REGIONAL MEETING OF EUROPEAN CIS CENTRES

LONDON, 23-24 November 2010

1. Mr **Gabor Sandi**, CIS Coordinator, opened the meeting, welcoming the participants (See the List of Participants in Annex I).

2. Mr Sandi called for nominations for the position of Chairperson. Ms **Irja Laamanen** (Finland) was nominated Ms **Elly Goos** (Netherlands), seconded by Ms Barbara Szczepanowska (Poland). There were no other nominations and Ms Laamanen was elected by acclamation.

3. The Meeting proceeded to the adoption of the Agenda (Annex II). This was followed by a self-presentation of the participants, and of the institutions represented.

4. Mr Gabor Sandi began his presentation with a report on CIS activities and accomplishments since the 2009 Meeting. He used the topic of nanotechnology to demonstrate how the CIS search strategy and the coverage of CISDOC can lead to better/more focused results than the use of other information sources. He stressed that CISDOC is the most authoritative source of OSH information in the world. Ms Irja Laamanen pointed out that research could also be made in Google Scholar. Mr Gabor Sandi then proceeded to present the main CIS products.

5. A discussion followed on the number of staff working for CIS (Ms Irja Laamanen) and on the future of the position of the CIS Coordinator (Mr **Jonathan Gorvin**, IOSH, United Kingdom). Gabor Sandi explained that for now no person had been found for his replacement from within CIS. As regards web editing, recruitment was considered at a P2 level which may make it difficult to find someone with all the qualifications of systems analyst, maintenance of SafeWork/CIS website and management of hardware and software.

6. Ms **Annick Virot** (CIS Centres Coordinator, ILO) made a presentation on CIS Centres Network activities. The rationale for these activities is based on the ILO's 2003 Global Strategy on OSH, which stresses promotion, awareness and advocacy; on ILO instruments (standards and codes); on technical assistance and cooperation; on knowledge development/management; and on international collaboration. Ten new centres had been created in 2008. In 2009, 2 new centres were added to the network: one in Kuwait and IOSH in the UK. In 2010, three new Centres were added: MAPFRE in Spain, IRSST in Quebec and the Labour Inspectorate in Serbia. Ms Virot elaborated on the importance of developing activities at the regional level, since such Centres usually share a common language, similar challenges and organizational setups. She also suggested that the way forward would entail the development of global OSH information exchange systems, the assurance that centres have a well-designed website displaying the CIS logo, a dedicated electronic mailbox, the training of staff of the centres and the promotion of their sustainability. The involvement of ILO OSH specialists in the regions was also a very valuable idea. She suggested the involvement of centres in the development of core CIS products, such as

CISDOC and the *ILO Encyclopaedia of Occupational Health and Safety*. Ms Virot suggested that a background strategy should be elaborated on how to strengthen the CIS Centres network, as well as a possible technical cooperation proposal to implement such a strategy and to request funding for it. Questions were asked about the motivations to become an ILO-CIS Centre and participants agreed that people were keen to be part of an international network and to relate to the ILO, because these accorded them a high profile.

7. Ms **Begoña Casanueva** (Technical Specialist on OSH, CIS) made a presentation on the Questionnaire Survey sent out to CIS Centres and on the assessment of replies received. She stated that the survey had been sent in August 2010 to the 150 CIS Centres in English, French and Spanish. Replies were received from 40 Centres. The purpose of the survey was to update contact details; assess the value of CIS activities and products, including CIS relation and collaboration with CIS Centres; improve the effectiveness of CIS products; find out about national OSH information programmes. The five main questions of the survey were:

   - How do ILO-CIS products (CISDOC, *ILO Encyclopaedia* and ICSC) contribute to national OSH information programmes?
   - What could be done to improve the effectiveness of CIS products in national OSH information programmes?
   - What are the key national OSH information programmes/activities (including requests to share recent successful initiatives)?
   - What could ILO-CIS do in support of national OSH information programmes in the coming years?
   - What are the roles of CIS Centres in national advocacy activities such as the World Day on 28 April?

   The following is a compilation of the main answers.
   > On Question 1: useful as reference sources in OSH; a need to disseminate CIS products more effectively in order to have a stronger impact on national OSH programmes and to update CIS products regularly and make them user-friendly.

➢ On Question 2: a need was expressed to disseminate CIS products more and to update and modernize CIS products.

➢ On Question 3: items went from organizing training workshops, awareness campaigns, distributing safety awards, setting up a website, developing web online tools and courses, offering a press clipping service and publishing a newsletter, establishing a register for inspection checks, adopting national OSH legislation.

➢ On Question 4: replies varied from providing expertise and know-how, providing financial assistance, preparing a project to strengthen CIS Centres capacity, organizing regional workshops, improving communication channels among CIS Centres and having more influence on decision makers.

➢ On Question 5: activities ranged from awareness campaigns, distribution of prize awards, organizing shows and events to preparing articles and clippings in the press and other media, translating and distributing materials and preparing training manuals.

In summary of the survey results, Ms Begoña Casanueva found that CIS future activities should be focused on: technical and financial assistance, reinforcing of regional capacities, updating of ILO-CIS products, improving publicity (including webpage), training other CIS Centres, improving communication HQ-CIS Centres and regular contribution from Centres to ILO-CIS products.

8. Mr Gabor Sandi demonstrated the new input system into CISDOC. He provided background information on the history of CISDOC, including the virtual Bulletin which will probably be discontinued. A new feature called Browse and new search categories have been devised, mostly based on the classification scheme of the *ILO Encyclopaedia*. The new interface would have browsing categories and be much more efficient. At present, much of the updating of the CISDOC database is accomplished by an external Geneva-based company contracted for the purpose, and this situation is expected to continue. Selection of documents for abstracting and quality control will continue to be done by CIS.

9. A discussion ensued on Gabor Sandi's presentation. Ms Irja Laamanen asked if contributions by FIOH, for example, would be acknowledged if they included abstracts as well. Mr Sandi said that it was certainly possible to acknowledge such contributions in the new database that was being developed. Ms Begoña Casanueva encouraged CIS Centres to send links of good quality documents to include them in the database. She also stressed the need to maintain a balance of documents and languages. Mr. **Tim Tregenza** (EU-OSHA) provided information on the copyright policy in the European Union and Mr Jonathan Gorvin suggested that the origin of documents should be acknowledged. Ms Irja Laamanen asked if browsing categories are mandatory. Mr Gabor Sandi replied that they were not and he added that in order to cut costs, additional changes had been made to the database. In the case of documents in French and in other Romance languages, fully bilingual abstracts will continue to be created; when the documents are in other languages, the French abstract will be significantly reduced in the future. He also reminded participants that the Spanish national Centre in Madrid translates CISDOC abstracts into Spanish.

10. Ms **Barbara Szczepanowska** (Poland) stated that she would send links to CIS and that it would be up to CIS to make a final selection. Ms Casanueva said that documents that did not comply with CIS's selection criteria would not be included in the database. She said that it was not CIS's role to ensure uncritical promotion of documents produced at the national level. On what is relevant, she elaborated on the CIS criteria of novelty and relevance and said that the abstractors' manual that had been distributed to potential abstractors needed to be updated. Some subject areas, such as military activities and animal experiments, were simply excluded. Mr Gabor Sandi insisted on the need to update LEGOSH and on the inclusion of training materials. Ms **Sheila Pantry** (United Kingdom) asked if journals were abstracted cover to cover. Industries such as coalmining were relevant because of the number of accidents. Ms Irja Laamanen asked how much overlap there was with PubMed.

11. Mr **Goran Vranic** (Republika Srpska) stated that CIS Centres at the national level should take action in their local languages and translate documents. He further suggested that CIS Centres should be rated for their contributions to the CIS network and awarded prizes at an award ceremony.

12. Ms Irja Laamanen asked how impact at the national level was assessed. Mr Goran Vranic said that impact is difficult to assess and Ms Elly Goos wondered if we assess which records are the most used. Mr Gabor Sandi insisted on the need to increase the number of records added to the database. He also reminded participants that bibliographies could be made using the database and mailed to users. He made a demonstration of this capability of the database. He also said that it may be possible with the new approach to add large sets of records to the database without direct access to the original texts: for example, he had about 500 records related to OSH theses in Brazil that had been kindly given to CIS by Fundacentro (CIS's Brazilian National Centre). With relatively little work, these records could be added to CISDOC, with a special note suggesting that people interested in the full text should contact Fundacentro for a copy of the original. To the question asked by Ms Elly Goos on when the new database would go live, Mr Gabor Sandi hoped that it would be at the beginning of 2011. Ms Begoña Casanueva urged again the Centres to send 10 documents per month with weblinks and to prepare abstracts.

Introduction of New Centres and highlights of new developments in Centres

13. A presentation was then made by Ms Irja Laamanen on the Cochrane project by FIOH. Work had started in 2010 with four persons and the Cochrane database now contains 1,800 records. It covers high quality research on both safety and health, as well as on construction safety and agriculture injuries. It also publishes the Cochrane Newsletter: www.osh.cochrane.org

14. Mr Goran Vranic made a presentation on the Labour Inspectorate of the Republika Srpska (a constituent of Bosnia-Herzegovina) in Banja Luka. He stressed the importance of CIS Centres Meetings and suggested that a meeting in

the coming years should be organized in the Republika Srpska. The Labour Inspectorate has 300 inspectors and 300 controllers at the municipal level. One of the strategic goals is to increase social discipline in enterprises. A regional conference has already been organized, an inspection management system is fully implemented, and a checklist exists on computer, as well as training courses and workshop. The Inspectorate encourages enterprises to do a self-assessment and send it to the Inspectorate. By doing so, enterprises learn more effectively about their obligations. The Centre has translated a lot of documents into Serbian: the Seoul Declaration, the Report of the CIS Centres Meeting, as well as the table of contents of the *ILO Encyclopaedia of Health and Safety*. It also organizes awareness campaigns. It has a fully operational training Centre for inspectors (500 seats, with all modern facilities), which was the first training Centre in Bosnia-Herzegovina. He showed how enterprises could be made aware of their legal obligations by checking the Inspectorate's website: www.inspektorat.vladars.net/registrar

15. A presentation followed by Mr Tim Tregenza on the project of an OSH Wiki site to be developed as a platform for the European OSH community to share content. The Bilbao Agency works on the project in conjunction with FIOH. It will start this year with the financial assistance of the European Union. OSH experts will be asked to add or contribute to the system. Seeding has already started and the OSH wiki will be complementary to the *ILO OSH Encyclopaedia*.

16. Mr Jonathan Gorvin made a presentation on IOSH, more specifically on the Occupational Health Toolkit available at www.ohtoolkit.co.uk. In addition, he mentioned the website of the Middle East Branch www.iosh.co.uk/branches/middle_east.aspx and suggested to store all presentations done on the website as a good way to share information.

17. Ms Sheila Pantry (Editor of the CIS Newsletter) made a presentation on OSH databases in the world. She stated that there are a lot of challenges for information providers and that people look for quality data. There are many sources of information and no-one can depend on one source of information only. The CIS network is important and is at the core of OSH information activities in

the world. Some OSH institutions have recently closed down (Italy, Sweden), while others have had to curtail their activities drastically (e.g. HSE is Great Britain). There are gaps in the coverage of OSH information and the HSE for example misses out on many publications. E-learning tools and toolboxes are also important.

18. In the absence of the CIS Centre for Turkey, Ms Annick Virot gave an update on the next World Congress to be held on 11-15 September, 2011, at the Haliç Congress Centre in Istanbul, Turkey. The theme of the World Congress was: **Building a culture of prevention for a healthy and safe future.** The Call for papers was now online. People interested in participating in a symposium, presenting a poster or speaking in the Speakers' Corner could submit an application (before 31 January 2011) at www.safety2011turkey.org. As regards the 2011 World Day on OSH, she informed participants of the theme: **OSH Management System: A tool for continual improvement**. Preparations have started and a brochure as well as promotional products will be available on line next year at www.ilo.org/safeday.

19. Discussions followed on future OSH information and CIS activities: Reflecting the Recommendations of the 2008 London Meeting and of the 2010 Beijing Meeting:

   a) *The logo and the name CIS*
      Participants insisted on the fact that the acronym CIS is ambiguous (Commonwealth of Independent States, Contents Integration System, etc) and that the name does not reflect what CIS really does. Many suggested that a new name should be found. Ms Begoña Casanueva proposed a name such as ILO-CIS or ILO-OSH Information, which would make it clear that CIS is a reliable global OSH information network. It is finally suggested to rebrand CIS name and logo, putting emphasis on ILO-OSH information.

b) *Where is CIS as an entity going*?

"It is essential that CIS has clear identified aims and objectives that can encourage, inspire and motivate CIS Centres wherever they are in the world". CIS has three core products: the CISDOC database, the *Encyclopaedia* and the ICSC cards. In addition, it has the network of Centres and a webpage. It promotes conventions and Codes of Practice. Other departments in the ILO also deal with OSH issues such as SECTOR which just adopted a Code of Practice on agriculture available on the Internet at: http://www.ilo.org/public/english/dialogue/sector/techmeet/mesha10/draftcode.pdf. Ms Irja Laamanen commented that the name of the institution should fix in people's minds identified aims and objectives.

c) *The CIS Network*

The CIS Centres Network is not effective in its present format. CIS must not lose its identity, but it needs to meet the requirements of future users who have different skills from previous ones. Nowadays users normally have a working knowledge of English and of the use of computerized information and understand the benefits of reliable, authoritative information that can be adapted to the needs of most countries. Ms Sheila Pantry suggested that CIS should find out from all its Centres if they are still interested in being a Centre. Many participants agreed that active Centres should be retained and inactive Centres be dropped, even if this led to a lower number of Centres in the network. IOSH suggested that we should not be afraid to lose some Centres, that all Centres be required to file an annual report which could then be filed on the CIS website. He further suggested that stringent criteria be set for entry and that acceptance in the network should be subject to revision. Mr Goran Vranic was in favour of more regional meetings; he further recommended that regional CIS Centres should be set up, on a rotating basis. Many institutions or organizations active in OSH matters are not in the CIS network, although they offer quality information and training. They should be linked to the CIS wider network and recognized as such. Ms Laamanen wondered about the opportunity to include private companies in the network as sponsors. Mr Gabor Sandi also noted that major institutions are not part of the network such as OSHA in the USA, WorkSafe BC in Canada (and many other

workers' compensation boards worldwide) and RoSPA (8,000 members) in the UK. OSH departments in universities could also be brought on board.

d) *Eliminate the distinction between National and Collaborating Centres*
Ms Begoña Casanueva recalled that among the 150 Centres, a large number were not active. We should balance the deleting of inactive Centres by adding new institutions. She also suggested that we should create an active network of OSH institutions. She further suggested that the distinction between National and Collaborating Centres should be eliminated since it is a source of confusion for many. Inactive Centres should also be reminded of the requirements of being a CIS Centre and given the opportunity to improve or relinquish the title. The whole network may be tarnished by poor or not performing centres. This question needs to be revisited because it has implications with CISDOCTEXT for example.

e) *Dissociate meetings from the World Congress*
It had been strongly recommended at the Regional Meeting of European Centres in 2008 that the holding of the CIS Annual General Meeting alongside the World Congress should be discontinued. Opinions diverged on this. Some participants still thought that the World Congress is an important event for OSH experts, including information specialists and that there is a lot to learn in such fora. The next CIS meeting has already been fixed to take place in Istanbul on 11 September 2011 in the Haliç Congress Centre, just before the World Congress. Participants were also reminded that WHO Collaborative Centres meet only once every three years. CIS Centres meetings should last for at least two days, and include a training component as well as guest speakers to make them more interesting and enriching.

f) *CIS Network needs a very dynamic Plan of Work (PoW)*
It was agreed that the CIS Network needs a very dynamic Plan of Work to which all members can adhere. There should also be a Steering Committee that can be in touch on a regular basis to help keep the *PoW* on track and assist when there are problems. It was agreed that CIS needs a Vision, a dynamic *PoW* and a steering Committee. A discussion ensued on the setting

up of a steering committee. Mr Seiji Machida favoured the creation of a working group with a plan of action and terms of reference. A one-page note should be prepared and shared with other members of the global network. Issues should be raised and dealt with globally. It was finally decided that four people would be part of the working group and would recommend changes to the CIS network: Ms Irja Laamanen, Mr Goran Vranic, Mr Jonathan Gorvin and Ms Sheila Pantry. Mr Jonathan Gorvin also suggested to organize webinars and to increase campaigning and publicity.

g)   *Training and twinning*

Ms Sheila Pantry recalled her personal experience at HSE. *Guidelines* were used to set up an information centre. These *Guidelines* needed to be revised to train individual centres. There is also a need to identify countries willing to train Centres (for example Finland trained the contact person of the CIS Centre in Korea). Going out to the countries and help them set up a CIS Centre was an alternative mentioned, but Mr Gabor Sandi questioned the issue of financing. The British Council used to provide funds. Ms Irja Laamanen mentioned having trained people from Korea, Malaysia and Uganda. It was a fruitful and rewarding experience for both FIOH and trainees. She added that training visits were also organized to Estonia and Sweden. Mr Seiji Machida enquired about the *Guidelines*, adding that many countries opened a CIS Centre which was not sustainable. Ms Sheila Pantry mentioned that a guide was developed for ARLAC (African Regional Labour Administration Centre) in Harare, Zimbabwe and that it was also a useful element in the Asia-Pacific project. It was agreed that Ms Sheila Pantry would update the document. Ms Elly Goos mentioned that twinning may be a problem nowadays because of current budgetary constraints. On training and e-training, it was suggested to use webinars and podcasting as IOSH does. Ms Barbara Barbukova (Bulgaria) explained that CCOHS in Canada provides a lot of free very useful training material.

h) The CIS Web

The issue was raised again to set up a discussion forum considered by many as a good idea. Ms Barbara Szczepanowska stated that she would need good quality logos for CIS and SafeWork, as well as good pictures. Among the other issues raised came the question of collecting names of OSH and training institutions/providers. A listing of OSH institutions/contact names should be put on the CIS webpage.

As an alternative, Mr Seiji Machida suggested to include a list of OSH profiles. Concerning the *ILO OSH Encyclopaedia*, it is reminded to have a special page to promote it and provide news of the progress on a regular basis. Press releases for the *Encyclopaedia* are cited as an example to promote both CIS and its products.

i) CIS products

Mr Gabor Sandi indicated that the Virtual Bulletin was going to be discontinued, that LEGOSH would be maintained and that the Thesaurus needed a major conceptual redoing. Both Ms Irja Laamanen and Ms Barbara Szczepanowska suggested that the Encyclopaedia collect all synonyms of a given concept, as it was a useful tool and needed to be kept up-to-date. The Glossary, according to Mr Gabor Sandi, also needed expanding, but resources for this were lacking.

20. Mr **Seiji Machida**, SafeWork Director, made a presentation on SafeWork activities. He recalled the heavy toll that workers pay in the workplace (an estimated 2.3 million deaths and 337 million injuries every year, representing a loss of 4% of the global gross domestic product). He presented national OSH systems and recent ILO conventions related to OSH, with the main emphasis on Convention 187. He listed the core elements of the Convention, including national OSH systems and their inclusion of promotion and advocacy, legislation, inspection and knowledge support services. He said that a number of OSH conventions were poorly ratified and cited the example of European Union (EU) countries which do not ratify ILO conventions although they satisfy the requirements of the EU which are similar to those of the conventions. He added that Convention 187 is similar to the European

strategy on OSH. Mr Machida surveyed some ideas for the role of national OSH information centres, encouraging them to support the following: creating a safety culture, compliance with OSH legislation, enterprise-level OSH measures, OSH data collection mechanisms, OSH training/self-learning, enquiry services and the dissemination of information through the Internet. Each country should have a strategic approach on OSH and should improve its OSH systems and performance. The emphasis today was on employment and financial constraints. He went over the main pillars of the Convention: policies, systems, programmes and profiles. The national programme is different for each country. In addition, there is a need for advocacy, promotional arrangements and knowledge support services (which is what CIS falls under). The programme should be sustainable and the elements of the system should interact. He also recalled that tripartism is a key feature of the ILO instruments. Referring to national OSH systems, he said that some systems elements may be weak. There is a need to set priorities and to evaluate weaknesses on a systematic basis. Regarding OSH information and training, there is room for improvement, and this can be accomplished by mobilizing institutions.

There are many possible arrangements to improve national OSH performance and to illustrate this, he cited the example of Thailand. First, 10,000 specialists were trained by governmental institutions thanks to a three month course. Ten years later, more training was done and with a two-day course, 100,000 specialists were additionally trained.

On the roles of the OSH information centre, Mr Machida suggested to include good practice at the national and enterprise level, OSH data on accidents and diseases and to promote a safety culture. Ms Sheila Pantry suggested that promotion and publicity are good hooks to keep people aware and that we should send continuous reminders.

21. A discussion ensued on the impact of the application of Conventions. Mr Seiji Machida recalled the General Survey on C. 155 presented at the International Labour Conference in June 2009 available at:
http://www.ilo.org/wcmsp5/groups/public/---ed_norm/---relconf/documents/meetingdocument/wcms_103485.pdf
This survey identified difficulties in the application of conventions. When a country has ratified a convention, the government must send a report periodically. After

ratification, some countries may develop rules and regulations, as well as training programmes. It is however difficult to assess the impact of the ratification of standards. There is usually more debate on the issue when the country has ratified a convention. Trade Unions play the role of monitoring agencies, but it remains globally difficult to assess the economic impact of ratified conventions. Ms Irja Laamanen made an analogy with the smoking ban impact. It is difficult to assess its real impact. Ratification of conventions has led to an increase in the reporting of accidents, but many countries are reluctant to show poor results. What is the impact of a convention or a campaign? One thing we can do is to learn from national experience.

22. Ms Sheila Pantry explained that she had created a database on major accidents. MIDHAS used to have a collection of major accidents, but is no longer being updated. Many accidents are underreported. For example, in the United Kingdom, traffic accidents, even when work-related, are not always reported – yet 20-25% of work-related accidents are linked to traffic. A comparison is needed between countries. What is important is to get reliable data and a good data system.

23. Mr Goran Vranic spoke about the information management system in the Republika Srpska, the development of a modern training Centre in Banja Luka and the expansion of labour inspection through this prevention function. Mr Seiji Machida stressed that inspectors can do promotion and it is up to the country to find the best mechanism through institutions, governments or non-governmental institutions. Expanding the role of inspectors is good and government plays a role at the start, but other partners should also be mobilized. He reiterated the difference between OSH inspection and labour inspection, the latter of which is in charge of inspection for the correct payment of wages and the application of rules related to working hours and the like. The UK inspection system is specialized in OSH. Ms Elly Goos stated that in her country people complained about excessive inspection. Mr Seiji Machida concluded that cooperation is needed between the different functions and that it is up to the employer to show that his/her organization is properly managed.

24. Mr Gabor Sandi then made a presentation on the status of the *Encyclopaedia*. He recalled that the 4th edition was published in the 1990s and was outdated in many instances. He also explained that Prof. Jeanne Stellman, Editor-in-Chief of the 4th edition, would be working on an online version of the publication. She would also develop a plan for the long-term sustainability of the project. New features would be added to the final version and the prototype of the chapter on cancer was demonstrated. A powerpoint presentation on the latest developments in the Encyclopaedia project, just received from Prof. Stellman, was also made.

25. A general discussion ensued on various subjects. Another suggestion made by Mr. Seiji Machida was to collect, as good practice, OSH posters and make them available through a database. It was envisaged that CIOP in Poland could coordinate such a project. Ms Sheila Pantry wanted to know if the monthly *CIS Newsletter* that she publishes is of any use. She reminded that the Newsletter has about 20 pages and is distributed to some 200 members. Ms **Barbara Barbukova** (Bulgaria) replied that she uses the *CIS Newsletter* to prepare the OSH Newsletter in Bulgaria. Ms Barbara Szczepanowska stated that she sends it to a further 200 people in Poland. It was concluded that it remained a good means of communication between members of the CIS Centres network and it was a tool showing the strength of the network. What was more, it was a great promotion vehicle delivered free of charge.

26. Mr Seiji Machida concluded that there are obvious problems with the CIS Centres Network. Some Centres are inactive and Centres overall have different capacities. It is a big challenge to maintain the network active. He would like to impose stricter criteria along the model of WHO Collaborative Centres. He regretted that Centres do not provide an annual report on their activities. Ms Barbara Szczepanowska considered that this is a fantastic network with some 150 Centres. She would however prefer quality to quantity. Mr Machida said that it would be good to define criteria for the Centres and to have an efficient and effective network that can have a real impact on the OSH situation. Members of the network should also ask themselves what they want to achieve and how they can tell whether they have any impact. For this, indicators are needed to show that needs are met. There is also a trend to integrate institutions (Japan, Italy, Canada (IAPA)). A mechanism of

feedback should be developed. He asked the participants to provide feedback on the impact of their activities.

27. Ms Sheila Pantry asked if CIS has a future. Mr Seiji Machida replied that CIS has a strong basis, but at the same time that it faces many challenges. Employers and Workers provide good robust support. However, we must be able to demonstrate our impact and do a cost/benefit analysis. The ILO may face further financial difficulties in the future, and there are trends to cutbacks. Nevertheless, technical people remain important. We have to prove that our activities are effective. Many important centres, such as HSE in the UK, BAuA in Germany, INRS in France, SUVA in Switzerland, NIOSH in the US and CCOHS in Canada, do not seem to attend CIS meetings. By the next meeting, we should define some criteria to assess the impact of our information activities. We must also never lose sight of the fact that our main aim is to reduce the negative human and economic impact of occupational accidents and diseases.

28. The Meeting was adjourned.

ANNEXES*

I   List of participants

II   Presentation on the Beijing Meeting and on CIS activities since 2009 (Gábor Sándi)

III   Presentation on the CIS Centres Network activities (Annick Virot)

IV   Presentation on answers to the Questionnaire Survey (Begoña Casanueva)

V   Presentation on plan for future CIS action (Begoña Casanueva)

VI   Presentation on the new input system into CISDOC (Gábor Sándi)

VII   Presentation on the future of OSH information and CIS activities (Gábor Sándi)

VIII   Presentation on new developments – Republic of Srpska Inspectorate (Slavko Subotic and Goran Vranic)

IX   Presentation on SafeWork activities (Seiji Machida)

* All these items are available on the Internet