well as communicating guidance effectively. There was also a lack of awareness of some key standards and concern as to the unavailability and difficulty of accessing the ILO-IMO-UNECE guidelines.
17. The Government group coordinator stated that firstly, responsibilities of people in the supply chain were not well defined, and it was often based on trust that the person in the previous step in the supply chain had done his job. Additionally training had to be simple and accessible.
18. The Government representative of Trinidad and Tobago also highlighted the need for training and better management. He explained the need to understand the risk of those working in the supply chain. He noted that looking at the frequency of accidents was a reactive measure. In Trinidad and Tobago responsibility was a target of an inspection programme of the Occupational Safety and Health Authority and key performance indicators had been developed concerning existing practices, risks in workplaces throughout the supply chain, and where risk prevention could be implemented. Finally, he suggested that the Forum could discuss how the key indicators could be improved.

-
19. The Government representative of Morocco stated that there were unsatisfactory practices throughout the supply chain which led to accidents. There were causes that could be identified and tackled by appropriate training. Safety was a concern to everyone in the supply chain. Health and safety committees and occupational health authorities had an important role to play. Information needed to be properly conveyed to all those involved, as well as the need for recognition of the potential seriousness of accidents.
 20. The Government representative of Congo highlighted the role of governments to police the implementation of good practices. She gave an example from her country. Port activities should be carefully monitored by governments as various companies were not always well supervised. Companies should have adequate funding for training. Publications were often costly. Manuals needed to be available for workers and on-going training for all the workers involved.
 21. The Government representative of Ecuador reiterated comments made by earlier participants as to the importance of training and accessibility of guidance. There was a need for workers to understand the importance of complying with packing standards. It was suggested that the ILO should collect statistics in order to analyse the accidents.
 22. The Government representative of Japan reaffirmed comments made previously by other participants as to the accessibility of the ILO–IMO–UNECE guidelines. When accessed they had been very useful and new legislation in Japan would reflect much of their contents. However, parts of the contents on terms such as the “centre of gravity” could be improved. There was explanation provided for vertical value but in terms of horizontal value the information provided was rather vague. Detailed explanations were required in the guidelines as to the stress of the weight on the actual tyres of the vehicles. Japan would implement the guidelines. The challenge appeared to be to make them applicable worldwide, so that there would be an equal playing field. It was felt necessary to proceed in cooperation with other countries.
 23. An Employer participant also echoed the difficulty in accessing the ILO–IMO–UNECE guidelines and found that it was not possible to download the guidelines from either of the three organizations’ websites. The only way to access these was to buy the guidelines which were in an IMO publication. Working jointly with the International Chamber of Shipping (ICS) a publication on safe transport of containers by sea which contained best practices was published. This publication was at a cost, but Chapter 6 concerning stuffing of containers had been extracted from the manual and posted on the ICS website free of charge. There was a need for consolidated simplified guidelines as segmented guidelines would create confusion. It was suggested that the ILO worked more closely with IMO and UNECE on the follow-up activities to the guidelines.
 24. A Worker participant stated that the new administration in Japan had undertaken work to legislate the safety of road transport of containers. Each step had to be covered as there was a possibility for accidents to happen throughout the supply chain. It was suggested that the Forum should establish an internationally binding legal instrument that corresponded to the supply chain. Attention should not only be given to loading ports as transport was not confined to this area. If a driver was suspicious he should be able to open the containers, however this was currently not possible. Examples were shared based on information and statistics resulting from Japanese investigations, which relayed the hazards packed into many containers.
 25. A Worker participant stated that a reason for poor practice was the packing of containers under time constraints due to economic pressure. Poor planning of loading could only lead to bad distribution of weight. Certain pieces of cargo and machinery, by their very construction and design, should not be loaded into containers. Another Worker participant said it was very important to regulate and oversee this process and to eliminate the

economic benefits of overloading containers. Labelling the contents of containers was important. In many circumstances it was unknown what was inside the container, and when it was opened, workers were exposed to dangerous substances. Enforcement was extremely important on this issue, especially working on eliminating the economic benefits from wrong doing in the handling of containers.

26. Another Worker participant stated that the major issue was enforcement. Guidance material was very useful on various aspects of safety. However, there should be an obligation to meet a minimum standard. These guidelines helped develop standards, procedures and boundaries that the workers could understand. Without enforcement of minimum standards, the application of the guidance materials depended on the professionalism of the person. The operational handling of containers fell under certain regulations of the state and could be enforced in a safe way. There should be universal standards for adequate weighing equipment and uniform regulations requiring the weighing of containers.
27. An observer participant stated that containerization had brought many benefits to the world economy, however he stated that there was also an adverse side to container handling. The IMO's Maritime Safety Committee would consider the misdeclaration of container weights during their discussions in May 2011, and they would also consider the misdeclaration of goods. He posed a number of questions in relation to who was responsible for informing the shipper of how to do his job correctly. If those responsible told the shipper what to do and enforced the guidelines, then there would be a better understanding of the situation. There was also a language barrier as there were a lot of documents with good advice but few were in the language of the shippers that used them. Port equipment manufacturers had accepted the challenge of ensuring that all lifting appliances were able to check-weigh what they were lifting. This would be a standing provision and they would develop packages where these items could be retrofitted.
28. The representative of UNECE noted that the ILO-IMO-UNECE guidelines were currently the only global guidelines and they were under revision. These existing guidelines only reflected the maritime side, but not the port handling, transshipment, road and inland transport issues. Most accidents happened inland before the ships were loaded. The problem was that many workers involved did not have the training and knowledge of safety issues and lacked the skills required. The ILO, IMO and UNECE could put together global guidelines that covered the whole chain, however, various specialized groups would need to participate in drawing up the rules. The international community could only produce the rules and guidelines. Once they were agreed, the international organizations needed to have the documents well publicized online and made widely available. The question of enforcement would remain after distribution of the guidelines. Cargo insurers had an important role to play as none mentioned the rules of proper packing in their contracts. If these insurers would enforce those rules, and refuse infringements, then the industry would be more responsible.
29. An observer participant stated that within his organization the loss committee dealt with the concerns over the loss of container content. In ten years there had been an increase from 4 million to 16 million TEU in container shipping. During the same time period, the marine insurance industry recognized a reduction in the quality in container transport. An example from German insurers with statistics of unsecured cargo was given. The insurers were using CTU guidelines as they should ensure quality. The purpose of the Forum should be used to improve the safety of transport and the revision of the ILO-IMO-UNECE guidelines should have an important impact on safety.
30. A representative of the Office highlighted two additional points of discussion. Firstly, the lack of appropriate inspection in current procedures and its possible important role. Secondly, the importance of developing a coordinated plan for loading activities,

especially when there were separate consignments being packed in the same container at different times.

31. In reaction to a previous comment, the Employers' group coordinator stated that private companies should not be expected to issue guidance for public dissemination. Rather the group considered that governments and representative organizations had the obligation to create guidance and good practices, which private companies should then implement where possible. There was no need to update the guidelines from the ILO–IMO–UNECE for all modes of transport. He disagreed with the view that economic incentives were the primary cause of bad packing, asserting that poor knowledge was certainly just as, if not more important a cause. Misdeclarations of weight were a problem which could lead to practices that were out of line with national laws but would not always lead to accidents.
32. The Workers' group coordinator disagreed with the Employers. He cited the case of the "MSC Napoli", which had a catastrophic accident, and had 17–20 per cent of containers overweight or poorly packed. The Employers' group coordinator emphasized that there was an important distinction between overloading and misdeclaration of content.

Point 2: Compliance to standards on packing of containers

33. The Executive Secretary introduced discussion point 2. The purpose of the discussion was to address the facilitation of the compliance and correct application of existing standards.
34. The Workers' group coordinator stated that the workers were keen on promoting compliance with all standards. It was often not clear who had packed the container. Due to the nature of the industry, there were casual workers and they needed training. No inspection of containers took place in ports apart from inspections for drugs or foods. This is why compliance with standards and enforcement were needed, as well as independent verification of containers. This would lead to a chain of responsibility and accountability thus preventing accidents and stopping the security problem. Transparency throughout the supply chain would be a major improvement.
35. The Workers' group coordinator replying to a question on the meaning of "enforcement" stated that if a container was being loaded, it was expected to be done correctly and safely. There should be verification that the content declaration was true, that the contents had been safely lashed and everything had been done by competent persons. These were the issues in the supply chain to which risks were associated with. Ensuring things were done properly is what was meant by "enforcement".
36. The Government group coordinator noted that the top 100 container ports handled 426 million containers in 2009 of which 10 per cent were empty. He asked if it was being proposed by the workers that the remaining 380 million containers should be inspected and noted that this would require a lot of resources.
37. A Worker participant urged the wider use of equipment that could detect dangerous contents of a container, measure radiation and determine weight and weight distribution.
38. An Employer participant stated that in terms of compliance, practicality had to be taken into account in order to undertake proper enforcement. Enforcement required resources to which governments would have to commit, however there were examples of where regulation had intervened, where no necessary resources had been provided. It would be unpractical to control every container and it would not necessarily help tackle the problem. While the Forum was discussing some very bad practices, it should be remembered that the vast majority of international trade was conducted in a proper manner.

-
39. A Worker participant stated that throughout the transport chain, terminals had the equipment to be able to verify at least the accurate weight of the container. This was being done without any hindrance to productivity, so there was no reason for concern. When a container raises suspicion, it should be inspected and should not be allowed to go further down the chain. The current problem was that even if a container was known to be dangerous it was allowed to continue its journey. The IMDG code of the IMO, was a recommendation that became mandatory but had not brought the industry to a halt. The ILO-IMO-UNECE code was mandatory in terms of dangerous goods. If the industry has been able to absorb these, it should also be able to adopt a system for verification of all containers.
 40. A Worker participant stated that all ships needed to be inspected. An example of a container declared to be empty, but in fact weighed 28 tonnes, where the carrier could only lift up 26 tonnes, and collapsed, was given. It was felt that there should be an international capacity to penalize and it should be mandatory to impose guidelines on safety for preventing injuries and deaths of workers.
 41. A representative of the Office suggested that inspections could be done at the beginning of the operation, having one person inside the company verifying that the packing of the container was done correctly. Inspection further down the chain was very complicated and costly, but if done at the point of origin, this was to prove much more efficient. If there were to be an accident later, it would be for the appropriate authorities to investigate.
 42. A Worker participant stated that it was possible to guarantee that a container was loaded using best practices available and to state this in a declaration. It was possible to have a guarantee that the packing was done in a professional way and declare it as such. Another Worker participant stated that economic competition by not applying safety rules was unacceptable. Another Worker participant indicated that in the aviation sector, the weight of air cargo packed and lifted into a plane was clearly known. He expressed his objection to the situation of no declaration, misdeclaration, and undetected harmful substances in cargo transport units.
 43. The Government representative of Trinidad and Tobago noted that the key focus should be on the safe handling as well as the packing of containers, but the point was very well taken that you could not inspect all containers. He provided an example of a process in his country of a targeted inspection programme and the effectiveness of using such methods of gathering data.
 44. A Worker participant recognized that the Forum needed to jointly come up with a solution to eradicate the poor practices that were giving the industry a bad reputation. He could not see how this could be achieved without enforcement, control, or inspection. If “substandard carriage of goods” could not be controlled, then there needed to be legislations with appropriate sanctions for violations. He noted that the statement provided by the International Chamber of Shipping on the overloading of containers was a “breath of fresh air” and quoted the US Government Department of Labor and Occupational Health and Safety to support that loaded containers should be weighed before being loaded onto a ship. Current technology allowed the determination of weight distribution on each axle. Investment in such technology did not impede productivity.
 45. The Employers’ group coordinator suggested that this issue should be addressed in the maritime sphere at IMO since they had competent experts.
 46. The Government representative of the United Kingdom agreed that regulators needed to find out about non compliance. Intelligence and information gathered from the industry, allowed governments to take appropriate action.

-
- 47.** The Employers' group coordinator said that it was unfair to assume that one individual who packs a container in the wrong way, was representative of the whole industry. Improving standards and making it easier for all concerned to follow the rules was possible. There would always be those who wilfully abuse the rule, but it should not be assumed that there was no value in extending best practices. He commented on the statistics provided by the German expert regarding improperly secured packages, and cautioned against accepting them at face value, questioning whether the high percentage of faults could not be attributed to the use in Germany of CEN standards for securing cargo which was not the same standard used in the rest of Europe.
- 48.** A Worker participant pointed out that the driver did not have access to all the information and that all stakeholders were responsible for ensuring safety. There were provisions in place but access to these provisions was limited. Information was important, not only in the maritime field. He quoted statistics from 1999–2009; there were over 24,694 accidents involving trailers and 318 lives were lost from these accidents. He emphasized that the workers were trying to prevent loss of life as a result of poor packing of containers. The main objective was not to impede the flow of goods, but rather to protect workers at every stage of the supply chain, and also others who may be indirectly affected.
- 49.** A Worker participant raised the issue of responsibility of drivers for negligence in securing loads on road vehicles, whilst those who did not correctly pack containers involved in accidents, seemed to escape any penalties.
- 50.** A Worker participant quoted statistics from the United States that showed around 15,000 trucks rolling over each year. In the United Kingdom, trucks rolled over regularly but the person to blame was the driver. Drivers were prosecuted with little investigation of the real causes of these accidents. Drivers should be protected, along with the public. This problem was not only a maritime issue and could not be left for IMO only. This Forum should find solutions for the whole supply chain. Another Worker participant felt that to not address those concerns because some parts were to be dealt with at IMO would be negligent.
- 51.** Another Worker participant noted that enforcement had various meanings. All parties engaged in the loading of containers should be trained by the national authority. In addition to certification, there should be an audit system to ensure that the process was done correctly and continuously. There should also be an independent verification scheme. Finally, he suggested that there should be penalties for violation of good practice. All of these elements could be part of enforcement similar to practice in other fields.
- 52.** The Government representative of Japan stated that the Forum should keep SOLAS in mind. Information on weight and contents needed to be given to drivers of trailers. He did not have data showing that lack of information led to accidents. However, he still thought it necessary that information should be properly delivered to all concerned in the transport chain.
- 53.** An Employer participant stated that he was led to believe that accidents were occurring all over the world constantly, however, he knew of few incidents. He thought that the information shared was very anecdotal. The Employers group did not have any data relating to accidents and even the Japanese Government stated they did not have this data. If he was to take a calculated guess and was to carry out a risk analysis, no container would be inspected and no container would be scrutinized. The Government representative of Japan responded that carrying out risk assessment was necessary when enforcing regulations. The Workers' group coordinator disagreed that the evidence was anecdotal as it was contained in the report therefore he felt it was factual.

-
- 54.** A representative of the Office informed the Forum that there was close collaboration between IMO and ILO, and recalled that at the diplomatic conference at IMO in 2002, where the SOLAS Convention was approved, the IMO recognized that they had no jurisdiction to comment on the land issues and that their expertise and jurisdiction lay with the maritime side. Therefore the two organizations would work together to supplement the SOLAS Convention. The work of the two organizations would be complementary. He concluded by informing the Forum that the Office was to have a meeting with the IMO in London, to convey to them what was discussed during this Forum. This was an assurance that the two organizations were working together, therefore emphasizing that the discussion was taking place within the UN system, including with the UNECE.
 - 55.** A Worker participant emphasized the workers concern that information alone would not sufficiently address the problem, and that if they were to follow up solely on that matter they would not be solving the problem. An Employer participant stated that as long as information was received by those loading the container, they did not mind which form it took.
 - 56.** The Employers' group coordinator said that all stakeholders agreed on improving the safety of workers by ending unsafe practices, however, it was necessary to identify how this could be done. The Employers preferred to maintain voluntary standards based on the ILO–IMO–UNECE guidelines, which took into account the need for safety in all the operations of the supply chain. All stakeholders should be involved in reviewing the ILO–IMO–UNECE guidelines. Upon completion of the guidelines, the question was how those standards would be implemented. He proposed a standard, verifiable form, to be developed so as to ensure that the container was safe. He suggested that an expert committee could work out how this form would contribute to the safety of the container it was related to.
 - 57.** A Worker participant stated that this met a lot of their expectations and that this was a way forward in making the guidelines a more respected document in the industry. There should be revisions and amendments made to the guidelines so that it would become a code of practice which would be voluntary. The Employers' group coordinator agreed.
 - 58.** The Government representative of Ecuador asked how the proposed Code of Practice would be elaborated. He suggested that the social partners request that the ILO provide for a meeting of experts and asked if the social partners agreed on that.
 - 59.** The Government group coordinator pointed out that the issue of enforcement had been discussed and suggested that, if The Code of Practice was enforced to ensure consistency, a parallel guide and principle document could be produced so that enforcement agencies would refer to the same standards.
 - 60.** A Worker participant asked if a meeting of experts could be held soon, considering that the ILO had already prepared proposals for 2012–13.
 - 61.** A representative of the Office informed the Forum that there was a tentative plan for updating the ILO–IMO–UNECE guidelines that had been discussed between these three organizations. He noted that a representative of UNECE was present in the meeting room. The IMO unfortunately was not present but the Office would meet with the IMO secretariat to convey to them the results of this meeting. The plan for updating the ILO–IMO–UNECE guidelines, following the decisions taken by the three organizations, was already set. A joint Working Group of Experts was to update the document. A detailed timeline of the progress of the guidelines and meetings schedule was given.
 - 62.** An Employer participant noted that it was not entirely clear how The Code of Practice would be implemented. There was a plethora of standards but the problem was information

dissemination, and finding out what applied to each specific sector. The Employers wanted a single document that would be transmodal, easy to access, and apply to everybody irrespective of the sector. It would be the source document to ensure safe packing of containers. A joint working group would take up the ILO–IMO–UNECE guidelines and develop them into a standard in order to have only a single document. The Office seemed to suggest that there would be a dual process; firstly – revising, updating and publishing of the ILO–IMO–UNECE guidelines after which another document, a code of practice would be produced by the ILO. This would be a confusing way of proceeding, as it would lead to two different documents. Rather, it was preferable to have one consolidated document that reflected all the needs of the supply chain. A Worker participant expressed agreement on this.

63. The Secretary-General clarified that the revision of the guidelines was already the subject of proposals which would be submitted to the Governing Body of the ILO at its March 2011 session. Further proposals would have to be made so that the new output would be a code of practice. She could not make any commitment on the final decisions to be taken by the Governing Body.
64. An Employer participant asked for The Code of Practice to be renamed, ILO–IMO–UNECE Code of Practice, after revision of the guidelines. The preparation should involve all sectors and not only the maritime sector.
65. The Workers’ group coordinator sought to clarify that there was not only a need to revise the document but also to expand it to include the whole supply chain, reaching out across sectors.
66. An Employer participant suggested that the Office could discuss with the IMO secretariat the possibility of producing an information document for the MSC in May 2011, so that it would be informed of the wishes of the Workers and Employers. He encouraged the governments to brief their delegations at the IMO. A Worker participant felt that some publicity and visibility needed to be highlighted within the ILO to raise awareness. The Employers’ group coordinator noted that he would appreciate the possibility to have delegates representing each sector. A representative of the Office stated that a number of nominations would be made by the Groups and could represent all the sectors concerned. Participants at the meetings would need to be balanced including participation from certain industry groups.

Point 3: Training on packing of containers and reaching out to all stakeholders for the dissemination and application of common standards and good practices

67. The Executive Secretary introduced discussion point 3. The purpose of this discussion was to share views on the best training practices and dissemination of Standards, to ensure that those packing containers not only had access to the guidelines but could gain the required skills to implement them.
68. The Employers’ group coordinator stated that education, training and awareness were key to achieving success in ensuring the safety in the packing of containers. Specifically, training on consistent standards to be used throughout the entire supply chain was the way forward. It was critical to ensure that skills requirements at every point in the handling of containers were addressed. Safety standards were in existence but there was a need to consolidate these standards so as to create a single set of guidelines. Once the guidelines were adopted, dissemination of information and proper training should reach all concerned.

He stressed the importance of accredited institutes in the provision of training to the different sectors of the supply chain.

69. Responding to a question on the meaning of “common standards and good practices”, a representative of the Office said that the problem was not a lack of existing standards but rather how to use these standards and implement training to implement the standards.
70. The Employers’ group coordinator pointed to Table 3.1 in the report, which showed that guidelines were there but no one was taking notice of them. The problem was who gets the guidelines and who issues them. The target group for the standards were the people who actually stuff and pack the containers. In many enterprises, this involved fewer than three workers stuffing, one manager and a company director telling them what to do.
71. The Government representative of Trinidad and Tobago gave an example of a problem in his country involving a port with problems in container safety. They had developed an approach to assist the port in stuffing and unstuffing of cargoes in order to reduce the associated risks. Specifically, he listed several steps that needed to happen. Firstly, all the processes involved in the supply chain at all levels needed to be identified. Secondly, some entity needed to assess those risks. Thirdly, based on the findings of the assessment which should show risks at each stage of the supply chain, appropriate training should be developed to reduce those risks. Additionally, he suggested that there should be some prioritization of which risks needed to be addressed since managers might not have the capacity to reduce all of them. Finally, the last stage would be to measure the effects of implementing a programme to reduce risks to assess the degree of success.
72. The Government representative of Japan stated that the first step was to recognize the necessity of developing an intervention to reduce risks. In Japan even first class companies might not implement the existing guidelines because they may not clearly understand what is actually taking place. He suggested that it was necessary to ensure that preventive measures should be taken at the very start of the supply chain. The good practices might be in guidelines already. However, the key was to ensure that they were respected and applied.
73. An observer participant noted the importance of disseminating guidelines and best practices to those who were packing the containers. He quoted an example of the German Government disseminating guidelines on securing containers. The Internet was suggested as a cheap or even free tool which could be used to disseminate the guidelines. Apart from existing national and regional shipper organizations, there was currently a Global Shippers’ Forum. The membership to those organizations could be taken as an opportunity to advertise the guidelines as well as other issues. Another observer participant agreed and suggested that the groups liaise with these organizations in order to publicize and advertise these materials.
74. The Government representative of Trinidad and Tobago agreed with the importance of the Internet as a tool to disseminate information and standards. However, in some regions problems may arise and the example of the Caribbean was used where there was a high level of illiteracy. Although the Caribbean had a Goods code, many people handling containers were not familiar with those codes. The staff of companies could access the codes but the actual worker performing the job had no access, which complicated the promotion of occupational health and safety.
75. A Worker participant indicated that Japan had followed the discussed issues for 30 years and that prevention, as well as the application of safety codes was essential for a trade union. He informed the participants about the dissemination of information through television which had been very effective.

-
- 76.** An Employer participant mentioned a practical problem regarding the existing guidelines due to the copyright. This issue should be addressed. The German Government made guidelines freely accessible.
 - 77.** The Government representative of the United Kingdom indicated that in comparison to 1997 when the guidelines were issued, the governments of today should be able to use the Internet to circulate such guidelines.
 - 78.** A Worker participant insisted on the fact that the discussion should not focus on the matter of implementation within a company but much more on how to implement in countries such as China or India. Another Worker participant said that one should not forget the training needs of those who did not have access to the Internet.
 - 79.** An observer participant agreed that the publication was copyrighted. The copyright should not be an issue as the publication was also to be in public domain. He further mentioned the PDP programmes as excellent manuals that were already used in many countries, and could be used as excellent training mediums to be offered to shippers as cheaply or even free as possible.
 - 80.** An Employer participant believed that the majority of the transport companies were not big companies but were moderately smaller companies with only around ten vehicles. The problem was not only about raising awareness in developing countries but also in developed countries.
 - 81.** The Government representative of Trinidad and Tobago addressed the difficulties concerning the relationship between employer and employee, and pointed to the fact that employers were not always clear about what their roles and responsibilities were. There was a need for governments to develop enforcement policies with guidance and principles first and to include first voluntary and, if insufficient, compulsory compliance.
 - 82.** The Government representative of the United Kingdom informed the Forum of the availability of a checklist on their website, which encouraged people in the supply chain to bring information down to final users. This document had been translated into seven EU languages and could be downloaded.
 - 83.** The Government representative of Morocco stressed that the key element consisted in implementing the good practices and to make the information available.
 - 84.** A Worker participant stated that the workforce had become increasingly flexible in logistics worldwide and that this was particularly true for people loading containers. Another Worker participant asked if there could be a recommendation to enable all workers to have access to the guidelines.
 - 85.** A Worker participant agreed that it was important to reinforce already mentioned issues such as training but that this was insufficient. It was not clear where exactly the chain started and the type of training that was required. It was not always possible to train everyone in everything. It may be that best practices existed but that those had not been implemented. This is why a regulatory element was required.
 - 86.** The Government representative of the United Kingdom spoke about the content of the training and asked whether it would include all aspects of the cargo unit, and whether people required training for a short time or more specific training.
 - 87.** A representative of the Office gave clarifications on the ILO–PDP training, adding that it existed in different languages and was compatible with group or individual training.

-
88. The Government representative of Trinidad and Tobago agreed that it was important to know that workers were constantly supervised. He gave the example of his agency which engaged with all stakeholders: management, supervisors, service providers and workers. Two types of tools were required: awareness and guidance across all the organization and information about legal requirements as well as about expectations. Employers needed to be aware of the workers' needs. In this case, this "performance management" was done with the help of a checklist.
 89. An Employer participant stated that all organizations needed to make commitments. Organizations representing employers should have the objective of ensuring that their members have the tools to do their best. Employers did not feel they had the capacity for the industry at large, but that they could try to do the best they could by giving all members the necessary tools and that models could be followed and agreed at a further stage. Another Employer participant added that his group could not agree to the devaluation of training.
 90. The Government representative from Trinidad and Tobago clarified that the question concerning compliance, had been raised to encourage employers and other organizations to ensure that accidents did not happen. If there was continued negligence, compliance should not remain voluntary but should become mandatory.

Point 4: Recommendations for a common approach throughout the supply chain for the correct application of the appropriate standards and good practices in packing of containers and follow up activities

91. The Executive Secretary introduced the fourth point for discussion, noting that the purpose of this session was to take into account the outcomes of the previous three discussion points and to focus on finding a common approach throughout the supply chain, for the correct application of appropriate standards and good practices in packing of containers that would lead to a list of recommended follow-up activities.
92. A Worker participant recalled the sectoral conference where they worked on an IRU task force which took place in October 2006. He noted that his group fully concurred with what the Employers' group coordinator had said about needing a certain team with the secretariat to follow-up activities including the revision of the IMDG Code. They did not want a group that simply monitored revisions but one which would follow wider activities as a result of this Forum.
93. A Worker participant noted that the joint work of ILO and IRU led to the UN Road Safety Decade Campaign, which was to start in May 2011. He urged all participants that this would be an excellent opportunity to highlight the issue of container accidents. The Employers' group coordinator confirmed that it was acceptable to the employers to participate in this campaign.
94. The Workers' group coordinator stated that more data on accidents was needed. In the past it was difficult to get any data on accidents due to wrong packing as these were classified as overturned lorries, rather than container lorries. This was a problem with national legislation and practices. The standard classification needed to be reviewed. Data needed to be collected to allow analysis of packing accidents.

-
95. The Employers' group coordinator concurred. The scale and challenge of the task was not underestimated. However, this was of significant value in gaining a better understanding of all container packing issues.
96. An Employer participant recalled the point on the non-accessibility of the current guidelines. He was hopeful that they had now embarked on a common and useful approach. However, as this would take several years he asked what would become of those people in the supply chain who currently required assistance. He proposed discussing with the IMO secretariat in reaching a solution and suggested that the MSC circular be extracted and posted on the IMO–ILO website and made available to the industry. The representative of the Government of the United Kingdom supported the suggestion that MSC Circular 787 should be put on IMO's public webpage and asked the secretariat to make this suggestion at the coming MSC in May 2011.
97. The representative of the Government of Japan announced that in Japan they were studying the possibility of a new set of regulations in this area, based on the analysis of data collected through investigations. In the United States, the FMCFA in the last few years had been recording distinctions in their reports such as the distinctions between trailers and semi-trailers.

Panel discussion: "The inspection of freight containers"

98. This panel discussion was moderated by Mr Mike Compton with Mr Albert Le Monnier, Mr Fer Van de Laar and Mr Keith Bradley as panellists. A presentation was given by the Expert, Mr Bill Brassington.
99. The presentation identified the types of inspection that containers could be subjected to, stressing the importance of thorough examinations and periodic inspections. Thorough examinations were required by the International Convention for Safe Containers, 1972 (CSC) at interchange or repair of containers covered by a continuous examination programme. Periodic inspections were required on containers covered by a Period Examination Scheme every 30 months, or when the container left or returned to a depot for containers covered by continuous examination programmes. Both of these inspection types were generally carried out on empty containers, but under exceptional circumstances they could be undertaken on loaded units. The third type of container inspection referred to was designed to check the packing of containers loaded with cargo. The IMO had implemented a programme which required maritime authorities to carry out inspections on containers loaded with dangerous goods. The IMO inspection programme covered ten items, seven of which were covered by requirements of the IMDG Code.
100. The remaining three items of the presentation related to the CSC, the associated circular IMO circular CSC.1/Circ. 138 – Revised recommendations on the harmonised interpretation and implementation of the international convention for safe containers, 1972, as amended, and the IMO–ILO–UNECE Guidelines for safe packing of cargo transport units (CTUs), and could be applied to all containers carrying all types of cargoes. The objective of the IMO's inspection programme was to improve compliance with regulations and guidelines. However, over the past five years the percentage of containers found with deficiencies in stowage or securing inside the freight container, vehicle or other CTU had been steadily growing, with a fall in 2010. In 2010, 25 percent of containers found with any deficiencies were recorded with a stowage or securing defect. This demonstrated the need for proper control of cargo packing and securing. In order that inspections were a tool that could be used to improve global cargo security, it was important that the inspectors were required to follow a common inspection and that the data generated was analysed and fed back to the inspectors and, more importantly, into information provided to packers. For

the data to be meaningful, the inspections had to be accurate so that the data gathered reflected the global reality.

- 101.** The presentation concluded that it was important that a common inspection programme should be developed, inspecting specific aspects, using consistent deficiency descriptions. There were a number of steps that were required to provide a valuable tool for cargo safety: Firstly the inspector should know what they are required to undertake, what features of the container and cargo they should inspect and how to select, and how many, or what percentage of containers should be included in the programme. Secondly each feature of the inspection should be accompanied by proper and detailed instructions, providing cargo surveys and authorised inspection personnel with consistent deficiency descriptions. There should be a properly described reporting procedure. Data provided must be analysed so that meaningful and beneficial information could be fed back to packers, cargo surveyors and authorised inspection personnel. Lastly, the information and data generated should be properly disseminated to the appropriate international and national authorities and forums.
- 102.** Clarification on IMO inspections was sought, as well as the traceability of inspections and how this information was available to the authorities. In response the Expert noted two schemes, the periodic examination scheme which required a next examination date to be marked and an Approved Continuous Examination Programme (ACEP) which the Convention required the owner of the container to be notified when an examination took place.
- 103.** A Worker participant questioned whether port State control systems should apply to all sea areas and including containers. The Expert responded that it was important to have an authority aimed at ensuring the safety of containers. An example of an effective scheme in Canada, where senior safety officers whose job it was to visit terminals and randomly inspect containers, was given by a panellist. Another panellist disagreed with the feasibility of such a scheme. Another panellist spoke about the existence of a maritime association having produced a package on port state control including the IMDG code. However, such systematic inspections would not be feasible. The panel moderator added that the IMO code would foresee inspections. An Employer participant agreed with the Moderator's comments, but added that in some cases the problem was not about the enforcement of law, but much more about the fact that containers could not be inspected whether randomly or in cases of suspected deficiencies.
- 104.** There was discussion on information sharing. A panellist gave the example of the United Kingdom sharing intelligence with customs, to avoid opening containers several times. The Moderator agreed with the idea of a unique inspection. An Employer participant suggested that inspections could be carried out by the police. The Government representative of Ecuador asked if an inspection company such as the "Société générale de surveillance" (SGS) could provide a service for such inspections. The Expert noted that it was important to have one single regime for consistency.
- 105.** An Employer participant informed the Forum, that his organization had worked with the Global Shippers' Forum to extract information and make it available for free, which could be found on the World Shipping Council website: www.worldshipping.org. Suggestions were made by the Government representative of Ecuador and an Employer participant that these publications should be translated into French and Spanish. Reference was made to another publication and the possible collaboration with the World Shipping Council.
- 106.** The Workers' group coordinator questioned the ownership of containers and asked who took the decision to scrap a container. The Expert noted that initially banks owned containers. The time periods for examination of containers was discussed and a panellist expressed that the 30-month intervals were at the centre of the problem, as a container was

only inspected three to four times in ten years. An example of a container that collapsed in Vancouver was shared with the Forum.

Consideration and adoption of Forum consensus points

- 107.** Following discussion of the four points, the Forum considered a set of consensus points proposed by the Office. These were adopted with amendments proposed by the participants. In the process, the Government representative of Japan expressed disagreement with paragraph 41. Lengthy discussion took place as to data collection and the use of the words “accidents” and “incidents”. The Government representative of Japan noted that other situations other than accidents had been discussed during the Forum, and this should be reflected. He disagreed to limiting the paragraph to accidents and pointed out that in order to stop improper packing, information was needed on how many containers were improperly packed. To be able to understand the problem entirely a study of all “incidents” was needed.
- 108.** The Secretary for the Employers’ group expressed that the wording proposed by the representative of the Government of Japan would not achieve the objective, as the aim of the Forum was to give clear mandate to the ILO. Although it would have been desirable for the Office to bring together data on “incidents”, this would be difficult as there were such a large number.

Closing remarks

- 109.** In closing, the Executive Director of the ILO Social Dialogue Sector, noted that the meeting had been challenging in part due to the difficulty of the subject itself, as due to its nature the supply chain was very complicated. He thanked all the participants as well as the secretariat. For the Office, the work had just begun as the follow-up activities charged to the ILO requested a considerable amount of work. In the case that The Code of Practice would come into existence, this would be a major achievement. It was also particularly attractive and highly favourable to work and cooperate with other UN organizations, especially UNECE as the message would be much broader. Finally, he thanked the Chairperson for his fair chairmanship and the Japanese Government for the Japanese translation.
- 110.** The Workers’ group coordinator congratulated the secretariat for making it possible and giving them the opportunity to work in a constructive way amongst the employers, governments and trade unions to make ports a safer place to work for all those he represented.
- 111.** The Secretary of the Employers’ group noted that these meetings were far too short and thanked the ILO for the great preparation of the Forum and thanked the workers and governments for their good spirit in working together. He concluded that the Forum was very much appreciated as it had produced something valuable.
- 112.** The Chairperson closed by agreeing that this was a short but productive Forum. He expressed his gratitude to all for their constructive spirit, discipline and reaching consensus, and especially thanked the secretariat. He also thanked the interpreters for their very hard work.

Points of consensus and conclusions of the Forum

Points of consensus and conclusions of the Forum¹

The Global Dialogue Forum on Safety in the Supply Chain in Relation to Packing of Containers,

Having met in Geneva from 21 to 22 February 2011,

Adopts this twenty-second day of February 2011 the following points of consensus:

Introduction

1. Many accidents and problems in the transport sector are attributed to poor practices in relation to packing of containers, including overloading or misdeclaration of contents. This has caused major concern particularly because the victims can be the general public, road transport workers, rail workers, portworkers, seafarers or other workers, or their employers, who more often than not, have no control over the packing of containers. Against this background, the Governing Body of the ILO decided to hold a Global Dialogue Forum on Safety in the Supply Chain in Relation to Packing of Containers.
2. Government, Employer and Worker representatives participated in the Forum held at the ILO, Geneva, on 21–22 February 2011.
3. The Forum examined strategies and policies to help constituents in ILO member States for a common approach throughout the supply chain for the correct application of the appropriate standards in packing containers that would pave the way for a substantial improvement in container safety.
4. The Forum considered the background report prepared by the Office: *Safety in the Supply Chain in Relation to Packing of Containers* that was published in 2010.

Theme 1: Reasons that lead to the application of poor practices in packing of containers

Points on which consensus was reached

5. Lack of training and knowledge of available standards (for example, ILO–IMO–industry) is a significant reason amongst others for poor practices in the packing of containers.
6. Inadequate dissemination of existing standards and guidance, and lack of awareness of this information, not only among workers and their employers, but other stakeholders and authorities, such as police, OSH inspectors, OSH doctors, etc.
7. In many cases, there is a lack of development of appropriate plans for the consolidation, distribution, segregation and securing of cargo in containers.

¹ These conclusions have not yet been examined by the Governing Body of the ILO in accordance with established procedures and therefore cannot be considered as definitive.

-
8. Suitable risk assessments are not always carried out in the supply chain so that the levels of risks would be identified, and particular problems would be targeted.
 9. Those responsible for packing containers are not reached by the existing guidance on good practices for packing containers, including the IMO–ILO–UNECE guidelines for packing cargo transport units (CTUs).
 10. The role and responsibilities of all the stakeholders, including governments, in the supply chain are not always clearly defined. This includes the responsibility for raising awareness of how to pack containers safely.
 11. There is a lack of a system for the inspection of containers for proper packing at the point of origin.
 12. Cargo insurance contracts provisions do not adequately address responsibility for unsafe packing of containers.
 13. Misdeclaration and the lack of adequate information on container contents and weight.
 14. Different consignments are packed in the same container and unpacked without the appropriate planning and coordination.
 15. Poor practices in the packing of containers also results from breaches of laws and regulations.

Points on which consensus was not reached

16. Workers felt that there was often economic pressure and benefits to rush the packing of containers that might result in the application of poor practices.
17. Workers maintained that some types of cargo that, due to their size, weight and configuration, should not be shipped in containers.
18. Some (including both workers and some governments) felt that there was a lack of specific mandatory requirements covering the entire supply chain (from packing, through transport, to unpacking).

Theme 2: Compliance to standards on packing of containers

Points on which consensus was reached

19. It is agreed that safety in the supply chain can be improved by implementing good practice through international standards on the packing of containers.
20. It is agreed that an ILO–IMO–UNECE code of practice on the packing of CTUs is necessary. The three organizations are requested to proceed with the revision of the existing guidelines for packing of CTUs which would form the code of practice.
21. Governments and all supply chain actors involved in the handling and/or transport of containers should participate in this revision process.

-
22. The voluntary application of this code of practice should improve the packing of containers and safety in the supply chain.
 23. The code of practice should therefore apply to the whole of the supply chain, with clearly identified responsibilities and accountability.
 24. In preparing the code of practice, the possibility of a subsequent document stating that the container has been packed according to the code of practice should be considered.

Theme 3: Training on packing of containers and reaching out to all stakeholders for the dissemination and application of common standards and good practices

Points on which consensus was reached

25. It is important for all stakeholders to recognize the importance of using safe systems of work when packing containers in multimodal transport.
26. Awareness of and training on consistent standards for the whole supply chain are necessary. The need for appropriate skills and competencies in all components of the supply chain should be addressed. However, guidelines on best practices should be established in order to ensure that correct training on techniques and practices would be implemented.
27. It is important to communicate the information to the people who are actually engaged in the packing of containers. This would include workers and their supervisors.
28. Relevant guidance should be disseminated in various ways:
 - through organizations of workers and employers, government institutions, as well as non-governmental organizations; and
 - using different media, including the Internet and printed materials.
29. A major hindrance to dissemination of the IMO–ILO–UNECE guidelines for packing CTUs is that they are copyrighted.
30. Appropriate training materials developed under the ILO Portworker Development Programme (PDP) should be made available more easily and free of charge to those involved in container packing operations.
31. The need for training and awareness is not only in developing countries but also in many enterprises in developed countries. Guidelines and training materials should especially be targeted at supervisors who might not be familiar with good practices for packing containers.
32. Governments and the representative bodies of employers' and workers' organizations have a role in the promotion of existing guidance on good practices for packing containers. However, they cannot commit to standards which have not yet been adopted.
33. The role of accredited training bodies is important. These can contribute in the continuous development of competency of supply chain workers and their supervisors and enable them to be recognized as competent professionals on packing containers.

-
34. It was noted that the high turnover of employees responsible for the packing of containers is an obstacle in maintaining a well-trained workforce.
 35. Shippers do not operate in isolation but have contacts with many other stakeholders in the supply chain, and these contacts could be used for the dissemination of good practices on packing containers.
 36. It is important to ensure that training is more focused and simple.
 37. The first step is to identify all the steps in the supply chain. The next is to assess the health and safety risks at each step and then to identify training needs to fill the competency gap. This would allow better use of training resources. Then the above process could be monitored for effectiveness.

Points on which consensus was not reached

38. It is important to identify the specific roles of employers, trade unions and others. It was suggested that a good regulatory policy is useful. This includes a consistent enforcement policy that allows, in the first instance, for voluntary compliance (advice, etc.) and, in the second instance, for mandatory compliance. This even applies when there is no specific law or guidance: the responsibility is placed on the employer to find the best practice.

Theme 4: Recommendations for a common approach throughout the supply chain for the correct application of the appropriate standards and good practices in packing of containers and follow-up activities

Points on which consensus was reached

39. Once the code of practice emanating from the revised/updated IMO–ILO–UNECE guidelines for packing CTUs is adopted, it will be important to ensure it is followed up with user-friendly publications (training material, tool kits, etc.) and that the code, and the accompanying publications, are made free and easily accessible and are widely disseminated. This follow-up should be undertaken in consultation with a steering committee and task forces on specific activities to be set up by the International Labour Office in consultation with the tripartite constituents of the Organization.
40. There is a need to improve the collection and publication of data on accidents related to the improper packing of containers. In this regard, consideration should be given to reviewing the standard classification of accidents in order to identify road and other accidents that are related to improper packing of containers.

Evaluation questionnaire

Evaluation questionnaire

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

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

	5	4	3	2	1	
	Excellent	Good	Satisfactory	Poor	Unsatisfactory	Average
The choice of agenda item (Safety in the supply chain)	12	8	1	–	–	4.52
The points for discussion	7	12	2	–	–	4.24
The quality of the discussion	3	16	2	–	–	4.05
The Forum's benefits to the supply chain	4	11	3	–	–	4.06
The conclusions	2	12	4	–	–	3.89
Panel discussion	1	11	6	–	–	3.72
Opportunity for networking	2	14	4	–	–	3.90

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

	5	4	3	2	1	
	Excellent	Good	Satisfactory	Poor	Unsatisfactory	Average
Quality of content	7	10	4	–	–	4.14
Objectivity	7	10	3	1	–	4.10
Comprehensiveness of coverage	6	11	3	–	–	4.15
Presentation and readability	6	11	3	–	–	4.15
Amount and relevance of information	4	7	9	–	–	3.75

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

	Too much	Enough	Too little
Plenaries	–	13	8
Group meetings	2	14	5
Panel discussion	1	13	5

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

5	4	3	2	1	
Excellent	Good	Satisfactory	Poor	Unsatisfactory	Average
11	6	4	–	–	4.33

List of participants
Liste des participants
Lista de participantes

Chairperson
Président
Presidente

Mr Seiichi Tajima
First Secretary
Permanent Mission of Japan
GENEVA
Switzerland

Members nominated by Governments
Membres représentant les gouvernements
Miembros representantes de los gobiernos

ARGENTINA ARGENTINE

Sr. Darío Celaya Álvarez
Ministro, Misión Permanente de la Argentina
GINEBRA
Suiza

AZERBAIJAN AZERBAÏDJAN AZERBAIYÁN

Mr Sabir Mirzoyev
Head of Sector, Ministry of Transport
Azerbaydjan bakumon of Transport
BAKU CITY
Adviser / Conseiller technique / Consejero técnico

Mr Ilgar Aliyev
Head Specialist of Technical Development Department
Azerbaijan Railways Ltd
BAKU CITY

CAMEROON CAMEROUN CAMERÚN

S.E. M. Anatole Fabien Marie Nkou
Ambassadeur
Représentant permanent du Cameroun
Chef de délégation
Mission permanente du Cameroun
GENÈVE
Suisse

CHINA CHINE

Mr Duan Dongwen
Counsellor
Permanent Mission of China
GENEVA
Switzerland

REPUBLIC OF CONGO RÉPUBLIQUE DU CONGO REPÚBLICA DEL CONGO

Advisers / Conseillers techniques / Consejeros técnicos

M^{me} Fernande Mvila
Conseillère
Mission permanente du Congo
GENÈVE
Suisse

M. Célestin Jean Raphaël Batina
Mission permanente du Congo
GENÈVE
Suisse

M^{me} Madeleine Malanda née Louvouandou
Mission permanente du Congo
GENÈVE
Suisse

DOMINICAN REPUBLIC RÉPUBLIQUE DOMINICAINE REPÚBLICA DOMINICANA

Adviser / Conseiller technique / Consejero técnico

Sr. Pablo Medina Jiménez
Ministro Consejero
Misión Permanente de la República Dominicana
GINEBRA
Suiza

ECUADOR EQUATEUR

Sr Jorge Thullen
Asesor del Ministro de Relaciones Laborales del Ecuador
GENTHOD
Suiza

HAITI HAÏTI HAITÍ

M. Jean-Bony Alexandre
Ministre conseiller
Mission permanente d'Haïti
GENÈVE
Suisse

JAPAN JAPON JAPÓN

Mr Takahiro Omori
Senior Officer, Accident Prevention
Ministry of Land, Infrastructure, Transport and Tourism of Japan
TOKYO

Adviser / Conseiller technique / Consejero técnico

Mr Kazuhisa Takumi
Officer for Accident Prevention, Road Transport Bureau, Ministry of Land,
Infrastructure, Transport and Tourism of Japan
TOKYO

JORDAN JORDANIE JORDANIA

Adviser / Conseiller technique / Consejero técnico

Mr Shukri Dajani
Special Adviser for ILO Affairs
Permanent Mission of Jordan
GENEVA
Switzerland

MADAGASCAR

Adviser / Conseiller technique / Consejera técnica

M^{me} Soafara Tsirin Aina Randriamiarisoa
Responsable du dossier OIT
Mission permanente de Madagascar
GENÈVE
Suisse

MOROCCO MAROC MARRUECOS

M. Abderrahim Benrouyne
Ministère de l'Emploi et de la Formation professionnelle
Délégué régional de l'Emploi – Casablanca
Délégation régionale de l'Emploi-Casablanca-Anfa
CASABLANCA

NIGERIA NIGÉRIA

Ms Nofisat Abiola Arogundade
Deputy Director of Factories
Federal Ministry of Labour and Productivity
Federal Secretariat
ABUJA

PAKISTAN PAKISTÁN

Adviser / Conseiller technique / Consejero técnico

Mr Ahsan Nabeel
Third Secretary
Permanent Mission of Pakistan
GENEVA
Switzerland

PANAMA PANAMÁ

Adviser / Conseiller technique / Consejero técnico

Sr. Alejandro Mendoza Gantes
Consejero
Misión Permanente de Panamá
GINEBRA
Suiza

QATAR

Mr Ali Al-Khulaifi
Minister Plenipotentiary and Representative of the Minister of Labour
Permanent Mission of the State of Qatar
GENEVA
Switzerland

SLOVENIA SLOVÉNIE ESLOVENIA

Mr Etbin Tratnik
Senior Adviser
Ministry of Labour
Family and Social Affairs
LJUBLJANA

SOUTH AFRICA AFRIQUE DU SUD SUDÁFRICA

Mr Tibor Szana
Director, Department of Labour
GAUTEUG

THAILAND THAÏLANDE TAILANDIA

Ms Sudthida Krungkraiwong
Director, OSH Strategic Group
Occupational Safety and Health Bureau
Department of Labour Protection and Welfare
Ministry of Labour
BANGKOK

TRINIDAD AND TOBAGO TRINITÉ-ET-TOBAGO TRINIDAD Y TABAGO

Mr Gaekwad Ramoutar
Safety and Health Inspector Team Leader for Chemicals, the Occupational Safety and Health Authority
and Agency of the Ministry Petrochemicals and Ports Unit
PORT OF SPAIN

TURKEY TURQUIE TURQUÍA

Mr Erhan Batur
Counsellor for Labour and Social Affairs
Permanent Mission of Turkey
GENEVA
Switzerland

UNITED KINGDOM ROYAUME-UNI REINO UNIDO

Mr Keith Bradley
Hazardous Cargoes Adviser, Maritime and Coastguard Agency
Spring Place
SOUTHAMPTON

URUGUAY

Adviser / Conseiller technique / Consejero técnico

Dr. Gabriel Winter
Consejero
Misión Permanente del Uruguay
GINEBRA
Suiza

Members nominated by the Employers Membres représentant les employeurs Miembros representantes de los empleadores

Mr Christopher Grahame Welsh
Secretary-General
Global Shippers Forum
FTA Hermes House
TUNBRIDGE WELLS
United Kingdom

Mr John Stawpert
Senior Adviser
International Chamber of Shipping
LONDON
United Kingdom

Mr Ferdinand Van de Laar
Managing Director
International Association of Ports and Harbors
TOKYO
Japan

Mr Damian John Viccars
Head of Social and EU Fiscal Affairs
International Road Transport Union
BRUSSELS
Belgium

M. Vincent Vu
Directeur des relations internationales
Union internationale des chemins de fer
PARIS
France

Mr René Zimmerman
Manager
International Federation of Freight Forwarders Associations (FIATA)
GLATTBRUGG
Switzerland

Members nominated by the Workers Membres représentant les travailleurs Miembros representantes de los trabajadores

Mr Bernard Farrelly
National Lead Organiser
Maritime Union of Australia
SYDNEY
Australia

Mr Allan Graveson
Senior National Secretary
Nautilus International
LONDON
United Kingdom

Mr Jan De Jong
FNV Bondgenoten
WEERT
Netherlands

Mr Bjorn-Erik Kristoffersen
Union Officer, International Transport Workers' Federation
OSLO
Norway

Mr Albert Le Monnier
Third Vice-President
International Longshore and Warehouse Union Canada
VANCOUVER
Canada

Mr Shosaku Machida, Secretary
Container Transport Section
National Federation of Dockworkers' Unions of Japan
TOKYO
Japan

**Additional members representing the Employers
Membres additionnels représentant les employeurs
Miembros adicionales representantes de los empleadores**

Mr Donald Armour
Head of International Department
Freight Transport Association
TUNBRIDGE WELLS
United Kingdom

Mr Jens Hügel
Head of Sustainable Development
International Road Transport Union
GENEVA
Switzerland

Mr Lars Kjaer
Senior Vice-President
World Shipping Council
WASHINGTON
United States

Mr John Charles Leach
Adviser
World Shipping Council
LONDON
United Kingdom

Capt Gerd Rohden
Adviser
World Shipping Council
WASHINGTON
United States

Additional members representing the Workers
Membres additionnels représentant les travailleurs
Miembros adicionales representantes de los trabajadores

Ms Claire Clarke

Personal Assistant – ITF Inland Transport Sections
International Transport Workers' Federation
LONDON
United Kingdom

Mr Mike Gibbons

Executive Member
WINCHESTER
United Kingdom

Mr Frank Leys

Section Secretary
International Transport Workers' Federation
LONDON
United Kingdom

Mr Katsushige Mashima

Deputy General Secretary
All Japan Dockworkers' Unions
TOKYO
Japan

Mr Tabudi Abner Ramakgolo

National Sector Coordinator
ITF Section Vice-Chair South African Transport and Allied Workers' Union (SATAWU)
JOHANNESBURG
South Africa

Mr Mac Urata

Section Secretary
Inland Transport Sections
International Transport Workers' Federation
LONDON
United Kingdom

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

**United Nations Economic Commission for Europe (UNECE)
Commission économique des Nations Unies pour l'Europe (CEE-ONU)**

Mr Martin Magold

Chief, Sustainable Transport Section
Transport Division
United Nations Economic Commission for Europe (UNECE)
GENEVA
Switzerland

Mr Markus Pikart

Economic Affairs Officer
United Nations Economic Commission for Europe (UNECE)
GENEVA
Switzerland

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

International Safety Panel (ISP) of ICHCA International Limited

Mr Mike Compton
Technical Adviser and Chairman of International Safety Panel
ICHCA International Ltd
ROMFORD
United Kingdom

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

M. Jean Dejardin
Conseiller
Organisation internationale des employeurs
Cointrin/GENÈVE
Suisse

**International Union of Marine Insurance (IUMI)
Union internationale d'assurances transports
Unión Internacional de Seguros de Transportes**

Mr Uwe Peter Schieder
Captain
Loss Prevention Committee
International Union of Marine Insurance (IUMI)
BERLIN
Germany

International Trade Union Confederation (ITUC)

Ms Esther Busser
Assistant Director
International Trade Union Confederation (ITUC)
GENEVA
Switzerland

**Panel moderator
Modérateur du panel
Moderador del panel**

Mr Mike Compton
Technical Adviser and Chairman of International Safety Panel
ICHCA International Ltd
LONDON
United Kingdom

**Resource person
Expert technique
Especialista técnico**

Mr Bill Brassington
BUCKS
United Kingdom