Towards Healthy, Safe & Decent Work through Alliances, Ethics & Influence

Principles and strategies to build the foundations for strong and effective labour inspection across the world in partnership with government and industry.
Foreword

It is with great pleasure that I present the following report summarising the activities and outcomes of the 2008 IALI Conference and associated forums held in Adelaide from 12-14 March.

The event was the culmination of more than two years of planning and preparation by a small army of people within SafeWork SA.

I believe the final result brought great credit not only to the agency, but to South Australia in general, by showcasing the abundant talent and expertise here in Adelaide to a wide, varied and influential audience of international guests.

They came from the established world of Europe and North America who’ve known labour inspection for over a century; the economies of Asia and Africa who are making leaps and bounds in their workplace safety management; and the island nations of the Pacific who are coming to grips now with workplace safety issues.

The outcomes of this conference will resonate across Australia, throughout the region, and around the world. I hope that in years to come, the achievements of the 2008 IALI Conference in Adelaide will be seen as a turning point for the profession of labour inspection.

There will be profound and lasting outcomes from the exchange and assistance programmes instigated from the discussions in Adelaide. More importantly however, the draft Global Code of Integrity discussed at the conference promises to provide a much-needed foundation of professionalism for international labour inspection. We know that both employers and the union movement globally are keen to see this realised as soon as possible.

Exciting times lie ahead in the field of labour inspection, and I am happy that Australia has contributed to some of that action started at the 2008 IALI Conference in Adelaide.

Our sincere thanks go to our partners – the ILO and the other OHS Authorities of Australia and New Zealand, and especially to the IALI Secretariat in Luxemburg and Geneva and our own SafeWork SA volunteers.

Michele Patterson
IALI President
Executive Director – SafeWork SA
Executive Summary

The International Association of Labour Inspection (IALI) held its first Pacific region conference in Adelaide, South Australia from 12–14 March 2008. The conference was significant as it brought together more than 200 labour inspection delegates from over 40 nations to discuss the opportunity to work together ‘Towards Healthy, Safe and Decent Work through Alliances, Ethics and Influence’.

The main purpose of the conference was to provide a global forum to share information about best practice, address challenges and foster cooperative arrangements between labour inspection authorities. A key outcome of the conference was to facilitate agreement on a Code of Integrity for adoption by labour inspectorates worldwide.

The conference was preceded by three regional forums that aimed to build relationships and cooperative arrangements between labour inspectorates within the South East Asian and Pacific regions, including Australia and New Zealand.

Outcomes from the three forums and the conference are as follows:

Pacific Forum
The Pacific Forum focussed on the development of a technical cooperation programme between inspectorates in Australia, New Zealand and the Pacific countries.

Delegates at the Forum agreed to the proposed technical cooperation programme and South Australia was nominated as the coordinator. Further outcomes and actions arising from the agreement included:
- Establishing and developing legislation and the development of tripartite structures;
- Provision of assistance to educate and train inspectorates on occupational safety and health (OSH) matters;
- Education to prevent or reduce workplace accidents and work related diseases;
- Strategies to deal with high risk industries, e.g. construction and mining, and small to micro business; and
- Appointment of programme coordinators for each country.

South East Asian Forum
The South East Asian Forum covered specific topics for progressing the development of Memorandums of Understanding (MOUs) between inspectorates in Australia, New Zealand and South East Asian countries. In the workshop session, participating countries discussed and shared experience on the following:
- Compliance initiatives across trading partners involved in supply chains;
- Regional cooperation on cross-regional OSH issues; and
- Coordinated implementation of OSH strategic intervention programmes and strategies.

South East Asian countries will now work towards confirming specific topics for MOU development with their respective Australian/New Zealand partners.

Australia / New Zealand OHS Inspectors Forum
This forum brought together representatives from inspectorates in each Australian jurisdiction and New Zealand to discuss the following issues:
- Adoption of an international Code of Integrity for labour inspection;
- Professional development of OSH inspectors; and
- Improved cooperation and collaboration amongst Australian and New Zealand jurisdictions.

The forum proved a success with all Australian jurisdictions committing to adopt the new Code of Integrity with New Zealand confirming their support. There was also commitment to enhance the training and professional development framework for labour inspectors under the Heads of Workplace Safety Authorities (HWSA) along with agreement to develop detailed plans for improving the effectiveness of harmonised OSH intervention campaigns across the Tasman.
The forum was appreciated by the delegate Inspectors in attendance who found the information sharing and networking opportunities valuable and were encouraged by the focus on ethical conduct and professional development issues.

Further areas of cooperation amongst HWSA jurisdictions were explored and included:

- A national training schedule
- A matrix of skills and expertise
- Professional exchanges
- Sharing of solutions and resources
- Cross border inspection initiatives
- An annual OSH inspectors forum

IALI Conference

The Hon Julia Gillard MP, Deputy Prime Minister of Australia in her opening ceremony address, laid down the following challenge to conference delegates:

“We need to work cooperatively to achieve reductions in work injury and improve safety through alliances on an international basis.”

Werner Blenk, Director of the International Labour Organisation (ILO), Pacific region provided a supporting argument to this challenge in his statement:

“When we put together all our energy, we can produce synergies that produce change on the ground. This conference is about participation and establishes a platform upon which we can build technical cooperation.”

The first session of the conference delivered the case for strengthening and modernising labour inspection – Alliances, Ethics and Influence as key strategies for success and set the scene for the three sessions that were to follow. A diverse range of speakers reinforced the message that to strengthen and modernise labour inspection, there must be defined relationships with key stakeholders, sharing of knowledge and expertise, adequate resourcing and an appropriate evidence base to support intervention activities that provide protection and opportunity to workers.

Labour inspection must consider maximising resources to address OSH issues by sharing the experiences of all nations and seeking to adopt best practice approaches suitable for their social, political and economic environment.

The second session of the conference on Alliances: The role of regional cooperation and partnerships in labour inspection provided a key message that through strategic alliances within regions and across the globe, labour inspectorates will be enabled to meet the challenges of both developed and developing countries to ensure fair and safe work. Further supporting this argument was the idea that labour inspectorates worldwide need to be willing to share and learn from one another and through cooperation and collaboration the challenges of the future can be met.

The third session of the conference on Ethics: The need for a global code of integrity and developing the foundation for professional labour inspection established the rationale and need for labour inspectorates to support common principles to underpin their governance and business frameworks. The key message arising from this session was that an international Code of Integrity will help build a consistent foundation for professional and ethical labour inspection across the world. This in turn will contribute to the growth and health of economies, enhance social justice and provide effective protection for workers.
During the conclusion of this session, agreement was reached by conference delegates to support the guiding principles of the Code. The Code will now be amended (based on comments and issues raised at the conference) and finalised in preparation for endorsement at the general IALI assembly in Geneva, in June 2008.

The fourth and final session of the conference addressed the topic of *Influence: Measuring and demonstrating the value of effective labour inspection*. A key message arising from this final session was that those IALI members that have adopted a scoreboard approach to assessing their performance can now work towards benchmarking with other IALI members. This in turn will facilitate the development of a global scorecard for labour inspection in collaboration with the ILO.

The central challenge for labour inspection arising from this session is that there is a vital need for labour inspectorates to develop a means of benchmarking their performance to ensure effectiveness, professionalism and continuous improvement.
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Regional Forums – Wednesday, 12 March 2008

Pacific Forum
The Pacific forum comprised delegates from thirteen Pacific Nations including Australia and New Zealand. The major purpose of the forum was to develop a Technical Cooperation Programme between Inspectorates in Australia, New Zealand and the Pacific countries.

Michele Patterson, on behalf of IALI, opened the forum by welcoming delegates and outlining the importance of labour inspection and the basic right to safe and decent work. Michele gave the forum three objectives:
1. To endorse the proposed technical cooperation programme for labour inspection;
2. To agree on areas of technical assistance for all Pacific countries; and
3. To appoint programme coordinators for each country.

Delegates identified and discussed areas of technical cooperation that included the provision of assistance in education and training of Inspectors and the development, improvement and implementation of OSH legislation.

The role of the International Labour Organisation (ILO) and their global commitment to encouraging and supporting the formation of regional networks for cooperation in OSH was also outlined. Discussion also detailed the ILO policy on the development of the Pacific Region which aims to strengthen the regions’ capabilities and commitment to improve Labour Inspectorates.

It was stated that the ILO perspective and commitment to this style of programme relies on building tripartite networks at different levels, including international associations, networking between countries and across countries.

Mr Ho Siong Hin from Singapore outlined the approach of the ASEAN OSH Network, with its success in driving collaboration in OSH labour inspection issues amongst the ten ASEAN countries.

Mr Ian Markos from SafeWork SA outlined the history of the Pacific programme commencing from the ILO Forum on Decent Work held in Melbourne in 2005. Mr Markos then presented a draft outline of a technical cooperation programme concentrating on specific areas for technical cooperation. The presentation also detailed the process for implementing and progressing the forum’s objectives.

Forum delegates discussed the draft proposals in work groups facilitated by IALI and HWSA Executive members. Each group discussed areas of technical cooperation important to all Pacific countries. The Pacific delegates actively participated in the work groups enthusiastically identifying areas of technical assistance specific to their needs.

Upon completion of discussions, each group presented their own feedback so that all delegates could get a clear understanding of the technical needs for each Pacific country.

Mr Ian Markos then presented the agreed outcomes and actions from the forum which were in line with the forum objectives. These included the following areas of technical cooperation:
1. Establishing and developing legislation and the development of tripartite structures;
2. Providing assistance to educate and train inspectors on OSH matters;
3. Education to prevent or reduce workplace accidents and work related diseases; and
4. Strategies to deal with high risk industries, e.g. construction and mining, and small to micro business.

Further issues identified from the discussions included:
- Tripartite audit of infrastructure in each country;
- Speed up the process of legislative development;
• Challenges related to funding for inspectorate resources;
• A model for education that includes a regional standardised module, tailored for each country and presented through Australian/New Zealand workshops in each country;
• Topics should be expanded to include ethical inspection and monitoring and evaluation of inspectorates and OSH performance;
• Technical training in risk management; and
• Extending training and education to workers and business.

Ms Michele Patterson then outlined the next steps for the technical cooperative programme, nominating SafeWork SA as the Australian coordinator. Further actions were given including addressing the requirement for funding, communicating the forum outcomes to all delegates and proposing that the programme commence in late 2008.

Ms Patterson then closed the forum thanking the ILO, Pacific delegates, IALI Executive and the HWSA Executive for their enthusiastic approach and cooperative contributions.

South East Asia Forum

The South East Asia forum was also the first of its kind and brought together more than 45 delegates from twelve Asian countries, two European countries and Australia and New Zealand. The major focus of the forum was to consider topics suitable for inclusion in Memoranda of Understanding (MOUs) to be developed by inspectorates throughout the South East Asian region including Australia and New Zealand.

The Chair, Mr Bernhard Brueckner opened the forum with a welcoming speech that focussed on fostering good working relationships and how regional, international cooperation could be put into effect to achieve this goal.

Ms Michele Patterson also welcomed delegates to the forum and spoke of the differences in labour inspection, the need to look beyond regional boundaries and working across regions, globally. She praised the ASEAN-OSHNET activities, particularly the search for value adding activities involving ILO, IALI, Australia and New Zealand. She concluded with the need to focus on the purpose of the forum during the workshop that followed to progress regional cooperation.

The then current secretary of ASEAN-OSHNET, Malaysia’s Dr Johari Basri next spoke about ASEAN-OSHNET, its setup and objective of promoting and enhancing safety and health within the region through six priority programme areas of research including: standards, training, inspection and national occupational safety and health (OSH) frameworks. The ASEAN-OSHNET alliance consists of 10 ASEAN countries plus three collaborating countries; China, Japan and Korea. They would like to see Australia and New Zealand as collaborating countries as well and IALI as an NGO collaborating organisation.

Ms Shi Yanping spoke about China’s experience on the benefits of international memorandums of understanding. She used examples of Sino – Australia cooperation on coal mining safety, Sino – Japan cooperation on technical training and Sino - US cooperation on coalmine emergency rescue.

Mr Igor Nossar of the Australian Textile, Clothing and Footwear Union (TCFU) spoke about an Australian partnership between government, unions and industry in developing innovative supply chain regulatory mechanisms in the clothing outworkers industry. He also spoke about the scope for appropriately harnessing private contractual ‘governance structures’ in order to achieve public regulatory outcomes, such as improved occupational health and safety.

The fourth speaker, Mr Kormain Mohd Noor from Malaysia, touched on Occupational Safety and Health in Malaysian Oil Palm Plantations and the complex environment of migrant workers from cross cultural backgrounds working in plantations owned by corporations from ASEAN and internationally.
In the workshop that followed, the delegates split into four groups, each facilitated by an IALI Executive member, to discuss:

- Compliance initiative across trading partners involved in the supply chain;
- Regional cooperation on cross-regional OSH issues;
- Coordinated implementation of OSH strategic intervention programmes; and
- Strategies based on each country’s situation and requirements, as identified from the pre-workshop questionnaires.

The group discussing supply chains agreed in principle for ASEAN-OSHNET to begin co-operating collectively with the OSH and Labour Inspectorates and departmental heads in New Zealand and Australia. The basis for such wider cooperation would focus on developing a compendium of OHS best practices in the respective jurisdictions. Such cooperation is also envisaged to include joint projects between the OSH authorities of ASEAN-OSHNET and Australia and New Zealand, in particular cooperative projects around supply chains, which stretch across ASEAN, Australia and New Zealand. This includes commencing discussions about the sale of hazardous plant and machinery across these jurisdictional boundaries, such as the export of potentially unsafe tower cranes. Dr Johari Basri also suggested tripartite involvement in this wider cooperation such as discussions and research cooperation with regionally based trade unions and employer associations.

It was proposed that the South Australian Clothing Outworker Code of Practice be included in the compendium of OSH best practices specifically regarding appropriate regulation of cross-jurisdictional supply chains. This is the first practical step of an ASEAN-OSHNET and Australia / New Zealand partnership arising out of the forum. It was discussed that the South Australian Clothing Outworker Code of Practice structure could potentially be promoted as a generic template for cross jurisdictional regulation of supply chains spanning the ASEAN-OSHNET boundaries in relation to the protection of OSH and the promotion of decent working conditions.

Delegates then discussed key topics for inclusion in an MOU to be developed between inspectorates in Australia, ASEAN-OSHNET and other South East Asian countries. These included:

- Expanding ASEAN OSHNET cooperation;
- Ensuring safe and decent working conditions along the supply chain for goods and services throughout South East Asia;
- Information sharing on workplace safety through a compendium of best practice; and
- Development of a supply chain database (in particular, the movement of high risk plant within the region).

Michele closed the forum by summarising the outcomes from the workshop and the future effort required to achieve these. Further, South East Asian countries agreed to identify and confirm specific topics for MOU development with their respective Australian and New Zealand partners and to develop of a compendium of OSH best practice.

**Australia and New Zealand OHS Inspectors’ Forum**

The first ever forum of trans-Tasman Occupational Health and Safety (OHS) Inspectors brought together more than 120 labour inspectors from every Australian and New Zealand jurisdiction to consider and discuss:

1. Professional development of OHS inspectors;
2. Improved cooperation and collaboration amongst Australian and New Zealand jurisdictions/inspectorates; and
3. Adoption of an international Code of Integrity for labour inspection.

IALI President Michele Patterson opened the Forum with international speakers Wolfgang von Richtofen, William Mukasa – Senyonjo and Kevin Myers who outlined their experiences from the eastern European, Ugandan and United Kingdom perspective. Following presentations from the international speakers, the forum considered the above three themes.
Meagan Browne, Chair of the Heads of Workplace Safety Authority (HWSA) National Workplace Inspector Training and Development Reference Group addressed the implementation of a competency based system of qualifications for OHS inspectors and the development of a national training schedule.

Shiela McBreen Kerr from the Department of Labour in New Zealand then outlined the New Zealand experience, recognising the need for continuous professional learning by inspectors to support them in carrying out their complex role. Shiela indicated that there is a need for skilled and creative leadership and that role modelling is essential in achieving a high level of quality in service delivery outcomes.

Cath Duane from WorkSafe Victoria discussed the advantages of core competencies at the inspector, departmental and national level. She then discussed different initiatives to support collaboration across jurisdictions with a focus on continuous improvement and best practice.

Jenny Thomas from WorkCover NSW outlined the principles of HWSA's work to develop and undertake national intervention programmes and the opportunities these provide for jurisdictional collaboration and industry improvement.

Finally, Joe Paparella and Sally Mitchell from SafeWork SA outlined the history and development behind the global Code of Integrity for labour inspection placing emphasis on six core values that underpin the document:

- Knowledge and competence;
- Honesty and integrity;
- Courtesy and respect;
- Objectivity, neutrality and fairness;
- Commitment and responsiveness; and
- Consistency between personal and professional behaviour.

The Forum was a success with jurisdictional commitment given to progress the training and professional development framework for labour inspectors under the auspices of HWSA. There was also agreement to develop detailed plans for improving the effectiveness of national and trans-Tasman intervention campaigns.

All Australian jurisdictions committed to adopt the principles of the new Code of Integrity, with New Zealand confirming their support.

Feedback from attending delegates at the forum was very positive. Delegates indicated that the opportunity for information sharing and networking was invaluable and were encouraged by the attention placed on ethical conduct and professional development.

A number of areas were identified for further consideration in order to improve inspector development and cooperation between jurisdictions. These included:

- An annual OHS inspectors forum;
- Identification of core competencies for all OHS regulatory authorities;
- Development of a national training schedule (including investigation, report writing, audits), identification of priorities and an implementation plan;
- Development of a matrix of skills & expertise existing in the jurisdictions;
- Development of a concept plan for professional exchanges, cross border inspection initiatives and sharing of solutions and resources;
- Development of a cross jurisdictional website to facilitate inspector communication; and
- Adoption of the Code of Integrity.
IALI Conference Proceedings

Welcome and opening ceremony

The Hon Julia Gillard, Deputy Prime Minister of Australia welcomed delegates to the first ever IALI conference in the Asia Pacific region. In a pre recorded video, Ms Gillard stated that Australia has long prided itself where all people are entitled to a fair go including safe and decent work. Ms Gillard then went on to express the Government’s commitment to improving health and safety in Australia through implementation of a national strategy. Ms Gillard supported the conference theme of ‘Towards Healthy, Safe and Decent Work through Alliances, Ethics and Influence’ and then laid down the following challenge to conference delegates:

“We need to work cooperatively to achieve reductions in work injury and improve safety through alliances on an international basis.”

The Hon Mike Rann, Premier of South Australia also addressed conference delegates through a pre recorded video message. In his speech, Mr Rann expressed the commitment and importance that the South Australian Government placed on workplace safety. Mr Rann also stated that South Australia was going through a time of economic boom, particularly in the mining resource sector and that achieving safe and decent work outcomes through national and international alliances was a critical part to success for this industry.

The Hon Michael Wright, Minister for Industrial Relations, then addressed the conference delegates in a speech that highlighted the current status of workplace injury and disease throughout the world and the importance that labour inspection has to good occupational safety and health (OSH) outcomes. Mr Wright stated that 270 million OSH incidents cause harm to workers each year and that through alliances, ethics and influence, labour inspection organisations worldwide can make a significant contribution to reducing this terrible statistic. Mr Wright also indicated that achieving safe and decent work provides substantial value towards improving productivity for business, particularly in light of an increasing global market.

In closing, Mr Wright talked about the impact of OSH on society through his statement:

“Safe and decent work is about social justice…it’s about the human person. People live in communities, not in economies. Effective labour inspection is the best means to ensure safe and decent work through a strong and committed labour inspection system.”

Mr Werner Blenk, Director of the International Labour Organisation (ILO), South Pacific Office, provided an official welcome to conference delegates from the ILO. In his speech, Mr Blenk welcomed delegates to a “world of ideas, principles and actions…”, indicating that the ILO stands for International Labour Conventions and that the IALI conference would help the ILO establish a platform for building technical cooperation amongst Pacific nations. Mr Blenk commended the IALI Conference as a great initiative for bringing together like minded people and that the work of the conference would support the ILO improve the lives of working people. Mr Blenk then provided a supporting argument for improving workplace safety through the formation of alliances on an international basis. Mr Blenk stated:

“When we put together all our energy, we can produce synergies that produce change on the ground. This conference is about participation and establishes a platform upon which we can build technical cooperation.”

Finally, Ms Michele Patterson, President of IALI and Executive Director of SafeWork SA, officially welcomed conference delegates and stated that IALI and SafeWork SA are seeking to achieve significant outcomes for safe and decent work around the world. Ms Patterson stated that this conference was a significant step towards achieving this and offered the following challenge to delegates:
• Achieving greater regional cooperation and partnerships;
• Influencing the business community through improved performance monitoring and measurement of labour inspection interventions;
• Increasing shared learning and best practice in comparative performance monitoring amongst labour inspection organisations; and
• Adopting a global code of integrity for labour inspection.
Session 1: The case for strengthening and modernising labour inspection

Overview

This session focussed on the strategic imperatives for strengthening, modernising and reinvigorating labour inspection worldwide, and the key strategies for addressing these challenges. The keynote addresses were designed to set the scene for the Conference, provide leadership and vision, report on global progress towards these goals and stimulate debate on the key themes.

Keynote Address: Alliances, Ethics and Influence – key strategies for labour inspection

Presented by: Professor Dennis Else, Ballarat University, Victoria, Australia.

Professor Else began his keynote address by challenging delegates to consider an evidence basis for measuring happiness in people. Professor Else suggested that in order to measure happiness, there were three important factors to consider:

- Know your strengths and understand them;
- Use those strengths easily; and
- Employ those strengths for something greater than yourself.

This became a prelude for Professor Else’s presentation on the importance of establishing an evidence base for labour inspection interventions. In his speech, Professor Else talked about the significance the role of research has in achieving an evidence base, especially in developing research models that transcend national boundaries. Labour inspectorates around the world need to form strategic alliances and share the results of their intervention activities. Shared models of thinking should be embraced.

The supply chain is also an area that provides significant opportunity to influence OSH outcomes. Supporting this is the role of Government and its ability to influence OSH standards within industry through regulation, accreditation and its effectiveness in the supply chain. In addition, modern, ethical labour inspectorates must ensure continuous improvement of their operations and encourage reporting and learning across the community.

Finally, companies with strong OSH performance have also been shown to be superior financial performers over comparable companies with poor OSH performance. This was demonstrated in a study that measured the performance of the stock market over a 10 year period. Companies that demonstrated good OSH performance generally led investors to long term, better than average returns.

In providing a conclusion to his address, Professor Else stated that, "to be seen as a professional body, we need to ensure an evidence base, with appropriate drivers, is used to underpin what we do…ethical investment will grow a safer and healthier world."

Keynote Address: The Global ILO perspective on achieving Decent Work – the key role of labour inspection in implementing labour standards and promoting decent work in today’s global economy


Mr Albracht opened his address by describing the context for Decent Work in the world today. The world of work has never experienced such rapid and profound changes as today. The overall goal in the international context must be decent work for all. Decent work is work that offers opportunity to both men and women, is fair and safe, and provides freedom, equity, security and human dignity.
To shape fair globalisation, the ILO has developed universally collective responses and consistent policies with social partners, governments, transnational companies, small and medium enterprises (SME’s) and non-government organisations (NGO’s). Decent Work Country Programmes (DWCPs) have become the main instrument for ILO’s cooperation with member states and its contribution to international development frameworks.

Due to the high number of workplace incidents around the world (including illnesses derived from hazardous substances such as asbestos), the ILO Governing Body decided to strengthen labour inspection as a key component of Decent Work and DWCPs. The ILO Governing Body proposed a new series of measures designed to “reinvigorate, modernise and strengthen labour inspectorates worldwide”. It is firmly believed that only a strong labour inspectorate can ensure decent work standards are effectively implemented and maintained at the enterprise level. Effective labour inspection has a significant impact on sustainable economic growth as well as on OSH performance through its influence in the supply chain.

Measures suggested for strengthening labour inspection include the development of ethical and professional codes of conduct, tripartite labour inspection audits to assist government identify and address weaknesses, global inspection principles, training and information. To this end, the ILO supports the development and adoption of a Global Code of Integrity for labour inspection.

Further to this, the ILO supports the need for:
• greater political acceptance of labour inspection and good governance;
• promotion of higher ethical and professional standards in inspectorates; and
• greater networking between social partners (eg. IALI, ILO, etc)

An efficient and adequately resourced labour inspection system makes a significant contribution to economic development, social cohesion and good governance.

Pacific Round up – the status and future of cooperative labour inspection initiatives in the Pacific
Presented by: Mr Werner Blenk, Director, ILO South Pacific Office, Fiji.

Mr Blenk opened with the statement, “the total is worth more than the sum of its parts”. The overall objective of the Pacific forum was to move in the direction of a technical cooperative programme in the Pacific region. The IALI is important as it brings together a range of stakeholders including policy makers, academics, politicians, etc. This brings comparative experience to the table and provides a platform for building technical cooperation.

Pacific countries are in need of support. In some countries, there is a need to develop tripartite structures, legislation and the inspectorate. The Pacific forum combined forces and information to identify how a programme of technical cooperation might be put together. The ASEAN experience was considered as well as regional and national experience.

Delegates from Pacific countries including Australia and New Zealand have highly trained and skilled people. With financial support and generosity, a programme of technical cooperation can be successful.

Following the outcomes from the forum (refer pg. 4 of this paper), the ILO will integrate this new programme of technical cooperation into the ILO Decent Work Country Program.

Mr Blenk concluded his presentation by expressing, “The success of the technical cooperation programmes will be achieved through working together with Government, IALI, ILO and constituents and integration into the ILO’s Decent Work Country Programme...When we all work together, then the total is more than the sum of its parts.”
South East Asia Round up – the status and future of cooperative labour inspection initiatives in South East Asia

Presented by: Mr Dato' Dr Johari Basri, Executive Director, ASEAN-OSHNET Secretariat and Director General, Department of OSH, Malaysia.

Dr Basri told delegates that the main objective of the South East (SE) Asia forum was to promote cooperation and solidarity amongst SE Asian countries. Another key objective of the forum was to promote a regional OSH knowledge base through expanding cooperative information sharing and building a compendium of OSH best practise including a supply chain database (refer to pg. 3 of this paper for further information on the SE Asian forum).

The ASEAN-OSHNET body is the predominant, united voice of South East Asia in OSH. ASEAN OSHNET is an integrated regional platform – is linked to the broader ASEAN platform – for Member Countries to jointly face globalised OSH challenges and threats while aiding the convergence of ideas, information and knowledge. Through the pooling of experiences, expertise and resources in Member Countries, ASEAN-OSHNET seeks to elevate OSH in the South East Asian region to a higher plane in the long term.

The ASEAN-OSHNET’s vision is to become an effective regional institution for fostering a safe and healthy working environment and to bring about a productive and competitive workforce, towards a better quality of life. The overall implementation of ASEAN-OSHNET’s programmes, activities and projects is in general guided by a four year plan of action. To date, six priority OSH areas, called Programme Areas, have been identified namely:

1. Research;
2. Standards;
3. Training;
4. Information;
5. Inspection; and

The challenges facing SE Asian countries include the development and maintenance of sufficient and competent manpower, the acquisition and maintenance of adequate and up-to-date equipment, the establishment and upkeep of adequate physical facilities and the establishment and maintenance of adequate information management systems. Nevertheless, through the development of Memorandums of Understanding (MOUs) between SE Asian nations and international funding and support, greater harmonisation and relationships can be fostered to meet these challenges and improve OSH for workers in Asian countries.

There are significant benefits by integrating OSH into business practice and by engaging tripartite parties in bringing about positive change. Regional alliances to improve work in small enterprise fits well into the ASEAN plan.

Finally, the work being undertaken by ASEAN is strong and comprehensive. There is much value that IALI, Australia and New Zealand can add to the good work already accomplished by ASEAN. Australia and New Zealand want to further their knowledge and learning of international supply chains and the movement of high risk plant. To this end, there is consideration for Australia and New Zealand to join the ASEAN-OSHNET network and further promote cooperative working relationships via MOUs within the region.

Australia’s Aboriginal Employment Strategy (AES) – a successful partnership between the Aboriginal community and corporate Australia, for the promotion of decent work employment for Aboriginal people

Presented by: Mr Danny Lester, Chief Executive, AES, Australia.

Mr Lester opened his presentation by providing detail on the AES and the importance of fair and decent work for Aboriginal people. In his address, Mr Lester stated that, "Aboriginal advancement starts from employment and
participation in the workforce…this is the key to improving health, housing and education…It’s about work, not welfare…creating successful partnerships between the aboriginal community and corporate Australia.”

The AES is a not-for-profit organisation that specialises in placing and mentoring Aboriginal people into employment. Its aim is to build pride, passion and commitment in Aboriginal communities. The AES provides a vehicle for corporate Australia to engage Aboriginal people and provides a link between business and the Aboriginal community.

The AES is a relationship company; it mentors clients and builds relationships that give employers a better understanding of Aboriginal people. The AES is also a Registered Training Organisation (RTO) and aims to lead the way for Aboriginal trainees.

The principle philosophy of the AES is to strategically increase the self esteem of Aboriginal communities. It is important that society looks forward, not back. The corporate community must be engaged to ensure they meet their corporate social responsibility.

Due to the pending skills shortage in Australia, the Aboriginal community offers a vast opportunity to fill this shortage. The AES is targeting this issue through the implementation of audits to determine the skill needs of industry and that their strategy will be outcome driven and solution based. A youth programme for young adolescents in years 7-9 to learn about the world of work is another initiative being developed.

IALI can learn from the strategies employed by the AES to hit the right ‘levers’ that will produce desired outcomes for safe and decent work.

Conclusions and Lessons from Session 1

General conclusions

To strengthen and modernise labour inspection, there must be defined relationships with key stakeholders, sharing of knowledge and expertise, adequate resources and an appropriate evidence base to support intervention activities that provide protection and opportunity to workers.

Lessons for Labour Inspection

Labour Inspectorates can maximise use of their resources to address OSH issues by sharing the experiences of all nations and seeking to adopt best practice approaches suitable for their social, political and economic environment.
Session 2: Alliances – The role of regional cooperation and partnerships in labour inspection

Overview

Partnerships between governments, employers, unions and others are vital to achieve healthy, safe and decent work. Strengthening labour inspection through regional cooperation is a long-standing principle of both the ILO’s strategy for safe and decent work, and IALI’s approach to its activities. Through sharing good practice and addressing the issues associated with the globalised workforce, we can develop alliances that will ensure effective labour inspection across the world.

Cooperation between labour inspectors across regions can facilitate social dialogue, deregulation, harmonisation, robust auditing, mutual recognition, and can remove trade barriers and opportunities for exploitation. Sharing training approaches and good practice assists in strengthening and modernising labour inspection services. Further, by formalising international networks, developing international agreements between labour inspectorates, and cooperatively developing and applying similar auditing tools, we can address such issues as working conditions and health and safety in supply chains between trading partners.

This session focussed on sharing experiences of successful partnerships and regional collaboration from around the world. A key aim was to define the way forward so that labour inspection can maximise its contribution to the achievement of decent work around the world.

Keynote Address: Testing and certification goes global – the role and growth of international testing and certification schemes

Presented by: Mr Peter Harley, Director, Laboratory and Testing Services Group, WorkCover, NSW, Australia.

Mr Harley provided delegates with some history of recent, major fatal accidents occurring in hazardous production situations such as underground coal mining, steel making and petro-chemical processing. He then went on to talk about the growth of international testing and certification schemes and their extension to all phases of the production cycle.

With the globalisation of equipment manufacturing on the increase, there is an ever-expanding need to ensure that plant and equipment is produced to exacting safety standards and that these processes are regularly audited. Development and adoption of international standard setting will assist this.

Consequently, many countries are now adopting international safety and conformity standards which require that plant and equipment destined for use in potentially hazardous locations is tested and certified by accredited testing authorities. This is now the case in Europe, Russia, the United States, Australia, New Zealand and countries within South-East Asia, that without appropriate certification, equipment will not be permitted either entry or installation.

However, further time and effort is required to continue the development of international safety standards covering globalised plant and equipment. Standards will need to address not only the movement of goods, but also the requirement for international cooperation in relation to testing facilities. Those countries involved in this issue should be adopting the highest possible standards…not the lowest.
**Vietnam’s occupational health and safety and cooperation with regional countries**

**Presented by:**  Mr Vu Nhu Van, Deputy Director of the Bureau for Safe Work, Ministry of Labour –Invalids and Social Affairs, Vietnam.

Mr Van outlined the current status of occupational injuries and disease in Vietnam and the commitment to addressing this issue. Currently, Vietnam has a population of 82.7 million with a workforce of 43 million. From 2002-2006, there were 505 fatalities; 18% related to construction, 15% related to electricity and 9% related to mining.

Mr Van described the role of the Ministry of Labour, Invalids and Social Affairs and its responsibility for the State administration of occupational safety and health (OSH). OSH activities in Vietnam are managed in partnership through tripartite collaboration with the Government, employer’s representatives (Vietnam Chamber of Commerce and Industry or Vietnam Cooperative Alliance) and worker’s representatives (Vietnam General Confederation of Labour).

A national programme for labour inspection has been developed. Some of the major objectives of this programme include:

- Reduction in fatalities by 15%;
- Reduction in occupational disease by 10%;
- Increasing the level of OSH training of workers in high risk industries by 80%; and
- Improving the treatment for workers suffering work related injury and disease.

Additionally, an OSH programme targeting farmers in 19 of 64 provinces over three years has commenced. To date, over 8,000 farmers have been trained.

Mr Van also stated the commitment of Vietnam to improving OSH through participation in ASEAN-OSHNET activities and implementation of various other national projects including a national OSH week and building a national OSH profile. The budget allocated for improving Vietnam’s OSH performance is $30 million (USD) with funding coming from the state (52%), enterprise (27%) and international organisations (21%).

Future initiatives being considered by the Ministry include:

- Creating an agency to oversee OSH in Vietnam;
- Increasing the level of OSH training for workers;
- Improving the reporting of workplace accidents;
- Establishing an accident compensation fund; and
- Expanding the level of OSH influence within the agriculture sector.

**Labour inspection and sustainable globalisation – PRO IALI**

**Presented by:**  Mr Paul Weber, IALI Secretary-General and Directeur de l’Inspection du travail et des Mines, Luxemburg.

“Synergy amongst stakeholders is the foundation for a holistic approach. Good safety performance not only benefits the worker, but the shareholder as well.” This was the message delivered by Mr Weber in relation to labour inspection and sustainable globalisation.

Occupational Health and Safety is good for business. It benefits the worker, the employer and the shareholder. When considering the European experience, it has been estimated that one workplace injury resulting in one day or more lost time can result in a cost of up to $25,000 Euros (includes both direct and indirect costs). Therefore, there are significant financial savings to be made through good safety performance.
National tripartite cooperation between the Government, employers and workers is needed for workplace safety interventions to be effective. Achieving safety performance enables success and profits all stakeholders leading to a win-win situation. Mr Weber provided examples of where this was working in some countries.

Mr Weber also talked about the individual worker. He indicated that each individual has a basic right of preserving their life, despite all differing or preceding convictions. Self-preservation is a law of nature, and therefore a true universal concept. Labour inspectors are the ‘supervisors’ or ‘ambassadors’ of these basic rights in the workplace on a governmental level. Their rational judgements play a dominating part in the maintenance of social balance. Labour inspection must face the challenge of adapting its talents and competencies if it is going to be successful in an increasingly complex environment.

At the international level, the IALI constitutes the operational arm for checking how countries and labour inspectorates support these sovereign rights which have been embodied in the tripartite International Conventions of the ILO and the United Nations system.

Finally, a model for developing a new paradigm to improve the safety culture of organisations and society was given. The model comes from Schopenhauer and illustrates four stages of cultural maturity:

1. ‘to be unaware of’ – increase information and this leads to the next stage;
2. ‘to poke fun at’ – provide greater scientific evidence and this leads to the next stage;
3. ‘to fight against’ – institutionalise OSH and this will lead to the final stage;
4. ‘that goes without saying’ – OSH is seen as fundamental and a valued part of life.

The role of international cooperation

Presented by: Ms Shi Yangping, IALI Vice President and Director, Department of International Cooperation, SAWS, PR China.

Ms Shi Yangping addressed the conference delegation by providing some background on the state of OHS in PR China. The State Administration of Work Safety (SAWS) is responsible for stabilising and reducing the rate of workplace injury and disease in PR China. This responsibility also extends to the administration of coal mine safety for some 20,000 coal mines.

To date, OSH performance has been improving within the coal mining industry with production increasing while the number of fatalities is decreasing. The challenges still facing the industry include:

- productivity variation;
- diversification of ownership;
- rapid growth and expansion of the industry;
- migration of workers from rural areas to urban areas; and
- the transfer to high risk work for many workers.

The legal framework for OSH is also incomplete and requires further development. Other obstacles to improving OSH outcomes within PR China include; an insufficient number of workplace inspectors, outdated plant and equipment and an insufficient awareness of employers and workers on OSH issues.

The Government is committed to improving OSH through a number of initiatives:

- Work Safe Law (2002);
- State Council decision for further enhancing safety (2004);
- Upgrade of SAWS to Ministry status (2005);
- Incorporation of OSH into the country’s five year development programme (2006-2010);
- Implementation of a work safe month (June) to raise awareness; and
- Increase alliances and cooperation with regional partners.
PR China is participating in a range of international arrangements to enhance cooperation between countries and to ensure the exchange of ideas and information. This international cooperation exists with key bodies such as IALI, the ILO, the World Health Organisation and the International Social Security Association. Furthermore, bilateral cooperation in the form of Memorandums of Understanding (MOU’s) for OSH exists with Australia, Germany, Japan and the United States of America.

Ms Shi Yangping indicated that there have been significant challenges as well as benefits through participation in international agreements and regional alliances. “Labour inspectorates should be open to an exchange of ideas and information so as to learn from world best practices. This exchange is facilitated by cooperative arrangements with our regional partners, which plays an active role in our effort to achieve continuous improvement”.

**Battling a legacy of death – a global alliance for an international ban on asbestos**

**Presented by:**  
Ms Sari Sairanen, National Health and Safety Director, Canadian Auto Workers Union, Canada.  
Mr George Botick, National Health and Safety representative, Canadian Auto Workers Union, Canada.

Ms Sairanen opened the presentation by providing context on the state of unity by trade unions around the world to battle the deadly asbestos legacy. All industry sectors in Canada have been affected by asbestos. The Auto Workers Union represents a broad range of industry sectors covering 25,000 skilled trades. The Union holds three broad based leadership meetings per year and asbestos is always at the forefront of discussions.

Given the latency of asbestos related illnesses, determining compensation claims is challenging and affected workers can be left facing terrible prospects. The Union is working hard to address this issue through bargaining and the continued education of members and employers on the fatal effects of asbestos exposure.

The Union is campaigning for an international ban on the production, use and exportation of asbestos. Part of this campaign involves the formulation of international alliances with other trade unions and labour inspectorates.

The role of the labour inspectorate is to protect the health and safety of workers and the public from risks arising from work. Therefore, labour inspectorates are seen as a critical partner in this global campaign. Through international alliances, trade unions and labour inspectorates can work together to pressure Governments and the employer community to support a total ban on asbestos.

**The challenges of creating a safer construction industry – the Cambodian experience**

**Presented by:**  
Dr Leng Tong, Director of Occupational Health, Ministry of Labour and Vocational training, Royal Kingdom of Cambodia.

Dr Tong began his presentation by providing some background of Cambodia’s turbulent past. However, the last ten years has seen a period of relative stability which has led to investor confidence. As a result industry, in particular, the construction industry, is going through rapid growth.

The construction industry ‘boom’ has created many challenges for protecting the safety of workers. Most of the industry relies on daily labour as part of the informal economy. Eighty percent of Cambodia’s population comprises of farmers. Poor education by both employers and workers in growing hazardous industries is another significant issue. To further compound the matter, there is a paucity of data concerning injuries and illnesses with anecdotal evidence being the norm.

Little legislation exists for occupational safety and health (OSH) and workers compensation is only a recent initiative. Further issues relate to the significant lack of human and financial resources along with an increase in work activity in other hazardous industry sectors such as oil, gas and mining.
In response to these challenges, the Department of Occupational Health (DOH) is providing numerous training and information sessions to industry on OSH requirements. The DOH is also focusing on legislative development around industry hazards and increased monitoring of workplace incidents and trends.

Cambodia requires assistance from the international community to further its work in the OSH arena and has formed collaborative relationships with the ILO, IALI and the Ministry of Manpower in Singapore with particular attention given to the training of OSH inspectors.

In closing, Mr Tong stated, “As we move through a period of economic growth, we must ensure we increase our awareness and understanding of OSH issues... particularly in the construction industry. There is a great need for improved OSH legislation, international cooperation and self regulation by industry.”

Labour and OHS in New Caledonia: the legal framework and major issues

Presented by: *Mr François Barthelmé, Deputy Director, Department of Labour and Employment New Caledonia.*

In his opening, Mr Barthelmé provided some background on New Caledonia. New Caledonia is made up of three provinces, each with provincial assemblies and comprises of a population of around 240,000. The Department of Labour and Employment (DLE) is a local government entity and has responsibility for the administration of occupational safety and health and employment legislation and policy.

The DLE consists of nine, non-specialised workplace inspectors. There are significant OSH issues related to:

- Construction industry;
- Natural deposits of asbestos; and
- Major mining projects.

Further, the OSH regulations are dated and don’t reflect the current environment.

The DLE is currently addressing the above issues through a programme of work activity aimed at updating the legislative framework, improving industrial relations and implementing a more efficient labour inspection strategy. In addition, the IALI conference in Adelaide provided the opportunity to form regional alliances and participate in the development of a technical program of cooperation aimed at increasing the knowledge and skills of DLE inspectors. In this way, New Caledonia is positioning itself to meet the challenges of the future related to construction, asbestos and major mining projects.

Challenging issues of inspection, enforcement and commitment to OSH in Lao PDR

Presented by: *Mr Thongdeng Singthilath, Deputy Director General of Skills Development and Employment Department, Ministry of Labour and Social Welfare, Lao, PDR.*

The key message arising from Mr Singthilath’s speech related to an urgent need for effective OSH intervention at both the enterprise and national level. Lao PDR is experiencing a time of rapid economic and industrial growth. In many instances, employers and workers in small to medium enterprises do not apply OSH seriously and/or little investment is made to improve OSH conditions.

In addition, there have been a number of industrial disasters along with the onset of occupational cancers (eg lung, skin and bone cancer) arising out of work within the agricultural sector. The diversity of the workforce is also an issue as knowledge and skills can be lacking.

The Ministry of Labour and Social Welfare (MLSW) has responsibility for OSH in Lao PDR. In 2005, a Master Plan was developed through a tripartite consultation process and introduced further OSH requirements for industry.
From this, a greater number of workplace inspections at high risk worksites have been carried out by inspectors. This has led to some improvement in the responsiveness to addressing OSH issues by both employers and employees.

Lao PDR is working on translating key audit tools from the ILO and other international organisations to assist them to improve OSH standards in industry. The IALI conference provided an opportunity to have input into possible areas of cooperation under a Memorandum of Understanding arrangement with other countries in the region. This together with the ASEAN-OSHNET alliance will greatly assist the MLSW to improve conditions for workers.

In closing, Mr Singthilath expressed his belief that, “through the implementation of the Master Plan (2005) and utilising our regional networks, we can improve the safety culture within industry and address the urgent need to manage our major hazards.”

**Philippines’ experience in developmental and preventive OSH Programmes**

**Presented by:** Dr Dulce P. Estrella-Gust, Executive Director, OSH Centre, Department of Labour and Employment, Philippines.

Dr Estrella-Gust provided an argument for workers’ safety and health as an integral part of the “just and humane terms and conditions of work” as guaranteed in the Philippine Constitution of 1987. The Occupational Safety and Health Center (OSHC), within the Department of Labour and Employment (DOLE), was established in the same year to initiate and coordinate nationwide preventive actions through training, research, technical advisory services, information dissemination and networking, as well as acting as a clearing house of information on OSH matters.

The DOLE is comprised of four key components:

1. Prevention
2. Enforcement
3. Compensation / Rehabilitation
4. Standards Review

The major industry sectors existing in the Philippines include mining, construction, manufacturing, agribusiness and hospitality.

Over the past three decades a body of national OSH Standards has been developed via a tripartite approach including policies on hazard-specific laws and programmes. In February 2008, the Zero Accident program was revisited with key priority areas identified into 16 regions incorporating existing technical assistance visits, self-assessment; Work Improvement in Small Enterprises (WISE); labour education programs; informal sector; child labour; and gender programs targeting young workers, women and older worker, migrants, the disabled and workers in the informal sector.

From 1998 to 2006, a strategic review of medium term planning was carried out. This review recognised emerging and re-emerging illnesses which go hand in hand with

- rapidly changing technologies and work processes;
- the international labour movement;
- the rise in female employment;
- the “flexibilisation” of work; and
- the exposure to toxic substances, biological and ergonomic hazards.

Besides normal inspection activities, the 180 strong OSH inspectors are closely involved in the implementation of the Zero Accident Program and the National Labor Standards Enforcement Framework, covering 800,000 establishments across the country. This is supported by not more than 2000 health and safety professional
accredited by DOLE and around 2,500 occupational health physicians (and a similar number of occupational nurses). Additionally, a handful of industrial hygienists exist plus around 20 health and safety training organizations. At University, Doctors are required to study OSH as a subject.

It is expected that by 2010 more tangible results regarding OSH performance are expected through improved multi-sectoral cooperation in the OSH system.

The challenges ahead include building capability and capacity through effective OSH training and competency, provision of technical specialist services, data collection and analysis of work-related injuries and illnesses to drive strategic intervention programmes. A strong case is being made for capacity and capability building through developmental, voluntary and inspection programmes. Furthermore, additional OSH personnel are required if the DOLE is to expand the coverage of workers and establishments.

Conclusions and Lessons from Session 2

General conclusions

Through strategic alliances within regions and across the globe, labour inspectorates can meet the challenges of both developed and developing countries to ensure fair and safe work.

Lessons for Labour Inspection

Labour inspectorates need to be willing to share and learn from one another. Cooperation and collaboration is essential in meeting the challenges of the future.
Session 3: Ethics – The need for a global code of integrity and developing the foundation for professional labour inspection

Overview

Labour inspectors face increasing challenges in their role of ensuring safe and fair standards of work. In an effort to ensure transparency and credibility of their operations as well as protection of their role, several countries have recognised the importance of underpinning labour inspection work with a Code of Ethics. Variously referred to as a code of ‘ethics’, ‘professionalism’ or ‘integrity’ (or a combination), this type of document serves as a foundation for establishing a credible and professional labour inspection system.

In 2005, IALI agreed that the development of a global code was vital. In subsequent IALI conferences throughout the world the feasibility of this proposal has been tested to determine what it would mean for countries in different stages of development. Following an interactive workshop at the 2007 Conference in Toronto, Canada, it became clear that a global code would assist all countries, regardless of the maturity of their labour administration, both in establishing the importance of an effective and professional labour inspection system and in providing the principles for its operation.

Further, the Canada Conference demonstrated that there is considerable commonality around the world, in the key elements agreed to be important as the foundation for professional labour inspection. IALI through SafeWork SA and Wolfgang von Richthofen, and assisted by the Ministry of Labour, Ontario, Canada has now developed a draft of the code. This has been available on the IALI website for public comment.

Many professional occupations use this type of code to present a professional and ethical face to the community. Raising awareness of the high standards of personal behaviour expected of inspectors worldwide can also be expected to provide assurance for employers and the workforce about the inspectors’ role.

In leading the development of a global code of ethics for Labour Inspection, IALI is aiming to progress the document to a final draft stage at this Adelaide conference. The intention is to gain approval of the document at IALI’s three-yearly General Assembly in Geneva in June 2008. This Conference session will hear from countries with experience in implementing codes of ethics and discuss the value, content and implementation processes associated with the global code.

Ethical labour inspection: The international employer perspective

Presented by: Mr Phil O'Reilly, Chief Executive, Business NZ – New Zealand and representative of the international Organisation of Employers, Geneva, Switzerland.

In his opening address, Mr O'Reilly stated that, “The code of ethics for labour inspection will contribute to economic wellbeing and social justice.” Further to this idea, an effective labour administration system provides for a stable business climate, as it is a key market supporting institution that encourages national and foreign direct investment. In today’s world market, a poor record of compliance with national legislation – as well as non-compliance with international core labour standards – can generate consumer concerns. A strong labour administration that guarantees compliance with national law by national and international companies can be an attractive feature for national and international businesses.

In addition, a sound labour administration is important for employers because through it, governments give effect to key economic and social policies that directly impact on the workplace. ILO Convention No. 150 recognises the relevance of this by requiring ratifying States to establish consultation, co-operation and negotiation mechanisms with employers’ organisations, thereby promoting the engagement of the latter in the development and implementation of national labour policy.
However, there are some intangible factors affecting sound labour inspection. These are the rule of law, education and property rights within countries. In some countries, it is enough to survive let alone act on principles – corruption and nepotism can be a way of life. The New Zealand International Organisation of Employers (IOE) recognises the real difficulties in those countries where the rule of law is weaker. Therefore, the rule of law and code of ethics are both equally important to economic development and to the success of nations.

Some issues from the employers’ perspective are productivity, ideology and quality. Labour inspection has an ability to support the productivity of the labour market. Ideally, the labour inspection role should be independent of union, employer and labour politics. Finally, labour inspectorates are in a position to either help or hinder the ‘quest’ for continuous improvement and quality in the labour market.

The Code provides a strong framework for labour inspection to move forward as a profession as it is action orientated and based on sound principles. The challenge for labour inspectorates is to think and move beyond compliance to assist and contribute to economic development and sustainability.

The New Zealand IOE and business community supports and endorses the Global Code of Integrity for labour inspection.

Ethical labour inspection: The international union perspective

Presented by: Ms Sari Sairanen, National Health and Safety Director, Canadian Auto Workers Union, Canada. Mr Lyle Hargrave, Director, Health and Safety Training, Canadian Auto Workers (CAW), Canada. Mr Igor Nossar, Chief Advocate, Textile, Clothing and Footwear Union (TCFUA), Australia.

Ms Sairanen and Mr Hargrave began the presentation by expressing the need for strong, independent trade unions and strong, well resourced labour inspectorates. In addition to this, they expressed the need for strong, tripartite collaboration between unions, employers and labour inspectorates to achieve safe and healthy working environments and conditions for workers. As globalisation increases, this tripartite collaboration should occur across regions and borders with specific focus on the international supply chain.

Effective labour inspection can influence corporate and social responsibility as well as ethical investment. Those employers that are not compliant should have legal sanctions taken against them. A key strategy for effectiveness is to involve unions and employers in labour inspection policies and activities. Having labour inspectors signed up to a global code of integrity is essential for unions and labour inspectors to be able to work successfully together.

Mr Nossar then gave a presentation on the issues associated with supply chain regulation. The supply chain consists of contract networks across different regions. To influence OHS outcomes using the supply chain, the following should be considered by labour inspectorates:

- Independent audits focussing on contracting practices;
- Use of commercial power in supply chains; and
- Obtaining details of and auditing agents within the supply chain on a regular basis.

Tripartite cooperation between unions, the government and employers around the regulation of the supply chain can make a difference to safe and decent work globally.

Finally, Mr Nossar expressed a need for, “a willingness to be creative on how we can regulate the supply chain contract network. Once regulation of the supply chain in each jurisdiction is effective, then the international supply chain can be regulated in the same way. Through tripartite cooperation we can address this issue at state, national and international levels.”
Ethical investment for safe, fair and decent working conditions

Presented by: Mr Nick Edgerton, Research Analyst, Sustainable Alpha funds, AMP Capital Investors, Australia.

Companies failing to provide safe, fair and decent working conditions are increasingly scrutinised along the value chain – not least by investors. This was a key message provided by Mr Edgerton of AMP Capital Investors in Australia. “There are many intangible assets in having safe, fair and decent working conditions...which make it sensible for business to invest in good OSH practices.”

Companies taking the lead in providing best practice workplace health and safety are opening up growth opportunities through sourcing employees, contracts, business and government partnerships and customers. Companies which do not provide best practice workplace health and safety, or fail to translate their commitment to basic human rights into fair and decent working conditions, are exposed to risks from consumers, governments and investors.

Companies can use their supply chain to take action to improve safe, fair and decent outcomes in the workplace. This may include:

- Ensuring equitable access to goods, resources and services;
- Upholding conventions on combating bribery and unethical work practices; and

Ethical labour inspection plays a vital role in building public trust and investor confidence in many organisations. The challenges for investors when considering investment and workplace health and safety include:

- Does one size fit all;
- What are companies doing to attract workers;
- Recognising standards and compliance;
- International operations and best practice; and
- Safety management vs safety culture.

Elements of professional ethics in French labour inspection

Presented by: Ms Sylvie Siffermann, Directrice du travail, Ministère du travail, France.

Ms Siffermann began her presentation by describing the terms ‘work ethics’ and ‘ethics’. ‘Work ethics’ relates to the number of rules and duties in a professional environment while ‘ethics’ relates to a moral system of values ie an internal obligation that one feels and is conscious about.

In France, labour inspection started in 1892 through the Ministry of Labour. The Ministry of Labour comprises of approximately 1800 agents where most of their time is dedicated to OSH issues and the rest of the time on industrial relations issues.

Increasingly, there has been a rise in the level of aggression shown to labour inspectors while carrying out their work. This aggression culminated in the murder of two inspectors at Saussignac in February 2004. Following this incident, the Ministry of Labour embarked on a collective reflection on professional ethics, out of concern for the protection of inspectors and to create a new approach to ethical conduct.

Underpinning the Ministry’s ethical standards for labour inspection is a number of principles such as impartiality, independence, probity and professional disciplines. The new approach focussed on teaching inspectors through demonstration of a range of good professional skills needed to prevent professionally inadequate positions.

The objective this approach was to equip inspectors with rules and benchmarks enabling them to carry out their job within a more protected framework and to circulate recommendations of good professional practices, in order to take account of realities on the ground.
In adopting this new approach and to ensure greater protection for labour inspectors in France, the following actions were taken:

- The recruitment and training system for labour inspectors, including everyone from senior management to administrative staff, was evaluated in order to further strengthen the rights and obligations of inspectors;
- Issuing of a mobile phone and camera to each inspector;
- Introduction of a ‘buddy’ system where a minimum of two inspectors are required to undertake workplace inspections. This can include the police where deemed necessary;
- Creation of a register of incivility e.g. verbal abuse, violence, etc experienced by inspectors which can be processed at a National level;
- Support centre created;
- Financial assistance offered to inspectors to pursue claims against a client;
- Production of a media film to inform the public about the role of the inspector;
- Provision of further training opportunities for inspectors; and
- Lobbying to get more inspectors.

The professional foundation of labour inspection in Canada and a successful Canadian alliance resulting in an E-learning course for labour inspectors

Presented by: Mr Len S Hong, President and Chief Executive Officer, Canadian Centre for OHS, Ontario, Canada.

Mr Hong informed delegates of the significant efforts Canada has made to ensure labour inspection is built on a strong and effective foundation of professionalism and integrity. Initiatives such as the development of a code of professionalism by the Ontario Ministry of Labour, have led the way for all public services to implement ethical practises as a fundamental mode of operation.

In pursuit of professionalism, and to streamline learning and development over a large geographic region, an e-learning ‘safety lockout’ course for labour inspectors was developed collaboratively amongst Canadian provinces. The development of the e-learning course was led by the Canadian Centre for Occupational Health and Safety (CCOHS) with the support from two Canadian jurisdictions and was designed to support the inspector’s role to enforce legislation, conduct inspections, provide advice and issue orders. The course specifically looked at the new Canadian Standard for ‘lockout’ and the application of the corresponding legislation.

The idea of using an online, e-learning training course as opposed to a standard ‘in-house’ training course came about due to the inefficiencies of reaching labour inspectors over a large geographic region. Also, issues such as time constraints and workload impacted the ability of inspectors to undertake training successfully. The online environment was very efficient at crossing the regional spread of labour inspectorates in Canada and allowed a ‘self-paced’ environment where inspectors could undertake the training at times convenient to them. Furthermore, the e-learning program adopted a number of familiar formats such as Microsoft word, illustrations, photos, diagrams, tables and charts to assist learning by inspectors.

The e-learning course also had a number of interactive slides that course participants could work their way through, along with general questions and answers, quizzes, case studies and a final examination at the end. Course participants were issued with a certificate of competence once they successfully completed the training.

 Whilst it is recognised that e-learning is not a substitute for face to face learning or mentoring, it does have many attractive advantages in supporting the capability development of the inspector in a time and user friendly environment.
How CIS – the International OSH Information Centre – can assist the development of professional labour inspection systems worldwide

**Presented by:**  Mr Gabor Sandi, Head of CIS – SafeWork, ILO, Geneva, Switzerland.

Mr Sandi presented information to delegates on the role of the CIS ie, the International Occupational Safety and Health Information Centre. The CIS was set up in 1959 as part of the International Labour Office (ILO) in Geneva. CIS’s main purpose is to support the ILO in the carrying out of its Global Strategy and Action Plan through the provision of occupational safety and health information worldwide.

CIS’s main means of action is through the provision of OSH information, in particular through maintaining its databases and the ILO’s Encyclopedia of Occupational Health and Safety. This encyclopedia is considered the definitive reference for occupational hygiene throughout the world. The latest edition (5th Edition) will be web-based and will be offered in multiple languages. Previously the ILO encyclopedia had been published in hard-copy format. The web-based database is expected to dramatically reduce the costs associated with providing the information contained therein and is expected to have a far greater reach than previous publications.

The most important of its databases is CISDOC, which contains more than 70,000 high-quality bibliographic references and abstracts covering the world’s OSH publications.

CIS’s other main role is to be the organizer of its worldwide network of CIS National, Collaborating and Regional Centres, regrouping organizations providing OSH information at the national and international level. In Australia and New Zealand, the national centres are the Australian Safety and Compensation Council, Department of Education, Employment and Workplace Relations (Canberra) and the Department of Labour (Te Tari Mahi), Health and Safety Section, Wellington, respectively. There are centres on every continent of the world.

The CIS is working to extend its network to cover labour inspectors and to further support the development of a health and safety culture with a focus on prevention.

Towards a Global Code of Integrity for IALI – an interactive session including questions and discussion

**Presented by:**  Mr Wolfgang von Richthofen, Senior Technical Advisor, IALI and international consultant, France. Ms Michele Patterson, President, IALI, and Executive Director, SafeWork SA, South Australia, Australia.

Mr Richthofen began the presentation by detailing his involvement in the development and production of a tool kit for labour inspectors that included a model enforcement policy, training and operations manual and ethical behaviour guidelines. Mr Richthofen then discussed the issue of corruption and its impact on the reputation and professionalism of labour inspection. “Corruption is often a cause of unethical behaviour and can affect many segments of society...corruption is evidenced where institutional control is weak.”

Dealing with corruption involves a range of professional and ethical issues. Labour inspectors are not always immune to attempts of bribery and can encounter various kinds of violations in their every day work which can lead to ‘offers’ to engage in corrupt behaviour.

Corruption in countries which are in transition have specific characteristics eg. bribery, queue jumping, inappropriate medical favours, extortion, using position to achieve illegitimate personal gain, etc. In these transitional countries, corruption in labour inspection can be high. In order to address this issue, a working group comprising of employer associations, trade unions, the labour inspectorate and other groups was formed. This has led to greater anti-corruption legislation being introduced.
Successful development and implementation of a Global Code of Integrity for labour inspection is one way in which corruption can be countered and result in a better public image and professional view of labour inspectorates generally. It is firmly believed that the Code will contribute to labour inspection being viewed as a true profession on the same standing as other professions such as doctors, lawyers, engineers, etc.

For a Global Code of Integrity to be successful, consideration to the following is required:

- A clear, no-tolerance policy;
- A commitment and leadership from the top;
- A comprehensive training programme for inspectors;
- Awareness raising and publicity campaigns;
- Implementation of a complaints hotline / procedure;
- Incentives for correct professional conduct;
- Full support from social partners; and
- Effective monitoring and feedback from stakeholders.

Mr Richthofen concluded his presentation by stating, “The Global Code of Integrity forms a vital part of IALI’s 2005-2008 strategy to strengthen and modernise labour inspection. The Code is intended to provide the basis from which governance frameworks can be created by labour inspectorates to suit local conditions.”

Ms Michele Patterson began her presentation by expressing the need for modern labour inspection for the 21st Century. A Global Code of Integrity can deliver this. Employers, unions and other stakeholders across the world want labour inspectorates to adopt such standards.

Ms Patterson then provided conference delegates with an overview of the development and status of the current Global Code of Integrity and the rationale for its importance to labour inspection.

The Code has been under development by IALI for the last three years. Ms Patterson reaffirmed the desire by IALI to establish a foundation of professionalism and modernising and strengthening labour inspection worldwide.

Arising from the Code are six broad values comprising:

1. Knowledge and competence.
2. Honesty and integrity.
3. Courtesy and respect.
4. Objectivity, neutrality and fairness.
5. Commitment and responsiveness.
6. Consistency between personal and professional behaviour.

The Code creates a governance framework for labour inspectorates aimed at shaping employee behaviour throughout the organisation. The Code attempts to put to labour inspectorates a moral obligation on the actions or inactions of labour inspection employees in the conduct of their work.

The Adelaide IALI Conference provided a significant opportunity to showcase the Code and gain commitment from delegates to the principles embodied in the Code. One of the significant outcomes achieved by the previous Australian and New Zealand Inspectors Forum was a commitment by all Australian jurisdictions to adopt the principles of the Code within their governance structures.

The intention of this session was to gain commitment from all conference delegates to the principles of the Code.

Following the presentations by Mr Richthofen and Ms Patterson, an interaction discussion ensued with many comments and suggestions being raised from conference delegates. Some of the key issues highlighted were:
• The ILO Convention No 81 should be added to the beginning of the Code to highlight the fact that labour inspectors are involved in the enforcement of legislation in their day to day duties.
• Some countries have IALI representation from government while other countries have IALI representation from labour inspection associations. IALI will need to clarify who will be responsible for putting the ‘system’ of the Code in place.
• There must be tripartite endorsement of the Code.
• There must be collaboration across the whole supply chain. The Code refers to not only inspectors but to all other employees within the labour inspectorate.
• There needs to be some guidance on how the Code should be implemented, monitored, reviewed and evaluated.
• In relation to Value 1: Knowledge and Competence – the identification of training needs for labour inspectors should be addressed and the term ‘competence’ should be further represented in the text.
• In relation to Value 5: Commitment and Responsiveness; Broad Definition – the reference to ‘values’ may need a broader / clearer explanation.
• Implementation of the Code will occur at different levels depending upon the stage of development of the country adopting it.
• The Code is only an ethical and professional framework, the actual moral obligation must come from the individual person.
• The Code could be enforced as part of a contract of employment.

The outcome from this interactive session was an acceptance by the conference delegation of the principles of the Code. The Code will now be amended based on the feedback received and following this, be presented at IALI’s General Assembly in Geneva in June for official endorsement.

Conclusions and Lessons from Session 3

General conclusions

A Global Code of Integrity will help build the foundation for professional and ethical labour inspection across the world. This will contribute to the growth and health of global economies, enhance social justice and provide effective protection for workers.

Lessons for Labour Inspection

When finalised, labour inspectorates will be asked to consider the alignment and/or relationship of their governance frameworks with the principles arising from the Code of Integrity.
Session 4: Influence – Measuring and demonstrating the value of effective labour inspection

Overview

Labour inspectors alone cannot achieve the safe, healthy and decent work objective. To be effective, they need to be able to influence all those who can affect work and workplaces including the community, politicians, business, media, economists, opinion-makers, governments, employers, workers, designers, manufacturers, suppliers and so on.

Influence depends on credibility. So building and fostering the foundations for effective labour inspection systems across the globe depends on being able to demonstrate their value.

Meeting this challenge is a key strategy to influence and promote safe, healthy and decent work outcomes as well as sustainable economic development.

There are many approaches to demonstrating effectiveness and value. This session delivered information on the latest innovative and good practice approaches for around the world. A specific aim was to examine the key indicators of performance that can contribute to demonstrating value in any aspect of the inspectors’ work – such as investigation, audit, prevention programmes and education.

Focus was placed on good investigation and audit practices in high risk industry sector such as major hazardous facilities, mining and construction.

Keynote: Working towards a global scoreboard to benchmark labour inspection performance

Presented by: Mr Nils-Petter Wedege, IALI Senior Technical Advisor, Norway.

IALI’s Senior Technical Advisor and former head of Norway’s Labour inspectorate, Mr Nils-Petter Wedege, began his presentation on what may have been the most ambitious objective of the IALI Conference – outlining possible ways to appropriately and accurately benchmark the performance of labour inspection across the world.

The delegation was told that a need for benchmarking exists as a means of ensuring effectiveness and continuous improvement of labour inspectorate activities as well as help create an environment in which inspectors’ work is understood and valued. The session examined the range of tools and innovative approaches labour inspection can use to foster attitudinal change to OSH and influence good OSH practice.

Benchmarking inspection activities enables a comparison in performance to be made in space and time. Due to the complexity of OSH and the varying stakeholders involved, benchmarking can be a rather complex exercise. There are few quantitative parameters for measurement with often no direct or unique link between the action of labour inspection and outcomes achieved.

Benchmarking requires simple models with few parameters. Performance indicators can be split into two categories; traditional indicators and system indicators. Traditional indicators focus on things such as number of notices issued and the amount of noise levels measured. System indicators attempt to measure the performance of OSH management systems.

Notwithstanding the two categories above, performance indicators should be created to increase knowledge and democratic dialog, to evaluate the success of safety management systems and interventions, be specific and be related to well defined objectives.
In Europe, there is no common benchmark model and no perfect set of indicators. In 2006, ILO Convention 187 was formed to address the promotional framework for OSH. Around the same time, work was started on the development of a Nordic Scoreboard. The Scoreboard was built on the EU OSH Strategy 2002-2006 to monitor the performance of nuclear States by EU nations. Most recently, it was adapted for use in other parts of the world, such as by SafeWork SA in South Australia.

The Nordic scoreboard reflects a preventative model with four dimensions:
1. Anticipation of risk and research;
2. Measurement at the enterprise level;
3. Building partnerships; and
4. Intervention of labour inspectorates.

Mr Wedege then talked about the scoreboard that SafeWork SA had adopted and further developed. The scoreboard was developed to measure the impact on the prevention of workplace injury. Four key performance areas are monitored quarterly, each of which have a number of more specific key performance indicators addressing dimensions that include those of the Nordic scoreboard: reach and influence, community impact, activity and impact, and programme milestones.

A State scoreboard has also been developed to monitor progress toward the State Strategic Plan target of reduced workplace injury, which incorporates performance on the SafeWork SA scoreboard as one of four dimensions, the other three being measures of the contribution of the other key players in OSH: employers and their representative bodies, employees and their representative bodies and other contributors such as designers and suppliers.

The main conclusions arising from Mr Wedege’s presentation were:
- Benchmarking is complex in any environment;
- Development of OSH scoreboards should be based on ILO Convention 187;
- In order for a scoreboard to be effective, it must illustrate the differences in approach and outcomes;
- IALI should work in collaboration with the ILO to further develop and promote international benchmarking of OSH performance through a global scoreboard;
- IALI will consider adopting the SafeWork SA scoreboard methodology; and
- The scoreboard concept should be applied globally.

Opportunistic approach to improving effectiveness in Safety and Health inspections: the case of preparations for Uganda to host the Commonwealth Heads of Government Meeting, November 2007

Presented by: Mr William Mukasa Senyonjo, Senior Specialised Labour Inspector, Department of OSH, Uganda.

Mr Senyonjo provided an overview of the state of occupational safety and health (OSH) in Uganda. In recent times, a number of disasters had befallen the country that had resulted in numerous fatalities. Three such disasters involved the collapse of a hotel, a school building and a city church – all making national headlines. In addition to this, there was a failure to effectively operationalise the OSH Act 2006 by the labour inspectorate. The recent disasters coupled with the ineffectiveness of the OSH legislation and its administration provided a much needed impetus for improving OSH outcomes in Uganda.

A great opportunity to further improve OSH came about when Uganda was nominated to host the Commonwealth Heads of Government Meeting (CHOGM) in November, 2007. This event necessitated the assurance of OSH standards at all sites and venues related to the CHOGM which included major hotels, airports, leisure centres and shopping centres.
Labour inspection activities expanded as a consequence of the CHOOGM. A new Minister of Labour was appointed as well as the formulation of a new, fully independent, OSH inspectorate. The OSH inspectorate also had its own funding and as a result was able to increase its number of labour inspectors. There was a heightened awareness of the need for OSH training, continuous inspections and guidelines for employers and employees to assist them to comply with the law. It was firmly believed that the calibre of inspector would have a significant impact on improving OSH outcomes within the region.

With this increased attention on the labour inspectorate came further scrutiny of inspector practices. A comprehensive training program for inspectors was implemented to improve the quality, professionalism and effectiveness of inspector activities.

Following the focus and attention placed on the labour inspectorate in preparation for the CHOOGM and resulting action, the following outcomes were achieved:

- An improvement in the level of inspector skills;
- An increase in the level of inspector mobility;
- An increase in the number of workplace inspectors to 50;
- Employers became more cooperative in relation to OSH;
- Greater media coverage on OSH issues and over 10,000 people receiving OSH information;
- Safety and health accreditation scheme for hotels developed;
- Labour tripartite spirit was reinvigorated; and
- The level of commitment to OSH by the government and society was significantly raised;

The greatest challenge remaining is to keep the momentum going. In closing, Mr Senyonjo expressed the following statement:

"Where we have an environment of uncertainty and inadequacy of resources, the calibre of inspectors will be critical in improving the effectiveness and professionalism of labour inspection. In addition, it is essential to use every opportunity to make a noise and have a voice to raise the profile of OSH."

Influencing Attitudinal change to OHS – creating the environment in which inspectors’ work is understood and valued

Presented by: Mr John Merritt, Executive Director, WorkSafe, Victoria, Australia.

Mr Merritt presented on the role that advertising, media and community campaigns has had on WorkSafe Victoria’s effectiveness over the last 20 years. "Media provides an ability for the regulator to reach out beyond employers, workers and their representatives in the workplace to the broader community." This idea is particularly important as inspectors have direct contact with relatively few workplace parties. In using media as a strategy, WorkSafe Victoria has sought both to influence thinking about occupational health and safety (OHS) as an important cause and to leverage that thinking so that the message about the need for good OHS comes not only from the regulator but is more an accepted social driver.

Mr Merritt stated that labour inspectorates are in the, “influencing and leveraging business”. “Everybody cares about somebody else”. This idea was highlighted in the recent ‘Homecomings’ media campaign launched through Victoria in 2007. The campaign reached out to the community in an emotive way depicting that the best reason for workplace health and safety wasn’t at work at all… but was about coming home to your family and loved ones. The success of this media campaign was so great, that it won a national award in the same year.

However, it is recognised that media campaigns won’t necessarily change the way in which people go about their work. WorkSafe Victoria has implemented a number of intervention programs aimed at specific hazards within industry. It has also aimed to improve the quality and accountability of its activities on industry through the implementation of greater performance monitoring and assessment strategies. An example of this was
the intervention program targeting manual handling, one of the largest causes of workplace injury in Victoria. Throughout the programme, WorkSafe Victoria implemented a survey every six months to gauge the effectiveness of its activities. Alongside this was the tracking of the percentage reduction of injuries attributed to manual handling. In this way, WorkSafe Victoria was well informed of the success of the programme. In addition this, WorkSafe Victoria has invested heavily in conducting programs aimed at increasing the professionalism and competency of the OHS inspectorate and measuring the effectiveness of inspectors’ work. There have been significant enhancements made in recent years to its training, development and support programs, which reflect a desire for inspectors to not only be technically competent, but also ethically sound in their actions and decision-making and having strong communication and engagement skills.

WorkSafe Victoria believes that undertaking all these functions and activities to support the operation of its OHS inspectorate, in concert, has resulted in inspectors being better placed in terms of their own confidence and capability. This extends to how they are regarded by those they directly deal with on a professional and value added basis.

In closing, Mr Merritt stated that, “As a modern regulator we must use our regulatory powers in a constructive, accountable, transparent and effective manner.” It is these attributes that will make the labour inspectorate influential in driving industry to achieve higher and higher standards of performance in achieving healthy and safe work.

Modernising the WSH enforcement approach – the Singapore experience

Presented by: Mr Silas Sng, Director, Occupational Safety and Health Inspectorate, Ministry of Manpower, Singapore.

Mr Sng provided delegates with a background of the recent reform to occupational safety and health (OSH) in Singapore. The Workplace Safety and Health (WSH) framework underwent a major revamp in 2005 following a Ministerial study that established new targets including the halving of fatalities by 2015 (from 4.9 to 2.5 fatalities per 1000 workers). A performance based approach was introduced in place of a prescriptive regime. This was embodied in the new WSH Act which replaced the Factories Act in 2006.

In previous times, the WSH inspectorate existed to demand compliance and enforce the law. With the change in direction from prescription to performance, the WSH inspectorate now promote a new approach that emphasises their existence to help facilitate a safe and healthy workplace as well as regulate the law.

Singapore’s vision is to achieve a safe and healthy workplace for everyone and develop Singapore’s reputation as the country renowned for best practice in WSH. The tangible outcomes that the WSH hope to achieve include:

- Reduction in occupational fatalities and injuries rate;
- Workplace safety and health as an integral part of business; and
- Singapore as a Centre of Excellence for WSH.

To realise these outcomes, four strategies have been established. These are:

1. Build strong capability to manage workplace safety and health. This includes developing a competency framework for the industry, developing WSH professionals, building capabilities in risk management and establishing good quality WSH training providers.
2. Implement an effective regulatory framework. This includes initiatives such as developing targeted strategic enforcement programmes and reviewing legislation.
3. Promote the benefits of workplace safety and health and recognise best practice. This includes initiatives such as enhancing the WSH recognition framework, rolling out industry-led WSH outreach programmes to bring the WSH message to a wider audience, as well as disseminating timely information on WSH.
4. Develop strong partnerships both locally and internationally. This includes enhancing the capabilities of the WSH Advisory Committee and establishing an International Advisory Panel of experts to provide critique on the development of WSH strategies and standards.

Following implementation of the strategies above, a number of achievements have been realised:

- A greater focus on eliminating or reducing risk at the source;
- Higher penalties for breaches of workplace health and safety introduced;
- Greater focus on risk management approaches and facilitating a safe and healthy workplace;
- Improved targeting of ‘hot spots’ i.e. greater focus on higher risk, higher accident workplaces;
- Increased use and weight given to performance based indicators as opposed to lag indicators;
- Improved education for inspectors and the community;
- Increased number of workplace inspections;
- Increased leveraging of media and information distribution (e.g., email platform for mass mailing, publication of a weekly WSH alert, etc);
- Better utilisation of the inspectorate’s website – inspection checklists used by the inspectorate have been placed on the website to inform the employer community so they can be prepared for inspection;
- Implementation of a ‘business under surveillance’ program targeting poor management of WHS, then close monitoring / enforcement / engagement from the inspectorate;
- Complaint investigation – leveraging on the public’s eyes and ears;
- Improved accident investigation techniques focusing on systemic issues as opposed to technical issues.

To continue to ensure success of the WSH strategies, the inspectorate will need to create structures and programmes that aim to shape behaviour and outcomes at the workplace. The major outcomes to date since the reform include:

- A greater community awareness and respect of WSH; and
- A continuing reduction in the number of workplace fatalities.

**Raising the value of work**

**Presented by:** Mr. Mike Munnelly, Regional Manager, Workplace Services, Department of Labour, New Zealand.

Mr. Munnelly provided information on the Department of Labour (DOL) in New Zealand. The DOL provides services that expand across both industrial relations (IR) and occupational health and safety (OHS). New Zealand has a population of 1.2 million people and its economic growth is driven by the growth of the labour market. A key change in the labour market culture has been the shift from doing more to doing better, i.e., raising the value of work.

The challenge for the Workplace Group (WG) within the DOL is how it can contribute to this expectation throughout the business community. It is understood that to do this, there will need to be a significant shift from compliance to influence. The current, key strategies driving the WG include:

- Fundamental rights at work;
- Social dialogue;
- Better quality working lives; and
- Raising the value of work.

In order to meet these strategies, the WG within the DOL is undertaking steps to improve its service delivery and impact in the community. The WG combines inspectors with advisors to provide a multifaceted approach to regulating IR and OHS in the workplace. There is now more rigorous assessment and evaluation of the WG’s programmes in relation to identifying and using the most influential levers, i.e., those strategies that will have the greatest reach and influence. The WG is also seeking to develop a better evidence base to support its interventions through investigative research.
Further to this, the WG is putting more time and energy into gauging the quality and effectiveness of its interaction with the business community. Work has begun in measuring the performance of its interventions, from output to outcomes, and seeking feedback from clients on the quality of its engagement. There has also been an increased commitment to learn from workplace tragedies and to work with employers to ensure that these learning's are shared and taken up by other relevant stakeholders.

Developing partnerships with industry and modelling work practice, ie “don’t do as we say, do as we do”, is also critical in furthering the IR and OHS agenda. The continuing challenge for the WG will be to support industry to build sustainable outcomes in IR and OHS to ensure safe and decent work for the long term future.

**Developing indicators for measuring the impact of decent work**

**Presented by:** Dr Eleftheria ehmann, General Director, Landesanstalt für Arbeitsschutz NRW, Düsseldorf, Germany.

Dr Lehmann began her presentation by discussing the need for measuring the impact of decent work. In modern societies work is the most relevant source of individual, corporate and community wealth. The quality of work is therefore a key element of policies on employment and social affairs. Reporting and monitoring are effective instruments in pinpointing priority fields in these policy areas. However, existing monitoring systems are focusing on deficits, e.g. unemployment, absenteeism, work accidents and occupational diseases. Probably due to the complexity of the interaction within the worker-work system, only a few indicators appropriate to describe the quality of work have been reported so far.

Dr Lehmann then talked about the ILO concept of decent work which relates to:

- Productivity and security;
- Respect for labour rights;
- Adequate income;
- Social protection; and
- Social freedom, including union freedom and collective bargaining.

There is evidence of a positive correlation between the design of work and work productivity. In exploring this concept further, Dr Lehmann discussed the results of a study that aimed to analyse productivity and social capital in companies. The study comprised a sample of five, mid-sized companies and involved 2287 participants. The study concentrated on the intangible aspects of work as opposed to easily quantifiable issues such as plant and equipment, noise, hazardous substances, etc.

The study mapped the strength of correlations found, with workplace culture (ie employee needs and values) identified as the most critical variable to measure in understanding the impact of decent work. The major results of the study included:

- Managers evaluate conditions more than employees;
- Younger and older employees had more health problems;
- Conditions were related to employer performance; and
- The concept of ‘good work’ related to three groups of indicators:
  - Resources
  - Occupational stressors / demands
  - Income security
Recommendations arising from the study included:

- Need to introduce standards for measurement;
- Need for good and reliable set of indicators;
- Better awareness of the impact of cultural differences; and
- Need to share knowledge and experience in measurement.

In closing, Dr Lehmann reinforced the notion that, “Traditional monitoring systems focus on deficits. Focussing on variables such as values, leadership, working conditions networking and health can provide a basis for a framework of monitoring the quality of work.”

Effective Leadership in managing major hazards

Presented by: Mr Kevin Myers, IALI Vice President and Director, Hazardous Installations Directorate, Health and Safety Executive, United Kingdom.

Mr Myers focussed his presentation on the need to learn lessons and improve process safety performance across major hazard industries. Mr. Myers gave some context to his argument providing background in relation to the number of onshore and offshore hazardous facilities existing under the Health and Safety Executive’s (HSE) control.

The HSE has dedicated 250 inspectors in support of controlling the risk of major hazard facilities. These inspectors are viewed as ‘change agents’ as a major part of their role is to influence outcomes in these hazardous industries.

With respect to managing high risk operations, employers need to relearn the lessons of the past, and become more sophisticated in how they monitor and measure their OSH performance. This follows the 20 year anniversary of the Piper Alpha disaster where it seems that some lessons are being forgotten and lost over a working lifetime. In support of this, the HSE has organised a conference for CEO’s of major hazard facilities to engender commitment and leadership in identifying better risk management practices and methods for the industry.

There is also a critical need to have multiple layers of protection to prevent disasters occurring – one risk control failure should not lead to the entire failure of the system. The HSE has developed a number of publications to support employers ascertain the level of safety performance in their organisation and the effectiveness of risk controls.

To prevent major incidents HSE is encouraging organisations to focus on process safety leadership built around 7 key elements:

1. Leadership which is demonstrated through actions from the top, so that all managers and staff know that process safety is taken seriously.
2. Process safety management taking place at all business levels. Process safety is a Company Board issue and requires clear accountabilities at all levels, together with effective measurement systems, including indicators of process safety performance.
3. Real and dynamic risk assessments to ensure that staff understand the links between hazards and the risks they create, and the control measures that are in place to control them.
4. Robust management of change approaches that capture real time plant and operational issues so that today’s plant and operating envelope are properly understood by those that ‘need to know it’.
5. Sustainability, with the business focussing on long term performance, so that investment and maintenance decisions in particular are focussed on the longer term, whilst also maintaining a responsible customer approach to any activities that are contracted out.
6. Well trained and competent people at all levels in the organisation and in sufficient numbers to address steady state operation, periods of change and emergency situations, and the infrastructure to ensure sustained competency.
7. A learning organisation that not only values and encourages learning from its own experiences, but looks beyond itself for lessons and avoids complacency.

In his concluding remark, Mr Myers stated, “Managing and controlling risks in major hazard facilities requires effective leadership, constant vigilance, understanding the control barriers in place and maintaining their effectiveness.”

**Results of the Washington State SHARP programme research into the effectiveness of inspector activities.**

**Presented by:** Mr Michael Foley, Senior Economist, SHARP Programme, Washington State Department of Labour and Industries, USA.

Mr Foley was unable to attend the IALI Conference. The following report was provided as an abstract in the IALI Conference Programme.

The Safety and Health Assessment and Research for Prevention (SHARP) programme of Washington State Department of Labour and Industries, USA, has conducted research in recent years on the effect of various compliance activities on workers compensation claims rates in Washington State. The ongoing study is examining the effectiveness of general deterrence vs specific deterrence to try and establish sound data on what influences sustained prevention improvements in workplaces.

The study measured reduction in hazards, decreased absenteeism, decreased turnover, increased requests for consultations, employer survivability and decreased claims incidence rate. It looked at the impact of compliance activities by size of employers and industry. The specific issue examined was whether there is any evidence for enforcement inspections that result in citations having a greater impact than that of enforcement inspection without citations?

First stage findings in 2007 indicated that:
- Enforcement visits among fixed-site industries is associated with a greater decline in claims;
- Smaller businesses show a greater drop in claims after an enforcement visit;
- The enforcement effect appears weaker among non-fixed site industries;
- As yet, there is no conclusive evidence for consultation visits;
- The effect of the citation visits was contrary to some expectations; and
- There was no decrease in business survival after enforcement visits.

**Occupational Safety and Health in Korea and the XVIII World Congress on Safety and Health at Work**

**Presented by:** Mr Sur, Han-Og, Director General, Korea Occupational Safety and Health Agency, Republic of Korea.

Mr Han-Og described the impact of workplace injury and illness in Korea. Each year, there are:
- 2,454 fatalities arising from 89,911 injuries; and
- 246 injuries per day.

Mr Han-Og described the value placed on people and their contribution to raising the profile and quality of Korean work and the economy.

Despite the uptake of modern world facilities such as computerisation, mechanisation and automation, risks will always be inherent in work due to the requirement for manipulation and management of work processes by people. Therefore, it is imperative that risks arising from work are identified and controlled.
Korea is looking at extending its reach in the international community through hosting the next World Congress for Health and Safety at Work in June/July 2008. The motto of the congress is “Safety and Health at Work: A Societal Responsibility”.

The main topics to be addressed in the Congress include:

1. Strategies and Programmes of Safety and Health for the Future;
2. Impact of changes of Working Conditions on Workers’ Protection’
3. New Challenges and Opportunities in Occupational Safety and Health; and

Key highlights arising from the Congress include:

- **Regional Meetings** – All meetings will be devoted to sharing experiences and promoting dialogue in the five regions of the world.

- **Symposia** – Contributing to the prevention of occupational accidents and the protection of workers’ health through the exchange of new technologies and information related to safety and health in the workplace.

- **International Film and Multimedia Festival** – Offers an overview of film and multimedia productions related to Safety and Health from all over the World.

- **Safety and Health Summit** – Selected world leaders in safety and health at work will be invited to reflect on OSH. At the Summit, “Seoul Declaration on Safety and Health at Work” will be announced.

Mr Han-Og invited all delegates to the Korean World Congress on Safety and Health at Work.

**Conclusions and Lessons from Session 4**

**General conclusions**

IALI members with scoreboard approaches can begin utilising their work to benchmark among themselves - with the aim of involving more participants as a global scoreboard develops in collaboration with the ILO.

**Lessons for Labour Inspection**

There is a vital need for labour inspectorates to develop a means of benchmarking their performance to ensure the effectiveness of their activities and the pursuit of continuous improvement.
Supporting Events

IALI and HWSA Executive Committee Meetings

The IALI Executive Committee Meeting and Heads of Workplace Safety Authorities (HWSA) in Australia and New Zealand Meeting preceded the IALI conference. Both meetings were held on Tuesday, 11 March 2008.

Welcome Reception, Conference Dinner and Industry Site Visits

The conference was held in the midst of Adelaide’s record breaking heatwave, however delegates enjoyed the finest South Australian hospitality culminating in a welcome reception hosted at the Adelaide Stamford Grand overlooking part of South Australia’s pristine coastline and then the official dinner at the spectacular and picturesque D’Arenberg Winery, at McLaren Vale to Adelaide’s south.

Site visits were also staged at the GM Holden auto assembly plant at Elizabeth, the Angas Zinc mine at Strathalbyn in the Adelaide Hills, the Defence Science and Technology Organisation complex at Edinburgh in Adelaide’s north, the Yalumba winery in the Barossa Valley and the award-winning Hospitality School of the Regency Institute of TAFE.
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