



Fourth item on the agenda: Human resources training and development – Revision of the Human Resources Development Recommendation, 1975 (No. 150)
(first discussion)

Report of the Committee on Human Resources

1. The 91st Session of the International Labour Conference set up the Committee on Human Resources at its first sitting on 3 June 2003. The Committee was originally composed of 172 members (68 Government members, 51 Employer members and 53 Worker members). To achieve equality of voting strength, each Government member entitled to vote was allotted 159 votes, each Employer member 212 votes and each Worker member 204 votes. The composition of the Committee was modified several times during the session and the number of votes attributed to each member was adjusted accordingly.¹

2. The Committee elected its Officers as follows:

Chairperson: Mr. J. Chetwin (Government member, New Zealand).

Vice-Chairpersons: Mr. A.J.E.G. Renique (Employer member, the Netherlands) and Mrs. H. Yacob (Worker member, Singapore).

Reporter: Mrs. A.V. Allones (Government member, Philippines)

¹ The modifications were as follows:

- (a) 4 June: 207 members (90 Government members entitled to vote with 341 votes each, 55 Employer members with 558 votes each and 62 Worker members with 495 votes each);
- (b) 5 June: 223 members (96 Government members entitled to vote with 667 votes each, 58 Employer members with 1,104 votes each and 69 Worker members with 928 votes each);
- (c) 6 June: 207 members (98 Government members entitled to vote with 1,479 votes each, 51 Employer members with 2,842 votes each and 58 Worker members with 2,499 votes each);
- (d) 9 June: 199 members (100 Government members entitled to vote with 1,219 votes each, 46 Employer members with 2,650 votes each and 53 Worker members with 2,300 votes each);
- (e) 10 June: 186 members (101 Government members entitled to vote with 1,716 votes each, 33 Employer members with 5,252 votes each and 52 Worker members with 3,333 votes each);
- (f) 11 June: 180 members (101 Government members entitled to vote with 1,504 votes each, 32 Employer members with 4,747 votes each and 47 Worker members with 3,232 votes each);
- (g) 12 June: 156 members (102 Government members entitled to vote with 182 votes each, 28 Employer members with 663 votes each and 26 Worker members with 714 votes each);
- (h) 16 June: 154 members (102 Government members entitled to vote with 322 votes each, 28 Employer members with 1,173 votes each and 23 Worker members with 1,428 votes each).

-
3. At its eighth sitting, the Committee appointed a Drafting Committee composed of the following members: Ms. N. Kocherhans (Government member, Switzerland), Mr. J.E.G. Renique (Employer member, the Netherlands), Mrs. H. Yacob (Worker member, Singapore) and the Reporter of the Committee, Mrs. A.V. Allones (Government member, Philippines).
 4. The Committee had before it Reports IV(1) and IV(2) prepared by the Office for a first discussion of the fourth item on the agenda of the Conference: Human resources training and development.
 5. The Committee held 15 sittings.

Introduction

6. In his opening remarks, the Chairperson provided the background to the discussion. Based on the *Conclusions concerning human resources training and development*, adopted by the International Labour Conference at its 88th Session (2000), the Governing Body in March 2001 decided to include in the agenda of the current session of the International Labour Conference a first discussion of an item on human resources training and development, with a view to adopting a revised standard in 2004. The main ILO instruments in the area of human resources training and development are the Human Resources Development Convention, 1975 (No. 142) and Recommendation (No. 150). These instruments reflected the economic and social conditions of a previous period. The Governing Body considered that Convention No. 142 remained a valid blueprint to guide countries in developing their training policies and systems. Recommendation No. 150, on the other hand, was considered to have lost much of its relevance, hence the need for a more dynamic instrument which could be used by member States and the social partners in formulating and implementing human resources development (HRD) policies.
7. The Chairperson, together with the Vice-Chairpersons, invited the Committee to stand for a moment of silence in tribute to Pekka Aro, the former Director of the InFocus Programme on Skills, Knowledge and Employability, who recently passed away under tragic circumstances. Pekka, who was to have been the representative of the Secretary-General to this Committee, was remembered for his depth of insight on matters affecting people's working lives, his energy and innovation, his impatience with bureaucracy, and his unfailing good humour.
8. The representative of the Secretary-General recalled that the member States and the social partners had proposed that the ILO prepare a new Recommendation to reflect new approaches to training. The ILO recognized that human resources development and improved working conditions were central to its mandate. This was most recently underscored by the Global Employment Agenda of the ILO which formed part of the Organization's broader commitment to promote decent work. This agenda identified the challenges to be addressed, especially increases in labour productivity, thereby setting the scene for faster growth, better employment outcomes and decent work. The positive link between knowledge, skills and productivity was central to the application of new technologies, increased employability and improved labour markets. Furthermore, human resources training and development were essential elements for enterprises, workers and countries to take full advantage of the opportunities and rise to the challenges of globalization. Enterprises benefited from increased productivity and depended on a skilled workforce for success and even survival. Workers gained in employability, whereas certain categories – youth and women for example – depended on education and training to gain access to the labour market and/or reduce poverty. In addition to growing competition, a

trend of skills intensification was seen in many sectors, requiring countries to make HRD a centrepiece of their economic growth and social development policies. The trend was supported by large and sustained investments in education and training. Over and above any economic considerations, education and training had contributed to wider benefits to society: equity, justice, gender equality, non-discrimination, social responsibility and participation of all in economic and social life. To effectively promote such policies, human resources training and development must form an integral part of comprehensive economic labour market and social programmes.

9. The Office had prepared Report IV(1), which analysed laws, policies and practices in the human resources training and development area in a wide range of member countries. The report, accompanied by a questionnaire, was communicated to the governments of member States in February 2002. Report IV(2) presented the replies of the governments of 96 member States and some 40 employers' and 30 workers' organizations and included the proposed Conclusions, intended to serve as a basis for discussions.
10. The Employer Vice-Chairperson congratulated the Office on reflecting the *Conclusions on human resources training and development* into Report IV(2). He noted that human resources development (HRD) policy, at both the national and company levels, must be seen in a wider context, complementing other economic and social policies as well as company strategies and the needs of employees. He supported the broad definition of human resources development used in the proposed Conclusions, which covered basic education and training, continued throughout one's career and included workplace learning, competency assessment and personal coaching. Remarking on the shift in emphasis between the adoption of Human Resources Development Recommendation, 1975 (No. 150) and the 2000 discussion in the International Labour Conference, the Employer Vice-Chairperson acknowledged that governments should take primary responsibility for basic education and pre-vocational training, but noted that human resources development was also essential for enterprises and knowledge economies in general. Human resources development was seen as vital to individuals throughout their lives, enhancing employability, job security and career development. Therefore, investment in HRD should be the shared responsibility of all three groups – governments, enterprises and individuals – as expressed in *The Cologne Charter: Aims and Ambitions for Lifelong Learning (1999)*.
11. The Employer Vice-Chairperson listed a number of key points of the proposed Conclusions that should be preserved. There was a clear consensus that the instrument must be more dynamic and applicable, formulating principles and policies rather than details. HRD policies must strike a balance between economic and social development. There must be shared, but different, responsibilities of individuals, enterprises and governments in implementing lifelong learning and ensuring employability. The right to education and training, particularly, making available quality initial education and wide access to continuing training should be preserved. The instrument should likewise stress the value and importance of assessment and recognition of informal learning.
12. In conclusion, some points of the proposed Conclusions needed to be strengthened and/or clarified. The roles of governments and the social partners were not always clear. The role of government in initial education, pre-employment vocational training and higher education was evident, but the responsibilities of individuals and enterprises in further training were not. Further training and development were the responsibility of the social partners and individual employers and employees. Governments could support and provide incentives to further training, but should not interfere in the market for further training and never at the enterprise level. A "bridge" between initial and further training was needed, including learning how to learn and the acquisition of information and communications

technology (ICT) skills. Initial training and lifelong learning should also focus on motivating and training for entrepreneurship. Effective monitoring of labour market trends and vocational guidance were seen as tools to facilitate the adaptation of the education system to the needs of the labour market. Individuals had a responsibility to balance their right to education with their duty to invest in their own future.

- 13.** The Worker Vice-Chairperson expressed appreciation of the work of the late Pekka Aro and expressed condolences to his family and the Office. She considered that the *Conclusions concerning human resources training and development*, adopted at the 88th Session of the International Labour Conference in 2000, provided a sound basis for discussion. It was noted that despite vast improvements in science and technology as the twenty-first century began, unemployment, poverty and social exclusion had increased; the ILO estimated that 180 million people were unemployed in 2002. Globalization, technological change and restructuring of work had generated increasing demands for educated and skilled people. People, not machines or systems, contributed to prosperity. Investing in people was the critical factor in determining whether enterprises and countries were able to compete effectively; education and training costs were investments for economic survival, human dignity and decent living standards. As an example, the Skills Development Fund of Singapore provided incentives for small and medium-sized enterprises, which were often the most reluctant to train. Most large companies invested more than the statutory one per cent of payroll, up to 4 per cent.
- 14.** Stressing the importance of sustainable development with people at the centre of such development created a challenge for the work of the Committee to ensure that every individual had an equal chance to participate in education, training and lifelong learning. The discussions should begin with the agreed paragraph 8 of the *Conclusions on human resources training and development*, recognizing that education and training are a right for all to be ensured by governments in cooperation with the social partners. This was consistent with the Global Employment Agenda which emphasized that employability as a consequence of improved knowledge and skills was a prerequisite to promote full employment, economic development and social justice. It was important to reaffirm the right to education and training and to free, universal, quality, public education for all, as explicitly endorsed in 2000.
- 15.** A number of obstacles and barriers to training and lifelong learning would need to be addressed in the discussions, with a view to recommending policies and programmes which would give special attention to certain groups such as women, single parents of both sexes, part-time workers, elderly workers with only a basic education or outdated vocational skills and migrants working on fixed-term contracts. Time off or paid leave for training were important considerations in facing these challenges. Moreover, the proposed new instrument should draw upon training and qualification frameworks to help training/grading/wage links at the national, regional and international level. Employability required a system that recognized skill transfer from job-to-job and across enterprises and sectors. Broad and transferable skills were preferred to those based only on the short-term needs of an employer as the latter impeded employability.
- 16.** Additional discussion points that the Committee should address included:

 - the need of developing countries to create enabling environments conducive to universal access to ICT;
 - the fight against child labour and the respect of universally accepted rights of children to education;

-
- the importance of linking comprehensive economic, labour market and social policies, labour market information systems, employment counselling, and vocational guidance to timely labour market information;
 - the importance of appropriate fiscal policies, social security and collective bargaining as a means to distribute economic gains on an equitable basis and as a basic incentive for training investments;
 - the need for social dialogue and partnerships to develop a national training framework and policy through power-sharing arrangements among governments and the social partners. Trade union training and the promotion of freedom of association should be recognized and reinforced;
 - development of a new culture of lifelong learning that went beyond employment related issues to stress the importance of personal development and fulfilment and the promotion of equal opportunity, active citizenship and rights.

17. In conclusion, the ILO's Declaration of Philadelphia stated that labour was not a commodity, which posed a question to all: how far had we progressed since that Declaration was adopted? Judging by the employment and poverty figures, there was a long way to go. A new culture of lifelong learning must be established, related not only to employment concerns, but equally to personal development and fulfilment.

18. The Government member of New Zealand supported the adoption of a revised Recommendation on learning and training. Her Government recognized employability, lifelong learning and adaptability to change as critical components of a high performance knowledge society. The Government was committed to supporting and enhancing learning and training for work, essential to New Zealand's continued growth and innovation, and consistent with high quality working lives for all citizens. The social partners and civil society were crucial to human resources development. Recognizing the importance of integrating training and employment strategies with workers' and enterprise needs, the country's training and tertiary education policies were linked to employment strategies for decent work. The overall aim of enabling people to develop their full potential required that access to and provision of basic education: should be effective for all individuals and groups – including women, people with disabilities and ethnic communities; should develop generic, foundation skills; and should ensure that workers were equipped to take advantage of enterprise opportunities. A revised Recommendation should provide guidance on developing regulatory and policy frameworks. To be meaningful, it should be based on the following principles: (1) practicality, with universally accepted core values; (2) a focus on outcomes to achieve underlying principles regardless of countries' socio-economic levels; and (3) broad application. The proposed Conclusions met those criteria in a constantly changing labour market.

19. The Government member of Cuba insisted that the key issue was human resources development for individual self-fulfilment. The right to education was inscribed in the Cuban Constitution, it was a fundamental responsibility of the Government and it was free. Beginning with the 1959 literacy campaign through to the emphasis nowadays on higher education and teacher training, the Government sought to realize this right for all by extending coverage: to rural areas with an emphasis on employability; to handicapped people; and to older and younger workers facing difficulties accessing employment. The Government had invested heavily to equip schools with modern technologies and to encourage their use. An education system should be coherent and results-oriented, but above all responsive to human needs. To those ends, government policy formulation and establishment of the conditions for success were necessary, including coordination of training, funding and regulation. Employers and workers had a role to play in encouraging

the political will to attain success. Her Government supported the adoption of a new Recommendation.

- 20.** The Government member of Canada agreed that a new, dynamic instrument, which provided guidance in achieving sustainable economic growth, better job opportunities, improved employability and adaptability and more inclusive workplaces was needed. A shorter instrument was preferred, one which focused on the roles and responsibilities of all key players – governments, training providers, employers and their associations, unions and individual workers. The Government of Canada acknowledged the ever-increasing demand for a well-educated and skilled workforce, and to this end, Canadian governmental jurisdictions from local to national levels were working together with the social partners as well as training providers, employers and individuals. His Government would like the following points reflected in the proposed Conclusions: the need for a shorter instrument focusing on roles and responsibilities; in terms of the right to education, respect for the principle of shared responsibility for post-secondary education and training in the context of labour market trends and resource availability; the avoidance of guidelines on the recognition and certification of skills which were difficult to apply, in favour of a transparent mechanism to accredit prior learning and experience across jurisdictions to which the ILO could contribute through dissemination of information on best practices; and recognition of the full inclusion of people with special needs in training, as determined nationally. The proposed Conclusions rightly put human resources at the core of ILO activities and provided a solid basis for further discussion.
- 21.** The Government member of Japan recognized the importance of a new Recommendation on HRD, which should better reflect the new reality of globalization and advances in information and communication technologies (ICT). In his country, in addition to enterprise-led initiatives, it was increasingly important to create an environment in which employees identified and planned their own career development, taking initiatives according to their specific life and career goals. The Recommendation should be as flexible as possible.
- 22.** The Government member of Egypt noted that her country was in favour of a new Recommendation on HRD which would take into account the changes in society and in the international community, as well as the new world realities. She pointed out that the new Recommendation should be a useful tool in promoting employment. Within this broader objective, key issues included the development of suitable skills for the labour market situation and provision of access to various types of education and training by governments. Developed countries could assist developing countries in meeting the challenges.
- 23.** The Government member of Greece, speaking on behalf of the Government members of the Committee Member States of the European Union (EU), emphasized the need for economies to grow in the face of economic and political uncertainties, by means of sound macroeconomic and structural reforms. He recalled that, at the Lisbon meeting in 2000, the EU had set itself the strategic goal of building a competitive and dynamic knowledge-based economy, capable of sustainable economic growth with more and better jobs and greater social cohesion. To accomplish this, EU Member States had made a commitment to a programme of reforms in labour, capital and product markets, with considerable progress already made – 5 million new jobs had been created since the Lisbon meeting, (500,000 in 2002) despite a difficult economic climate. His Government and the EU as a whole, most recently, via decisions of the 2003 European Council, continued to strive to reach the Lisbon objectives by means of employment policies emphasizing full employment, quality and productivity at work, and social cohesion and inclusion. In the future, accelerated economic, social and demographic change, technological developments,

new managerial and business practices, globalization and the forthcoming enlargement of the EU must be addressed. Specific guidelines to deal with these developments would take account of the following priorities:

- active and preventive measures for the unemployed and inactive;
- job creation and entrepreneurship;
- addressing change and promoting labour market adaptability and mobility;
- promoting human capital development and lifelong learning;
- increases in the labour supply and promotion of active ageing;
- gender equality;
- promoting the integration of and combating discrimination against people at a disadvantage in the labour market;
- making work pay by means of incentives to enhance work attractiveness;
- transforming undeclared work into regular employment; and
- addressing regional employment disparities.

24. He concluded by affirming that the proposed Conclusions suggested by the Office were in line with the policy priorities of the EU.

25. The Government member of Portugal supported a new international instrument on HRD which took account of globalization, technological change and the goal of decent work. Mechanisms that enhanced HRD, combining macroeconomic with social policies, needed to be developed in line with the Lisbon goals. People should develop broad-based skills, as unemployment increased; this was where the all-inclusive concept of lifelong learning would be important. The roles of the different players should be better defined by means of social dialogue, taking into consideration differences across countries. In conclusion, she emphasized the importance of defining a framework, which included the modalities in which skills could be recognized, irrespective of how they had been acquired.

26. The Government member of the United Republic of Tanzania joined other speakers in supporting the initiative to develop a new Human Resources Development Recommendation. Governments needed to revise and put in place new policies on training for lower, middle and higher job categories, including managerial levels. An enabling environment for employers and trade unions to provide training to their organizations as well as leadership should also be developed. Employers should provide training to their employees, whereas the employees themselves must take the initiative to acquire new skills, thereby becoming better prepared for workplace challenges which would lead to increased productivity and enhancement of community life. He expressed concern at the way local people were often marginalized by foreign investors when it came to employment and skills development. Citing the example of his own country, where new investors often brought in their own people to work, he called upon governments to put in place capacity-building measures for skills development of local people.

-
- 27.** The Government member of Ecuador felt that there was a need to make a clear distinction on whether lifelong education and training was an obligation or a right. Training, with its components of education and instruction, constituted the main subject of discussion. Education was meant to guide, direct, lead and to provide the moral and ethical basis which underpinned all decent work activities. Within this framework, education should be compulsory and universal for everyone, including governments, employers and workers. Teaching and learning were processes that needed responsible planning based on societal needs and individual aptitudes so that workers and human life generally were valued at the highest level.
- 28.** The Government member of Cameroon recognized the importance of human resources in assisting countries to move forward. Vocational training needed to be adapted to the requirements of a country, which required substantial investments. Yet, many developing countries did not have sufficient infrastructure and/or resources to tailor vocational training to their needs, hence the importance of international cooperation and assistance as mentioned by the Government member of Egypt. Restrictive emigration and migration policies often imposed limitations on developing countries' responses to such problems. The new Recommendation needed to provide for policies to permit the acquisition of training anywhere.
- 29.** The Government member of Trinidad and Tobago, speaking on behalf of the Government members of the Bahamas, Barbados, Jamaica and Suriname, affirmed that all five Governments viewed the proposed new Recommendation as a contributor to economic development. Two forces at work in the region would particularly affect future economic and labour market developments: the creation of a single market and economy in 2004; and the establishment of the Free Trade Area of the Americas in 2005. The Caribbean Single Market and Economy, would result in increased labour mobility, requiring a corresponding augmentation in skills development standards and HRD. The agreement on the Free Trade Area for the Americas would increase access for the region's products, hopefully impact on investment decisions and reinforce the significance of lifelong learning. The changing international environment obliged countries of the region to move ahead on these fronts or otherwise perish. Concern was expressed over the issue of accreditation, especially in constructing lifelong learning institutions and programmes; whether at national, regional or international levels. Accreditation programmes should be such as to allow learners to respond to new opportunities. HRD played a crucial role in developing the region's workforce to meet globalization challenges, adding new weight to the discussion on a new Recommendation.
- 30.** The Government member of Saudi Arabia affirmed that his Government recognized the need for reviewing his country's education and training system in response to the twenty-first century's economic, social and technological changes. Appropriate education and training would positively enhance the economic status of employees and employers, and more generally, the nation's workforce qualifications. Saudi Arabia's General Organization for Technical Education and Vocational Training developed training programmes targeted to meeting business needs by means of improved technical and scientific qualifications of the workforce. Programmes covered the whole country, not just the cities but the country as a whole. The Organization's specific goals included use of more practical and flexible approaches to address gaps between the growth of the nation's population and labour force, and the continued dependence on large numbers of expatriates. Trainees were encouraged to abide by labour market requirements while continuing to upgrade their educational and technical abilities. To meet demands created by rapid technological change, a coordinating process had been developed with private enterprises to provide trainees with direct training experience in workplaces so as to improve their competencies.

-
- 31.** The Government member of Namibia applauded the ILO's initiative to review HRD standards in order to bring them in line with labour market realities and business needs. There was an international consensus on the power of education and training to enhance employees' capacity to cope with evolving job requirements brought on by technological developments and changes in labour markets towards more highly skilled work. The expensive cost of training necessitated returns on such investments. A new ILO instrument should seriously address the issue of relevance as a prerequisite for training interventions. A thorough training needs assessment should precede training interventions to ensure value for money. Regrettably, too many training policies of institutions, employers and countries were supply-driven instead of being demand-driven. Such policies resulted in an excessive supply of trained people who nevertheless remained unemployed and thus provoked a wastage of scarce resources. The revised instrument should provide clear and forward-looking guidelines to assist member States in devising training policies that are relevant to labour market demands.
- 32.** The Government member of France, speaking on behalf of the Government members of the Group of Industrialized Market Economies (IMEC) present in the Committee (Australia, Austria, Belgium, Canada, Cyprus, Denmark, Finland, France, Greece, Ireland, Italy, Japan, Luxembourg, Malta, Netherlands, New Zealand, Norway, Portugal, San Marino, Switzerland, Turkey, United Kingdom and the United States), welcomed the proposed Conclusions which reflected the general discussion from the International Labour Conference of 2000, as well as the responses of the constituents to the questionnaire. The proposed new Recommendation could address common challenges of ensuring that all people were equipped with the knowledge, skills and understanding which would permit their participation in the labour market and wider society. It could also reflect the importance of lifelong learning and the recognition of skills achieved through formal and informal means. The Government members of the IMEC group on the Committee supported the principles reflected in the Global Employment Agenda, in particular the right to education for all and encouragement of training provision. The Government members of the IMEC group on the Committee recognized the importance of removing barriers to education and training as a means of guaranteeing personal achievement, full insertion into society and access to decent work, including for those with special needs. Education and training were investments, not costs. The new Recommendation should reaffirm the need for coordination between social and economic policies; education and training were strategic tools for effective and sustainable social and economic development. The Recommendation should also recognize the roles and responsibilities of governments, the social partners and individuals in education and training provision, as well as the roles of other interested parties at different levels.
- 33.** The Government member of Thailand expressed her support for the revision of Recommendation No. 150. As stated in the current Thai National Economic and Social Development Plan, people were at the centre of development. Reflecting this principle, the Government had reformed its educational system which included measures targeted to the poor and most vulnerable people, as well as free basic education for at least nine years with the goal of extending it to 12 years. Lifelong learning was the main strategy to achieve a knowledge-based economy and a learning society. In order to provide incentives for skills training by employers and enterprises, the Government had revised its "Skill Development Promotion Act". Another challenge was to link education and work in ways that encouraged the workforce to continue training up to higher education levels. Responding to globalization challenges, the Government encouraged acquisition of more computer skills through a computer purchasing programme. Human resources development should go hand in hand with employment promotion strategies, including development of self-employment opportunities and entrepreneurship as strategies for income generation and alleviation of poverty. In this sense, labour market information systems were of great

importance. Coordination between ministries dealing with human resources development and other stakeholders such as employers' and workers' organizations, non-governmental organizations (NGOs) and professional organizations was also crucial. Finally, she called for sharing of best practices on: (a) effective labour market information systems; (b) vocational and career guidance; (c) skills standards to cope with rapid technological developments; and (d) encouragement to trade unions to play a more active role in lifelong learning development.

- 34.** The Government member of India complimented the ILO's initiative to bring the HRD issue to an international forum as an important contribution to advancing economic competitiveness and decent work. Her country was the second largest populated country in the world with a labour force of around 406 million, the key problem being that about 122 million workers lived below the poverty line. Increases in productivity and income levels of the working poor would be possible only through workforce skills upgrading and multiskilling, together with improvements in economic growth. Skill development efforts had to keep in mind the large size of the informal economy. The Government of India had planned to develop a national vocational training system. However, this initiative involved significant financial implications which were not possible to bear, and attempts to involve the private sector and other stakeholders in the network had not been entirely successful. It would be worthwhile for the ILO to develop an "international skills development fund" so as to help poor countries to venture into large-scale skills training activities and improve their competitiveness.
- 35.** The Government member of Papua New Guinea considered, along with other Pacific island nations, that human resources development was a fundamental and global issue, particularly questions of vocational guidance and training. His Government welcomed its inclusion on the agenda for discussion at the current session of the Conference. The Government of Papua New Guinea needed new approaches to education and training, and while lifelong learning, as part of education policies had been discussed, follow-up on these issues in his country was lacking. Nevertheless, a number of interventions had been taken to improve human resources development with, for example, the issue of skills training being included in the national development strategy for 2003-07. The National Training Council also worked closely with the Department of National Planning and Rural Development to ensure that the training system met national economic priorities for good governance, efficient service delivery, export driven economic growth, rural development and poverty reduction efforts. The success of training could be measured by its achievements within the overall development process, thus it should be integrated with other economic and social policies, including those intended to upgrade the informal economy. Reflecting the perceived inadequacy of current training to provide relevant skills for industry, the revised instrument should stress responsibility for training programmes within ministries of labour and employment, with co-financing and support from industry. Of particular concern was the plight of rural workers who were disadvantaged due to poor infrastructure and lack of access to training. The new instrument could be useful in providing guidance on improving national apprenticeship systems and employment services which provided vocational guidance and training. Such systems in many developing countries lacked effective management, policy support and data collection methods, often constrained by lack of resources. A national qualifications framework to improve the matching of qualified individuals with available employment opportunities would be a useful innovation. His Government fully endorsed the points expressed in Reports IV(1) and (2).
- 36.** The Government member of the United Kingdom remarked that her Government fully supported the statement made on behalf of the Government members of the IMEC group on the Committee. The Committee had an important role to develop a framework which

promoted a flexible system of training and lifelong learning that would be responsive to the needs of individuals, the labour market and the wider economy. Special attention should be paid to the concerns of disadvantaged groups. Labour market adaptations were essential to economic flexibility, and a more skilled workforce was better able to adapt to change, hence the need for action to improve the skills of the young as well as those already in the labour market.

- 37.** The Government member of the Philippines stated her Government's support for the revision of the Human Resources Development Recommendation, 1975 (No. 150) and emphasized the need for a more dynamic and responsive instrument. It could be a potent tool to promote decent work, reduce poverty and enhance human dignity. While recognizing education and training as a right for all, the realities in developing countries, including her own, should compel the Committee to pay particular attention to marginalized individuals who had poor access to training and education. This was especially important in the case of informal economy workers, comprising over half of the national labour force in the Philippines. The ILO had assisted the Government in defining the informal economy and its workforce, thus supporting ongoing efforts to improve social protection and social dialogue for such workers. As basic education could not solve all problems, the issue of the informal economy must be included in the Committee's deliberations, with the ultimate objective of moving informal economy workers to mainstream economic activities. In that respect, a national qualifications framework was important to help ensure the portability of skills and to institutionalize their recognition. In concluding, she also stressed that child labour should be abolished, hence the importance of meeting education and training needs of all young people.
- 38.** The representative of the International Federation of University Women (IFUW), also representing the Geneva-based NGO Committee on the Status of Women, noted that the proposed Conclusions appeared to have a "gender blindness," and stressed that it was particularly important in a rapidly changing world to consider the gender dimension. The lack of labour mobility among women due to customary laws, cultural and religious aspects, issues of domestic violence and their traditional role as caregivers must be addressed as should the flow of information and technology to those most in need, especially to the 80 per cent of the world's population living in poverty, 70 per cent of which were women. The precarious nature of much female work in a world economy increasingly oriented towards high value added and technologically demanding jobs should be taken into account, particularly in terms of the obstacles posed by such work to high quality skills development. Of special concern was the provision of an enabling environment to improve the situation of women workers, for example, the provision of maternity protection, as called for in relevant ILO Conventions.² She also stressed that data collection should be disaggregated by sex to improve the design of HRD policies through enhanced information. The ILO should have greater recourse to best practice models for networking and mentoring such as the circles of influence utilized by her Organization and the learning communities project in Spain.
- 39.** The Government member of Finland congratulated the Office for its work in preparing for the revision of Recommendation No. 150 and supported the proposed Conclusions. The role of the different actors should be further clarified, especially the role of the State in addressing the problems of vulnerable groups and social exclusion resulting from globalization. The contribution of enterprises to lifelong learning was central, but formal

² Notably the Workers with Family Responsibilities Convention, 1981 (No. 156) and the Maternity Protection Convention, 2000 (No. 183), in connection with the Equal Remuneration Convention, 1951 (No. 100) and the Discrimination (Employment and Occupation) Convention, 1958 (No. 111).

vocational education and training programmes were also critical, in addition to the acquisition of broader competencies. Enterprises might not always view provision of general skills as their responsibility, hence the important role of governments. Finally, in European countries, where more individuals were leaving the labour market than entering it, human resources development was particularly crucial to the continued development process.

40. The Government member of Denmark expressed full support for the statement from the Government members of the IMEC group on the Committee. He noted that Report IV(1) provided a consistent and appropriate platform for the work of the Committee. The importance of striking the right balance of responsibilities between governments, the social partners and enterprises was emphasized. Equally, the focus of discussion should concentrate on the political objectives and the frameworks needed to provide education and training rather than the specific modalities of implementation, content of education and evaluation.
41. The Government member of Australia acknowledged the importance of human resources training and development in meeting the objectives of economic development, full employment and social inclusion. HRD had both a proactive, developmental element, which enhanced an individual's prospects in the labour market, and a social element, which acted as a safety net and prevented living standards from falling below acceptable levels. Some reservations as to the need for a new Recommendation were expressed, but given the overwhelming support for it, his Government was prepared to join the consensus and participate constructively in developing a more demand-driven training system. As in Australia, a flexible, responsible and accessible vocational education and training system that could respond quickly to emerging needs would be valuable. The revision of Recommendation No. 150 should provide an improved framework to: promote lifelong learning and enhance the employability of all workers; improve access and equality of opportunity to education and training for all workers; promote national, regional and international qualifications frameworks which included provisions for prior learning; build the capacity of social partners for partnerships in education and training; recognize the various responsibilities for investment and funding of education and training; address the need for increased technical and financial assistance for less-advantaged countries and societies; and provide guidance on many issues that were central to contemporary training policy and system reform. Referring to the vocational education and training system in Australia, the Government focused on promoting national consistency and higher quality standards, notably through a qualifications framework and a quality training framework which together promoted lifelong learning and a seamless education and training system.
42. In his concluding remarks the Employer Vice-Chairperson noted that some consensus and support for the proposals in Report IV(2) had been expressed. There was agreement on the character of the new instrument – providing policy guidelines rather than details of an operational nature. Several speakers had highlighted the underlying importance of HRD for economic development and individual employability. HRD policies should be consistent with employment, economic and fiscal policies, while the issue of rights to education and training, which had been addressed by the Governments of Canada, Denmark and New Zealand, required more attention. Moreover, the roles of governments and the social partners in education and training needed to be specified more clearly; governments should be responsible for initial education and pre-employment training, and the social partners responsible for continuing and further training. He reiterated the point made by the Government member of the Philippines that special attention should be given to workers in the informal economy, adding that governments needed to take responsibility for the training needs of those in the informal economy because developing countries often lacked the infrastructure and resources to adequately address this challenge.

-
43. The Worker Vice-Chairperson noted the overwhelming government support for the new instrument on HRD, a reflection of the importance that many governments had placed on this issue. She agreed with the Government member of Thailand that people should be placed at the centre of development, as this viewpoint captured the heart of the entire discussion. She also supported the position of the Government member of the United Kingdom on the need for flexibility in education and training, so as to be responsive to the needs of individuals, labour markets and the wider economy. In addition, she endorsed the views expressed by several Government members on the importance of giving special attention to the needs of workers in the informal economy in order for them to be integrated into the formal economy, as well as women and disadvantaged groups such as the elderly and the poor. While calling on employers to increase opportunities for training as well as its financing, she pointed out that training opportunities needed to be fully utilized when made available.
44. The Worker Vice-Chairperson re-emphasized the point made in paragraph 8 of the 2000 *Conclusions concerning human resources training and development*, that education and training were a right for all and that universal access must be ensured. Policies and structured systems of education and training which conformed to certain standards and quality must be put in place. Market forces alone were incapable of achieving the desired outcome of developing the capacity of individuals and society in a systematic way, hence government intervention was needed to formulate policies to strengthen the delivery of education and training. She agreed with other speakers that creating a right to education and training was insufficient; all discrimination should be removed to ensure that access to education and training became a practical reality.
45. The Chairperson noted the general support for a new instrument, which was to take the form of a Recommendation that was both dynamic and set out clear principles. It should also be robust to the rapidly changing environment. Certain issues and themes were consistently highlighted:
- the need for a clear definition of all parties' responsibilities, an issue that could be addressed through social dialogue;
 - the desirability for human resources training and development to be aimed at both economic and social outcomes, addressing the needs of individuals, enterprises and society;
 - the need to integrate education and training policies with employment, structural macroeconomic and social policies, as well as the integration of policies within the human resources training and development area itself;
 - for individuals, human resources training and development should be aimed at helping them achieve employability and adaptability in a world of change;
 - the paramount importance of initial education, literacy and foundation skills as well as ongoing learning;
 - the need for recognition of skills acquired formally and informally at national, regional and international levels;
 - the establishment of information systems to support good decision-making by governments, the social partners, enterprises, providers and individuals;
 - the importance of human resources training and development as a means of assisting people to escape from poverty in developing countries where infrastructure and

resources were often lacking, and the opportunities available to the international community to assist in addressing such weaknesses; and

- the importance of targeting HRD policies to the special requirements of the informal economy where many workers were concentrated in developing countries.

46. The Chairperson concluded by thanking all for their active participation and by noting that a good framework had been set for further discussion.

Consideration of the proposed Conclusions concerning human resources development and training

I. Form of the instrument

Point 1

47. As there were no amendments, Point 1 was adopted without discussion.

Point 2

48. As there were no amendments, Point 2 was adopted without discussion.

II. Preamble

Point 3

49. The Employer Vice-Chairperson expressed the hopes of the Employers' group that the Preamble would be concise, concentrating on the pillars of the proposed instrument – why it should be adopted, the broader context for its adoption, and the responsibilities of governments and the social partners. This approach was reflected in the amendments submitted by the Employers' group. It was not necessary to include a large number of references to other ILO instruments. Rather, the Preamble should contain only those references directly related to the instrument under discussion, for example the Human Resources Development Convention, 1975 (No. 142) and the *Conclusions concerning human resources training and development*, as discussed at the 2000 International Labour Conference.

50. In her introductory comments, the Worker Vice-Chairperson indicated that she did not disagree with the Employer Vice-Chairperson's remarks. The object of the Preamble was not to include a great deal of references to other instruments. Still, as the first part that anyone would read, the Preamble should capture the heart and essence of the instrument and reflect the reason for its adoption. Since education and training must be considered holistically with other policies, the proposed instrument could not be considered in isolation and therefore cross-references to other instruments were necessary.

D.32

51. The Worker Vice-Chairperson introduced an amendment to the Preamble to recognize the significant contribution of education, training and lifelong learning to meeting various

employment, social and economic challenges. It was important to bear in mind the contributions that these forms of HRD could make to promoting the interests of people, enterprises, the economy and society, especially considering the critical challenge to attain full employment, social inclusion, competitiveness and sustained economic growth. The Employer Vice-Chairperson supported the amendment since it addressed economic and social values.

52. The amendment was then adopted.

D.3

53. The Employer Vice-Chairperson introduced an amendment to the Preamble to specify the roles of governments and the social partners in the provision of various forms of education and training. The reason for the amendment was to stress that each party had defined responsibilities in the realization of human resources development policies. The Employer Vice-Chairperson then presented a subamendment to delete the words “existing and future” after the word “training”.

54. The Worker Vice-Chairperson also proposed a subamendment to the amendment to replace the words “developing their own abilities and careers” by “making use of the opportunities”.

55. Both subamendments were supported by the Employer and Worker Vice-Chairpersons.

56. The amendment was adopted as subamended.

D.33

57. The Worker Vice-Chairperson introduced an amendment that sought to include in the Preamble the concept that education, training and lifelong learning, while fundamental to sustainable economic and social development, could not operate in isolation; they must form an integrated part of economic, labour market and social policies and programmes.

58. The Employer Vice-Chairperson proposed a subamendment to replace the word “coherent” by “consistent”.

59. The amendment was adopted as subamended.

D.2

60. The Employer Vice-Chairperson introduced an amendment that clarified in the Preamble the need for human resources development policy to be consistent with other policies such as economic, social and fiscal policies. He acknowledged that there was some overlap with the preceding amendment which had been adopted, as subamended, and proposed that the Drafting Committee could make minor adjustments to ensure consistency in the text.

61. The Worker Vice-Chairperson supported the amendment, and the amendment was adopted, with the understanding that the Drafting Committee would make the necessary changes to the text so as to integrate it with the preceding amendment.

D.34

62. The Worker Vice-Chairperson introduced an amendment to the Preamble that affirmed the need for tripartite and international consensus on the issue of universal access to education

and training, including lifelong learning, and stressed the special difficulties faced by developing countries, such as the lack of technology and the need for debt relief.

- 63.** The Employer Vice-Chairperson noted that the role of the tripartite partners was dealt with in the preceding adopted amendment, and that the issues of lifelong learning and the commitments of different partners, with regard to international assistance, would be addressed in following sections of the proposed Conclusions. Therefore, the Employers' group could not support the amendment. The Government member of Switzerland shared the reservations of the Employer Vice-Chairperson concerning the amendment, noting that in the discussion of the IMEC group, it was felt especially important that the text of the Preamble should be as concise as possible. The issues raised by the amendment were covered elsewhere in the proposed Conclusions.
- 64.** The Government member of Jamaica remarked that the first part of the amendment was similar to the text of an amendment to the Preamble previously adopted, but asked for further clarification on the intention of the amendment's second paragraph. The Worker Vice-Chairperson replied that the Preamble should address the essence of issues related to human resources development and that the special needs of developing countries should be considered as fundamental, including the problems of debt relief and the need for assistance in designing and implementing modern education and training policies. The Government member of Jamaica therefore suggested that the important role of international funding organizations should also be included.
- 65.** The Worker Vice-Chairperson then introduced a subamendment to the second paragraph which would insert the phrase, "structural adjustment programmes including through an active role of international funding agencies", after the words "debt relief measures". The Government members of Jamaica, Suriname and Trinidad and Tobago supported the amendment, as subamended. Representing a developing country, the Government member of the Philippines supported the subamendment in principle, but wished the Preamble to mention only international development cooperation in general terms, leaving the details to other parts of the proposed Conclusions. The Government member of India also supported the principle behind the subamendment and wondered if a reference should not be made to the development of an international skills development fund.
- 66.** A number of Government members expressed reservations about the amendment and/or the proposed subamendment. The Government member of Argentina, in general, supported the thrust of the amendment, as subamended, but doubted whether the proposed formulation adequately covered the concerns about debt relief. The Government members of Australia, Canada, Turkey, and the United States expressed concerns that the amendment, as subamended, would burden the text of the Preamble, which should be brief and concise, and that the issues raised, while important, could be covered in other sections of the instrument. The Government member of New Zealand also did not support the amendment, as subamended. Noting in addition that the instrument should not be time bound, which could be the case if some issues referred to, such as, growing levels of illiteracy and the need for debt relief, were included.
- 67.** The Government member of France announced his readiness to assist developing countries, but proposed that the subamendment should be reworded. The Worker Vice-Chairperson then proposed a second subamendment to the amendment and the initial subamendment which would delete the first paragraph and in the second paragraph the words "through inter alia technology and knowledge transfers, and debt relief measures including through international funding agencies". The Employer Vice-Chairperson supported this second subamendment which was also supported by several Government members.

-
68. The Government member of the Philippines also supported the second subamendment, and proposed a third subamendment to delete in the second paragraph the words “which are unable” and “given their growing levels of illiteracy and massive debt crises”, and to replace the word “nor” by the words “for them to”. In the interest of brevity, the Government members of France, Switzerland and the United States, as well as the Employer and Worker Vice-Chairpersons, supported the subamendment proposed by the Government member of the Philippines.
 69. The Government member of Jamaica supported these subamendments, provided that the details concerning international cooperation could be addressed in subsequent points of the proposed Conclusions.
 70. The amendment was adopted as subamended.

D.1

71. The Employer Vice-Chairperson introduced an amendment to specify various developments which provided a rationale for a new Recommendation, as it was important to explain the urgent need for a new instrument in the Preamble.
72. The Worker Vice-Chairperson contested the necessity of the amendment, but would wait until Government members had commented on it.
73. The Government members of Canada, Suriname, Switzerland and Turkey objected to this amendment in the interest of brevity, suggesting that the proposals could be dealt with elsewhere in the proposed Conclusions. They variously agreed with its spirit, as it reflected the new international paradigm, around which, the discussion was being held.
74. The Worker Vice-Chairperson introduced a subamendment to replace the current text with the new text. The Employer Vice-Chairperson did not feel that the subamendment added significantly to the amendment, and while appreciating the support of many Government members for the principle behind it, in the interest of avoiding an overly lengthy Preamble, the amendment was withdrawn.

D.59

75. The Employer Vice-Chairperson introduced an amendment to delete clause (b). This reflected the earlier discussion that the Preamble should be short, as well as the importance of only dealing with issues relevant to the new instrument. While the Employers’ group fully supported the Tripartite Declaration of Principles concerning Multinational Enterprises and Social Policy, it did not relate to HRD and was therefore not appropriate as a reference in the Preamble. Multinational Enterprises (MNEs) could play a role in human resources development, but the proposed new instrument should be inclusive of all enterprises in this regard, including small and medium-sized ones.
76. The Government members of Australia, Denmark and Switzerland supported the amendment, citing various reasons of brevity, clarity and irrelevance of clause (b) to the main issue.
77. The Worker Vice-Chairperson opposed the amendment on grounds that it was vital to retain the abovementioned Declaration in the Preamble as it dealt with an important subject related to training and lifelong learning, namely the role played by MNEs in terms of technical transfers and human resources development. Because MNEs operated across

borders, the absence of a linkage to this ILO Declaration would weaken the proposed Conclusions. There were many paragraphs on training within the Declaration.

- 78.** The Government members of Argentina, France, Greece, Jamaica, Japan, Mali, South Africa, Suriname, Thailand, Trinidad and Tobago and the United Kingdom opposed the amendment on various grounds. These included the inconsistency with previous arguments that the new instrument should demonstrate the linkages between HRD and broader economic and social policies, and the context which this important ILO Declaration on MNEs gave to the issue at hand, especially as it had been adopted after the Human Resources Development Recommendation, 1975 (No. 150).
- 79.** The Employer Vice-Chairperson then withdrew the amendment in view of the clear majority opposed to it.

D.60

- 80.** The Employer Vice-Chairperson introduced an amendment to delete clause (c). The rationale was the same as for the previous amendment in that the ILO Declaration on Fundamental Principles and Rights at Work was not directly linked with the debate on human resources development.
- 81.** The Worker Vice-Chairperson did not support the amendment. She cited the replies to the questionnaire submitted to ILO member States for comments on the proposed Conclusions, which indicated that 76 of 82 governments supported the specific inclusion of a reference to this Declaration in the proposed new instrument. The Workers' group considered the Declaration to set out the core principles which should guide access to human resources development.
- 82.** All Government members who spoke were equally opposed to the amendment, citing the importance of the Declaration in linking the concept of fundamental rights and decent work to HRD, and the viewpoint that the Declaration should guide all the work of the ILO.
- 83.** After noting the opposition by the Government members, the Employer Vice-Chairperson withdrew the amendment.

D.35

- 84.** The Worker Vice-Chairperson introduced an amendment which would include in the Preamble a reference to the Declaration of Philadelphia adopted in 1944. Reaffirming the principle that labour was not a commodity was crucial.
- 85.** The Employer Vice-Chairperson, while supporting the Declaration of Philadelphia, opposed the amendment as it was not relevant to the issue under discussion and therefore not appropriate for inclusion in the Preamble. All Government members who spoke were also opposed to the amendment, since the basic principle advocated in the amendment was already reflected in clause (c) which referred to the Declaration on Fundamental Principles and Rights at Work, and this Declaration was more modern.
- 86.** The Worker Vice-Chairperson, noting the general support for the principles embodied in the Declaration of Philadelphia, withdrew the amendment in view of the opposition of Government members.

D.5

87. As the amendment was not seconded, it was not considered.

D.69

88. The Worker Vice-Chairperson introduced an amendment to make reference to certain ILO Conventions and Recommendations which were relevant to human resources development. This was the practice in other instruments.

89. The Employer Vice-Chairperson opposed the amendment because it was too long and some of the Conventions and Recommendations referred to in the amendment were very old, whereas the discussion concerned a potential new instrument. Moreover, several Conventions are not relevant to the issue of HRD.

90. The Government members of Australia, Canada, Japan and the United States opposed the amendment in the interest of brevity, as did the Government member of Turkey on grounds that the only directly relevant standard to the discussion was the Human Resources Development Convention, 1975 (No. 142).

91. The Government member of France supported the inclusion of pertinent standards as references which would render unnecessary the next proposed amendment.

92. The Worker Vice-Chairperson then proposed a subamendment to delete reference to the words: “Discrimination (Employment and Occupation) Convention, 1958 (No. 111)” and “Vocational Rehabilitation and Employment (Disabled Persons) Convention, 1983 (No. 159); Employment Promotion and Protection against Unemployment Convention, 1988 (No. 168) and Employment Service Convention, 1948 (No. 88)”.

93. The Government member of Canada proposed the inclusion of relevant standards in an annex to the proposed Conclusions, while the Government member of Chile proposed their inclusion in a footnote. Upon informal advice from the Office of the Legal Adviser, the representative of the Secretary-General considered that both suggestions were neither in line with common practice or desirable.

94. The Government members of Cameroon, Chile, Egypt, Finland, France and Thailand supported the subamendment put forward by the Worker Vice-Chairperson, as reference to these standards would give added value to the new instrument.

95. The Employer Vice-Chairperson expressed a preference for the amendment to be deleted, but if the number of references were limited, the position could be reconsidered. Given that even some of the Governments in support of retaining the Paid Educational Leave Convention, 1974 (No. 140) had not ratified it, he proposed a second subamendment to also delete reference to this standard. The Government members of Australia, Canada, Denmark, Turkey and the United States supported the second subamendment proposed by the Employer Vice-Chairperson.

96. The Worker Vice-Chairperson opposed this second subamendment. The Government members of France, Mali and South Africa felt that elimination of a reference to paid educational leave in the context of human resources development would be a great loss; the standard was at the heart of the discussion. Moreover, the Government members of Botswana, Cameroon, Côte d’Ivoire, Greece, Indonesia, Malaysia, Namibia and the United Republic of Tanzania opposed the second subamendment and supported the first subamendment proposed by the Worker Vice-Chairperson.

97. With continuing reservations concerning the first subamendment proposed by the Worker Vice-Chairperson, the Employer Vice-Chairperson decided to withdraw his subamendment.

98. The amendment was adopted as subamended.

D.21

99. The Chairperson announced that, since amendment D.69 had been adopted, the amendment would not be considered.

D.36

100. The Worker Vice-Chairperson introduced an amendment which would replace the previous text of Point 3 with four paragraphs. Since three of the proposed paragraphs, the first, the third and the fourth were covered by clauses already agreed upon, she proposed a subamendment to retain only the second paragraph. Retention of the second proposed paragraph reflected an apparent agreement that decent work was at the core of the ILO and it was the desired outcome of education, training and lifelong learning.

101. The Employer Vice-Chairperson, noting that the ILO had many other important objectives and principles, did not support the amendment.

102. The Government members of Canada, Mali, Namibia, Papua New Guinea, South Africa, Suriname and Trinidad and Tobago supported the amendment as subamended by the Worker Vice-Chairperson. The Government member of Suriname stressed the importance of decent work. The Government member of Mali reminded Committee members of the earlier discussions about the dignity of labour, emphasizing its relationship to decent work.

103. The Government member of the Philippines presented a second subamendment to use the plural form for the word “dimension” after the words “quantity and quality”. The Worker Vice-Chairperson supported this subamendment.

104. The Chairperson noted the support of a wide range of Government members. The amendment, as subamended, was then adopted.

D.11

105. The Government member of Switzerland, speaking also on behalf of the Government members of Canada, France, Greece and Switzerland introduced an amendment to alter the order of previously agreed clauses. In order to take account of amendment D.69 adopted earlier, she proposed to include the new clause as (c) in the amendment.

106. The Employer Vice-Chairperson further proposed to place the clause on the *Conclusions concerning human resources training and development*, adopted at the 88th Session of the International Labour Conference as 3(b). To resolve these questions, the Chairperson proposed that the Drafting Committee should address the ordering of the clauses in Point 3. This proposal was accepted.

107. With this understanding, Point 3 was adopted as amended.

III. Objective, scope and definition

Point 4

D.37

- 108.** The Worker Vice-Chairperson introduced an amendment on the recognition of education and training as a universally accessible right for all. The amendment was a reiteration of clause 6(a) of the proposed Conclusions. Investment in human capital was an important factor in the performance of individuals, enterprises and societies. The right to education and training for all was crucial in the fight against poverty. Therefore, Point 4 would be the most appropriate place to introduce this notion.
- 109.** The Employer Vice-Chairperson opposed the amendment as redundant since the concept was captured in the proposed clause 6(a). The Government members of Australia, Botswana, Canada, Namibia and Suriname also opposed the amendment, agreeing with the argument put forward by the Employer Vice-Chairperson.
- 110.** After restating the reason for proposing the amendment, the Worker Vice-Chairperson acknowledged the views of a number of Government members and withdrew the amendment. At the same time, she expressed her appreciation for the support to clause 6(a).

D.17

- 111.** The Government member of France, speaking also on behalf of the Government members of France and Portugal, withdrew the amendment, noting that it would be presented again under Point 5.

D.57

- 112.** The Employer Vice-Chairperson introduced an amendment to replace the word “monitor” by “review”. The word “review” was felt to be a term more appropriate for dealing with policy issues. The Worker Vice-Chairperson suggested a subamendment that would include both “monitor” and “review” in the text. The Employer Vice-Chairperson noted that to “review policies” captured the notion of monitoring and thus including both was unnecessary.
- 113.** The Government member of France referred to the French translation of the amendment and suggested a more appropriate term. It was agreed to refer the suggestion to the Drafting Committee.
- 114.** The subamendment was withdrawn, and the amendment, was adopted.

D.18

- 115.** The Government member of France, speaking also on behalf of the Government members of France and Portugal introduced an amendment to replace the words “and training policies” by “policies through education and training” to make the text clearer. The Employer Vice-Chairperson proposed a subamendment to rephrase the sentence as “education and training policies” which was supported by the Worker Vice-Chairperson. The Government member of Papua New Guinea supported the subamendment proposed by the Employer Vice-Chairperson.

116. The amendment was adopted as subamended.

D.9 and D.56

117. The Committee considered these two amendments in tandem as they were closely related. D.9, introduced by the Government member of South Africa, and seconded by the Government member of Botswana, proposed to replace the word “coherent” by “complementary”. The Employer Vice-Chairperson proposed under amendment D.56 to replace the word “coherent” by “consistent”. The Government member of South Africa felt that the word “complementary” would give more weight to the meaning of the sentence, although she was willing to accept the proposal of the Employer Vice-Chairperson as an alternative. The Employer Vice-Chairperson suggested that the word “consistent” was more appropriate – a viewpoint shared by the Worker Vice-Chairperson.

118. The Government member of Botswana then proposed a subamendment to include both the words “complementary” and “consistent” in the text to replace the word “coherent”. The Employer Vice-Chairperson reiterated his preference to use only the word “consistent”, while the Worker Vice-Chairperson supported the use of both words.

119. The two amendments taken together were adopted as subamended, with the Drafting Committee entrusted to determine the appropriate ordering of the two words.

D.19

120. The Government member of France, speaking on behalf of the Government members of Belgium, France and Portugal, withdrew this amendment, in light of the preceding discussion.

D.58

121. The Employer Vice-Chairperson introduced an amendment to add at the end of Point 4 the phrase “in view of national circumstances”. This was a necessary addition to reflect specific national circumstances in the development of national policies. The Government members of Indonesia, Malaysia, Mali, Mexico and Saudi Arabia supported the amendment as it would reflect the diversity of member States.

122. The Worker Vice-Chairperson opposed this addition to the text, seeing it as unnecessarily restrictive and superfluous, since by definition national policies reflected specific national circumstances. Agreeing with this argument, the Government members of Côte d’Ivoire, Finland, France, Greece, Guinea, India, Malawi, Philippines, South Africa, Syrian Arab Republic and Turkey opposed the amendment, which was withdrawn.

D.31 and D.20

123. These two amendments were considered together as they were similar in their effects, with amendment D.31 being taken up first. The Government member of France introduced the amendment to add the words “and other interested parties” on behalf of the Government members of Australia, Belgium, Canada, Denmark, Finland, France, Greece, Netherlands, Norway, Portugal, Switzerland, United Kingdom and the United States. In fact, she noted that the amendment was supported by all Government members of the IMEC group on the Committee. Referring also to D.20, the amendments were proposed to reflect territorial interests.

-
- 124.** The Employer Vice-Chairperson opposed the amendment, affirming that social dialogue referred to dialogue between the social partners and this should remain the main focus. Nevertheless, without the amendment, the text did not exclude, or forbid, the involvement of other people.
- 125.** The Worker Vice-Chairperson expressed her understanding of the rationale for the amendment and the objectives of the Government members, but agreed with the position expressed by the Employer Vice-Chairperson. In the context of the ILO, social partners meant trade unions and employers' groups. She then proposed a subamendment to insert the words "implementation of the policies can involve other relevant parties as agreed by the social partners". The subamendment was supported by the Employer Vice-Chairperson, as well as by the Government member of Namibia.
- 126.** The Government member of the United Kingdom clarified the point of the amendment by stressing that governments and the social partners were indeed, key players, but they were not the only players; others could add value and this notion should somehow be reflected in the text.
- 127.** The Government members of Indonesia and Switzerland did not support the subamendment proposed by the Workers' group since it could be too restrictive, possibly excluding relevant partners in either the formulation or implementation of policies. The Government member of France, speaking on behalf of the Government members of the IMEC group on the Committee, declined to support the subamendment. The Worker Vice-Chairperson then withdrew the subamendment and the Government member of France withdrew the amendment on behalf of the others.
- 128.** The Government member of France reiterated the reason for the second proposed amendment, D.20, which was to reflect the extremely important role of territorial partners in a number of countries. In light of the previous discussion, however, she withdrew the amendment.

D.38

- 129.** The Worker Vice-Chairperson introduced the amendment which sought to specify what was meant by various terms, including lifelong learning, competencies and qualifications. These terms in the new instrument could be interpreted differently, and it was therefore important to provide explanations for them. The Employer Vice-Chairperson supported the amendment, but proposed a subamendment to delete the words "existing and future" in the second paragraph. The Worker Vice-Chairperson agreed to the subamendment.
- 130.** The amendment was adopted as subamended.
- 131.** Point 4 was adopted as amended.

Point 5

D.39

- 132.** The Worker Vice-Chairperson introduced an amendment to clarify that the instrument was not just about human resources development but also concerned education, training and lifelong learning policies. She then proposed a subamendment to delete the words "of workers", ending the sentence with "facilitate employability". This subamendment would provide a clearer focus.

-
- 133.** The Employer Vice-Chairperson and the Government members of Australia, India, Mali, Philippines, Poland and South Africa rejected the amendment as subamended, variously arguing that changing the original terminology would be repetitive and would not add value.
- 134.** The Government member of Switzerland advised the Committee that the French translation of clause (a) would give a different meaning to the text. The matter was referred to the Drafting Committee.
- 135.** Reflecting on the views expressed, the Worker Vice-Chairperson withdrew the proposed amendment, though the words in the amendment, “education, training and lifelong learning”, would have better reflected the tenor of this point.

D.40

- 136.** The Worker Vice-Chairperson introduced an amendment to define in detail the term “employability”. It was appropriate to have this term clearly defined in the instrument so as to have a common understanding of its meaning.
- 137.** The Employer Vice-Chairperson stated that lengthy definitions were not looked upon with favour, but in this case an exception could be made. However, the proposed amendment was too long and did not correspond with the structure of Point 5. A subamendment was proposed to replace the word “workers” by “individuals”, and to delete the text after the words “life cycle”.
- 138.** The Government members of Australia, Canada, Finland, and the Philippines agreed that the definition of employability was an important matter, but did not agree with including lengthy definitions of such terms in the text. Therefore, they supported the subamendment proposed by the Employer Vice-Chairperson.
- 139.** The Worker Vice-Chairperson supported the part of the subamendment to replace the word “workers” by “individuals”, but opposed the deletion of the text after the words “life cycle.” She re-emphasized the point that the purpose of the amendment was not merely to provide a definition of employability, but to highlight that this term lay at the heart of the instrument, hence the importance of clarifying the concept. Noting the concerns raised by the Employers’ group as well as by several Government members, she proposed a second subamendment to replace the amendment which read as follows:

For the purpose of this instrument employability refers to portable competencies and qualifications that enhance an individual’s capacity to make use of the opportunities available in order to secure and retain decent work, progress within and between jobs, and cope with changes in technology and labour market conditions. Employability has to be part of a range of policy measures designed to achieve quality and safe jobs and promote education and training as well as sustainable economic and social development.

- 140.** The Employer Vice-Chairperson appreciated the shorter text as well as the clarity brought to the definition of “sustainable development”. However, the addition of the words “education and training” did not fit well with the structure. He proposed a third subamendment to add the word “enterprise” after “within”, and to delete the words “education and training” after the word “promote”. With these changes, the subamendment proposed by the Worker Vice-Chairperson would be acceptable as a continuation to the first line of clause (a), which already mentioned “lifelong learning and employability”.
- 141.** The Worker Vice-Chairperson agreed with the addition of the word “enterprise”. However, in order to promote employability, appropriate measures of education and training policies

were necessary. After initially proposing that the Drafting Committee could take up the issue of how, and where to place the words, “education and training”, she agreed to their deletion as the concept was already included in clause (a), and then agreed to the amendment, as subamended, by the Employer Vice-Chairperson.

- 142.** The Government member of Canada supported the amendment and it was adopted as subamended.

D.10

- 143.** The Government member of France, also speaking on behalf of the Government members of France and Portugal, introduced an amendment to recognize the rights of all to lifelong learning and to ensure universal access. The issue was a crucial point and should remain as a new clause in Point 5, which was a more appropriate place than in Point 6.

- 144.** The Government members of Belgium and Finland supported the amendment.

- 145.** The Employer Vice-Chairperson opposed the amendment as being inappropriate under Point 5, of title III which dealt with objective, scope and definition. The Government members of Australia and Canada also opposed the amendment, as it should be considered under Point 6. The Government member of Suriname, likewise, questioned its place here after the discussion and adoption of the preceding amendment. After initially supporting the new clause, the Worker Vice-Chairperson indicated her opposition to the amendment if it were designed to replace clause 6(a). The Chairperson announced that the amendment failed through lack of support.

D.54 and D.55

- 146.** The Employer Vice-Chairperson introduced two amendments to replace clause (b) – “equal consideration” by “balanced consideration” – as it was more appropriate in the existing text, and the distinction between economic and social development would also be made clearer. After some discussion, it was decided to take these together.

- 147.** The Worker Vice-Chairperson preferred to keep the word “equal” but otherwise could agree with the combined amendment. The Employer Vice-Chairperson accepted this proposal.

- 148.** The Government member of Canada proposed a subamendment to insert the words “job retention” after “decent work” in the text proposed by the Employer Vice-Chairperson. The Employer and Worker Vice-Chairpersons supported the subamendment.

- 149.** The amendment was adopted as subamended.

D.30 and D.41

- 150.** In view of the agreement on the previous amendment, these amendments were not considered.

D.16

- 151.** The Government members of Belgium, France, Portugal and Switzerland introduced an amendment affecting only the French text of clause (b) which was referred to the Drafting Committee.

D.42

- 152.** The Worker Vice-Chairperson introduced an amendment which would stress the importance of competitiveness, greater economic growth and employment, as well as the relationship between education, training and skills development for innovation.
- 153.** After noting some problems with the Spanish version of the amendment, the Employer Vice-Chairperson proposed a subamendment to delete the word “quality” before the words “job creation”, and replace the word “workers” by “individuals”, and to insert the words “in order to meet new skills demand” after “education and training”.
- 154.** The Worker Vice-Chairperson proposed a second subamendment which would replace the word “quality” by “decent”, and the word “individuals” by “people” as suggested by the Employer Vice-Chairperson and to delete the remainder of the clause.
- 155.** The Government member of Canada proposed a third subamendment to insert the word “productivity” after “competitiveness”, arguing that technological change most often drove changes in productivity, which then had a ripple effect throughout the economy. The Employer Vice-Chairperson supported the subamendment.
- 156.** The Worker Vice-Chairperson and the Government member of Italy initially opposed the subamendment as being unnecessary, given that the term “competitiveness” also encompassed productivity. After the Worker Vice-Chairperson withdrew her objection, the amendment was adopted as subamended. The representative of the Secretary-General drew the Committee’s attention to a technical error and read a corrected version of the text, which was then adopted.

D.24

- 157.** As a result of the adoption of the previous amendment, this amendment was not considered.

D.43

- 158.** The Worker Vice-Chairperson introduced an amendment to emphasize the need for policies and programmes to help employers and workers in the transition from the informal to formal economy. The amendment also stressed the need to integrate training policies with other policies and the importance of mechanisms to validate skills acquired by people in the informal economy.
- 159.** The Employer Vice-Chairperson proposed a subamendment to delete all the text after the words “should be developed”.
- 160.** The Worker Vice-Chairperson opposed the subamendment because the deletion of the last sentence would render the text virtually the same as that of the original Office text. She proposed new wording which would hopefully shorten the original amendment and find acceptance.
- 161.** The Government members of Australia, Denmark, New Zealand, Papua New Guinea, Philippines, Poland, United Kingdom and the United States supported the first subamendment proposed by the Employer Vice-Chairperson rather than the amendment or the second subamendment proposed by the Worker Vice-Chairperson. Though some agreed with the thrust of the original amendment, they advanced a number of arguments against the proposals of the Worker Vice-Chairperson, including the desirability of a

shorter text which would not be so complex, the need to maintain a focus on the education and training aspects as opposed to very broad considerations of other policies, and the fact that the issue of creating decent jobs was already captured in the first sentence. In view of the support to cut the text proposed in the amendment, the Government member of Italy expressed the wish to keep the text as originally drafted by the Office since a shortened amendment would have no meaning. The Government member of South Africa regretted that the concept of validating prior learning and skills would disappear with a shortened text.

- 162.** Taking account of the opposition to a longer amendment, and the remark by the Government member of South Africa, the Worker Vice-Chairperson proposed a second subamendment to insert the words “and validation of prior learning and skills gained”, after “training opportunities” in the first sentence. If this subamendment was accepted, she would in turn accept the deletion of the second sentence of the amendment.
- 163.** The Employer Vice-Chairperson agreed with the second subamendment proposed by the Worker Vice-Chairperson, and with that understanding, the amendment was adopted as subamended.

D.52 (Corr.) and D.27

- 164.** The Employer Vice-Chairperson introduced an amendment that proposed no fundamental changes to clause (e), but simply made the text easier to read. The Worker Vice-Chairperson had no primary objection to the amendment, but noted that the word “encourage” would appear twice in the text. The Employer Vice-Chairperson suggested replacing the word “encourage” by “promote”. This was accepted by the Worker Vice-Chairperson and the amendment, as subamended, was discussed in tandem with the next amendment.
- 165.** The Government member of the United Kingdom introduced amendment D.27 as a second subamendment to the text. Adding the word “sustainable” after “private” would allow countries to establish links with regard to investments. The Worker Vice-Chairperson expressed her support for the subamendment.
- 166.** The Employer Vice-Chairperson opposed this subamendment, indicating that it would not add any value. The Government member of Argentina supported the original amendment put forward by the Employer Vice-Chairperson. However, he had difficulties understanding the notion of “sustainable investment” as proposed in the second subamendment.
- 167.** Two further subamendments were proposed to help clarify the text. The Government member of the Philippines suggested replacing the words “promote public and private sustainable investment” by “promote and sustain public and private investment”. The Government member of Switzerland proposed to delete the word “especially” after “infrastructure”, as retaining the word reduced the scope of the types of investment.
- 168.** The Employer and Worker Vice-Chairpersons and the Government members of Argentina, Belgium, Canada, France, Mali, Suriname and the United Kingdom expressed support for the various subamendments. The amendment, D.52 (Corr.), was adopted as amended. As a result, D.27 was not further considered.

D.44

- 169.** The Worker Vice-Chairperson introduced an amendment which would add a new clause to Point 5 to address the inequalities in access to education and training for adults. The Employer Vice-Chairperson proposed a subamendment to replace the words “combat and reduce” by the word “address”. The Worker Vice-Chairperson suggested replacing the word “combat” by “address” while retaining the word “reduce”. The Government members of Finland and Portugal and the Employer Vice-Chairperson supported this subamendment.
- 170.** The amendment was adopted as subamended.
- 171.** Point 5 was adopted as amended.

Point 6

D.53

- 172.** The Employer Vice-Chairperson introduced an amendment to clause (a), addressing the issue of education as a right for all and removing barriers in accessing training and lifelong learning. There was both a philosophical and legalistic interpretation of a “right”. He acknowledged that employers had a responsibility in the provision of training for employees. The amendment was an effort to differentiate between initial education, on the one hand, and training for those in the labour market, on the other. The Employer Vice-Chairperson also proposed a subamendment to delete the word “basic” before “education” and to delete the term “post secondary education”, thereby better capturing this point.
- 173.** The Worker Vice-Chairperson proposed a second subamendment to include the words “lifelong learning” after “education”; delete the word “broad” and introduce the words “for all” after the word “access”.
- 174.** The Employer Vice-Chairperson opposed the subamendment as it failed to adequately distinguish initial education from training as a right. The Government member of Australia did not support the subamendment proposed by the Worker Vice-Chairperson except for the inclusion of the term “access for all”.
- 175.** The Government member of Canada proposed a third subamendment to delete the word “financial” before the words “and other barriers”, as it was too restrictive, neglecting the numerous other kinds of barriers to education and training. He further proposed to replace the words “lifelong learning” by “pre-employment education or training.” The Employer Vice-Chairperson supported the Worker Vice-Chairperson’s subamendment only if it included the subamendment proposed by the Government member of Canada.
- 176.** The Worker Vice-Chairperson restated the proposed subamendment submitted on behalf of the Workers’ group, noting that she did not concur with the subamendment proposed by the Government member of Canada. The Government member of Uruguay, while acknowledging the concerns of the Employer Vice-Chairperson, supported the Worker Vice-Chairperson’s subamendment.
- 177.** The Government member of Canada restated the text of his proposed subamendment. The Worker Vice-Chairperson responded, citing paragraph 8 of the *Conclusions concerning human resources training and development*, adopted during the general discussion on this subject at the International Labour Conference of 2000. She argued that the subamendment

would weaken the instrument. Additionally, she remarked that government responses to the questionnaire reproduced in Report IV(2) demonstrated the overwhelming government support for the proposed Office text.

- 178.** The Government member of Switzerland expressed concerns about the term “lifelong learning” as opposed to the word “training” and proposed a subamendment to replace the words “lifelong learning” by the word “training”. The Worker Vice-Chairperson expressed support for the subamendment.
- 179.** Agreeing with the Government member of Switzerland, the Government member of the Philippines proposed a fourth subamendment to replace the text after the words “work towards” by “ensuring access for all to lifelong learning”. The Worker Vice-Chairperson agreed.
- 180.** The Employer Vice-Chairperson noted that, in spirit, he accepted the notion of education and training as a right for all in the sense of access and availability, but rejected the proposed amendment. Additionally, employers were committed to training employees and to the recognition that lifelong learning should be realized by governments and the social partners. There was a difference between initial education and workers’ training; the responsibility for the latter lay with the social partners. The Government member of India agreed, supporting the amendment introduced by the Employer Vice-Chairperson.
- 181.** The Worker Vice-Chairperson highlighted the difference between the right to training and removing barriers to training. In light of volatile labour markets, more workers were likely to lose their jobs, and the role of government in supporting lifelong learning for those people became important. She could not accept the amendment by the Employer Vice-Chairperson without the subamendment proposed by the Workers’ group, reiterating her support for the subamendment proposed by the Government of Switzerland to replace the words “lifelong learning”, by the word “training”.
- 182.** The Government member of Argentina supported the amendment as subamended by the Workers’ group, but in agreement with the Government member of Uruguay, felt that the original text proposed by the Office was better expressed. The Government member of Italy shared the views of the Government member of Argentina.
- 183.** The Government member of Canada proposed a fifth subamendment to insert the words “training for core work skills”, after the word “education” in the first line, noting the importance of core work skills, particularly in a volatile labour market. He supported this by referring to the concept in Report IV(2). He expressed his willingness to accept the subamendment proposed by the Government member of the Philippines, if the words “core work skills” was included. The Employer Vice-Chairperson and the Government members of Australia and the United States supported the subamendment proposed by the Government member of Canada. The Worker Vice-Chairperson opposed inclusion of the term, as it was restrictive and not very clear.
- 184.** The Government member of Israel supported the subamendment proposed by the Government member of the Philippines by reaffirming that training was beneficial for both employers and workers. Similarly, the Government member of Belgium fully supported the position expressed by the Workers’ group and the subamendment proposed by the Government member of the Philippines.
- 185.** The Government members of Cameroon, Ecuador, Finland, France, Greece, Indonesia, Malawi, Mali, Namibia, Papua New Guinea, Portugal, United Republic of Tanzania, Thailand and Trinidad and Tobago supported the subamendment put forward by the

Government member of the Philippines. Various arguments were cited, including the notion that training already encompassed “core work skills” and the latter concept was subject to varying interpretations, continual training was required in the modern world and many developing countries and regional groups, such as the EU, had policies on lifelong learning. Echoing these sentiments, the Government member of South Africa noted that her Government had introduced a skills development levy so that employers would help the Government in training and skills development.

186. The Employer Vice-Chairperson placed on record the strong objection of the Employers group to the subamendment proposed by the Government member of the Philippines and expected the discussion to be resumed at the second discussion of the proposed instrument at the International Labour Conference in 2004. Notwithstanding, he reaffirmed the commitment by employers to training employees.

187. Given the majority in favour, the amendment was adopted as subamended.

D.28

188. As a result of the adoption of the previous amendment, D.28 was not considered.

D.68 and D.45

189. The Chairperson decided to discuss amendments D.68 and D.45 together. The Employer Vice-Chairperson introduced amendment D.68 which was similar to the text of clause (i) of the proposed Conclusions. Placement of this text earlier in Point 6, however, would illustrate the importance of social dialogue on training at different levels. He noted that the amendment submitted by the Worker Vice-Chairperson on Point 6(b) was too specific and detailed, particularly in respect of the establishment of a tripartite institutional framework for training policies.

190. The Worker Vice-Chairperson introduced amendment D.45 that was intended to strengthen the Office text with the inclusion of the term “institutional tripartite framework”. The amendment, submitted by the Employer Vice-Chairperson, was simply a repetition of the proposed Office text contained in clause (i).

191. In an indicative poll called for by the Chairperson, a clear majority of governments indicated their preference to proceed with a discussion of the amendment submitted by the Worker Vice-Chairperson, and this was done.

192. The Employer Vice-Chairperson proposed a subamendment to delete the term “institutional tripartite framework,” arguing that such frameworks should be determined by governments and social partners, not by the proposed Conclusions.

193. The Worker Vice-Chairperson recalled that the Committee’s discussions had focused on the need for an integrated strategy to ensure the coherence of economic and social policies. Therefore, a national training policies framework was critical to this end.

194. The Government member of Portugal noted the strategic need for an institutional framework which was defined from the outset, but proposed a second subamendment to delete the word “tripartite” from the text. The Government members of Brazil, Canada, Finland and South Africa supported this subamendment. The Government member of Canada suggested the addition of the words “other interested parties” in place of “the various parties”.

-
195. The Employer Vice-Chairperson proposed a third subamendment to delete the words “institutional” and “tripartite” while retaining the word “framework”. The Worker Vice-Chairperson responded by noting that the inclusion of the term “tripartite” in Point 6 was agreed to in the 2000 General Discussion and served to emphasize the responsibility of the social partners. Furthermore, an “institutional” framework did not imply that the role of government would be superseded.
 196. The Government member of the Philippines supported the view of the Employer Vice-Chairperson that there was a need to define the roles of the social partners. She proposed a fourth subamendment to delete the word “tripartite” as well as the words “and specify the roles of the various parties”.
 197. The Employer Vice-Chairperson remarked that the wording of the amendment suggested that institutional frameworks for training policies should be established at the enterprise level and he did not see how this was feasible. He proposed a fifth subamendment to add the term “with the involvement of the social partners ...” after the first word “define”, and delete the word “institutional” after the second mention of the word “define”.
 198. The Worker Vice-Chairperson supported the subamendment proposed by the Government member of the Philippines and agreed to the Employer Vice-Chairperson’s proposal to add the term “referring to the social partners” but to place it after the second mention of the word “define”.
 199. The Employer Vice-Chairperson reiterated his concern about using the term “institutional”. The Government member of Switzerland supported the Employer Vice-Chairperson, agreeing that the word “institutional” was problematic.
 200. The Government member of Portugal clarified the meaning of the term “institutional framework”. The Government member of France, agreeing with the Government member of Portugal, proposed a sixth subamendment to include the word “reference” to define “framework”. The Employer Vice-Chairperson and the Government member of Trinidad and Tobago expressed support for the proposal from the Government member of France.
 201. The Worker Vice-Chairperson appreciated the intervention by the Government member of France as it reflected the message that was being discussed. However, she stressed the importance of retaining the word “institutional”.
 202. The Government member of the Philippines noted that, from a strategic perspective, deleting the word “institutional” meant that other kinds of frameworks could be developed while the Government member of Jamaica proposed a seventh subamendment using the words “appropriate frameworks”.
 203. The Worker Vice-Chairperson emphasized, once again, the importance of “institutional” and, in the spirit of reaching an agreement, proposed an eighth subamendment to replace the words “institutional framework” by “systematic framework”.
 204. The Employer Vice-Chairperson said that it was obvious that a “framework” was “systematic”. He preferred the original text proposed by the Government member of France.
 205. The Government member of Canada suggested replacing the word “systematic” by “comprehensive”. The Worker Vice-Chairperson agreed, explaining that the word “framework” on its own, could be confused with a national qualifications framework, rather than a framework for the coordination of policies.

206. The Employer Vice-Chairperson noted that there could be no confusion as this was a reference to “training policies” and not to “qualifications”. He re-emphasized that he could support the suggestion by the Government member of France or retain the word “framework” only. The Government members of Australia and Portugal agreed.

207. The Government member of the Philippines proposed a ninth subamendment to use the term “guiding framework”. The Employer and Worker Vice-Chairpersons supported this proposal.

208. The Government member of Suriname asked for clarification since the text, with the suggested subamendments, would suggest that a national strategy for education would be defined without the involvement of the social partners, while a national strategy for training would involve the social partners. The Worker Vice-Chairperson noted the validity of this point and proposed to include the words “the involvement of the social partners” in both places of the text to avoid ambiguity.

209. The Employer Vice-Chairperson agreed to the subamendment, provided that the brackets “(national, regional, local, sectoral, enterprise)” was deleted. The Worker Vice-Chairperson pointed out that the Committee had agreed on substance and suggested leaving the wording to the Drafting Committee.

210. The amendment was adopted as subamended. As a result D.68 was not further considered.

D.26

211. As a result of the adoption of the previous amendment, D.26 was also not further considered.

D.15

212. The Government member of France introduced an amendment to clause (c), suggesting that the word “coordinate” better reflected the objective and strengthened the sentence. The Employer Vice-Chairperson felt the word “align” was more appropriate in the English text, and proposed that the Drafting Committee determine an equivalent term for the French text. It was agreed that this amendment would be left to the Drafting Committee.

D.8

213. The Government member of South Africa introduced an amendment, seconded by the Worker Vice-Chairperson, to capture the understanding that strategies, as well as policies, strengthened employability. The Employer Vice-Chairperson accepted the amendment.

214. The amendment was adopted.

D.66

215. The Employer Vice-Chairperson introduced an amendment to highlight the necessity of economic growth in creating employment opportunities. The Worker Vice-Chairperson agreed.

216. The amendment was adopted.

D.67

- 217.** The Employer Vice-Chairperson introduced an amendment which would stress the centrality of economic, fiscal and social policies. The Worker Vice-Chairperson supported the amendment.
- 218.** The amendment was adopted.

D.46

- 219.** The Worker Vice-Chairperson introduced the amendment, stating the purpose of the proposal was to stress the need for national strategies to address illiteracy. The Government member of Australia supported the amendment but suggested minor editorial changes for clarity which the Drafting Committee could address.
- 220.** The Employer Vice-Chairperson, expressing his sympathy for the intent, opposed the amendment as Point 7 already covered this issue. The Government member of the Philippines agreed.
- 221.** With the understanding that the discussion would be resumed under Point 7, the Worker Vice-Chairperson agreed to withdraw the amendment.

D.29

- 222.** It was decided that this amendment would be addressed by the Drafting Committee.

D.63

- 223.** The Employer Vice-Chairperson introduced an amendment to clause (d) which would add more flexibility to the proposed text. He then proposed a subamendment to delete the first sentence.
- 224.** The Worker Vice-Chairperson agreed to the amendment, as subamended, subject to a second subamendment, to replace the word “These” by “This” and the words “flexible enough to anticipate and follow” by “responsive to”. The Employer Vice-Chairperson agreed.
- 225.** The amendment was adopted as subamended.

D.23

- 226.** The Government member of Canada, on behalf of the Government members of Australia, Belgium, Canada, Denmark, Finland, France, Greece, Japan, Netherlands, Norway, Portugal, Switzerland, Turkey, United Kingdom and the United States introduced an amendment to ensure that skills which were acquired informally would be recognized in the framework.
- 227.** The Employer Vice-Chairperson supported the amendment but proposed a subamendment to include the word “competencies”, arguing that qualifications were already recognized. The Worker Vice-Chairperson and the Government member of Canada supported the subamendment.
- 228.** The amendment was adopted as subamended.

D.64

- 229.** The Employer Vice-Chairperson introduced an amendment to delete clause (e), because it assumed governments should decide training policies and did not consider training which often took place in the private sector.
- 230.** The Worker Vice-Chairperson objected to the amendment, stressing that an effective training delivery system was critical for the implementation of the policies. There was no implication that governments should define strategies for the private sector and, in a number of countries, governments were working hand in hand with the private sector in providing training. The overwhelming majority of countries had supported the decision to include this particular provision, as reflected in Report IV(2).
- 231.** The Government member of the Philippines, referring to D.25, proposed a subamendment to include the words “the development of” after the word “facilitate”, to capture the concerns of the employers.
- 232.** Following a point of order raised by the Employer Vice-Chairperson, and a separate clarification from the Government member of Switzerland to which the Chairperson responded in the affirmative, the Government members of Mali, South Africa, Suriname, Switzerland and Trinidad and Tobago did not support the amendment.
- 233.** Noting the responses of many governments and in the interest of time, the Employer Vice-Chairperson withdrew the amendment.

D.25

- 234.** The Government member of the Netherlands, speaking on behalf of the Government members of Australia, Belgium, Canada, Denmark, Finland, France, Greece, Japan, Netherlands, New Zealand, Norway, Portugal, Switzerland, Turkey, United Kingdom and the United States, introduced an amendment which sought to express the importance of the private sector in training. The Employer Vice-Chairperson supported the amendment.
- 235.** The Worker Vice-Chairperson proposed a subamendment to replace the phrase “facilitate appropriate” by “ensure the development of”. The Employer Vice-Chairperson wished to retain the word “appropriate” and opposed this subamendment.
- 236.** The Government members of Australia, Canada, Mali, Namibia, Saudi Arabia and Trinidad and Tobago supported the amendment as originally put forward.
- 237.** Noting the overwhelming support of the word “appropriate”, the Worker Vice-Chairperson proposed a second subamendment which would include “appropriate”, but retain the remainder of the first subamendment.
- 238.** The Government member of the Netherlands, opposing this further subamendment, pointed out that the word “ensure” was too strong and supported the wording of the amendment.
- 239.** The Government member of Ecuador proposed a third subamendment to include the words “national necessities” after “appropriate”, as national conditions and practices differed.
- 240.** The Government member of Indonesia proposed a fourth subamendment to combine the amendment proposed by the Government member of the Netherlands and the subamendment proposed by the Worker members so that the new text would read:

“facilitate the development of an appropriate training delivery system consistent with national conditions and practices”. Both the Employer and Worker Vice-Chairpersons agreed.

241. The amendment was adopted as subamended.

D.47

242. The Worker Vice-Chairperson introduced an amendment to add a new clause to Point 6 addressing the issue of career guidance and its importance to lifelong learning. The amendment was subamended by the Worker Vice-Chairperson, deleting a number of phrases from the amendment including, “career development services”, “career education, career counselling” and replacing “all have a crucial role in fostering a career development culture, which promotes lifelong learning” by “which promotes a lifelong learning culture” at the end of the sentence. The Worker Vice-Chairperson felt that it was important to treat this subject in Point 6 as knowledge of the job market and the suitability of available jobs was a crucial component in assisting the process of lifelong learning.

243. The Employer Vice-Chairperson noted that career guidance was addressed in Point 10(j) and did not support its inclusion in Point 6.

244. The Worker Vice-Chairperson remarked that Point 10(j) dealt only with career guidance for employed workers, and that ensuring that a person was trained would be insufficient to provide access to the labour market.

245. While agreeing in principle, the Government member of the United Kingdom remarked that the issue of career guidance and counselling was extensively addressed in Point 19(a) of the Office text and suggested that the issue could be left for a later debate.

246. As a result, the Worker Vice-Chairperson withdrew the amendment, as subamended, noting that the proposed text of the amendment would be discussed later under Point 19(a).

D.48

247. The Worker Vice-Chairperson, in introducing an amendment to clause (f), proposed a subamendment in which the following text was added at the end of the first sentence – “With special emphasis on disadvantaged groups to ensure that access to education and training is not denied due to financial reasons.” – with the remaining text of the amendment to be deleted. This would expand upon the Office text by emphasizing the important role of governments to facilitate access to education and initial training by disadvantaged groups.

248. The Employer Vice-Chairperson remarked that the issue of disadvantaged groups was dealt with later in the proposed Conclusions and should not be included in Point 6. He did, however, feel that the sentence in the amendment beginning with the words “Qualified teachers and trainers” could usefully be inserted after the Office text and proposed a second subamendment along these lines, with the insertion of the words “Recognizing that” before the sentence to provide a transition. The last sentence on teachers’ conditions was better left for negotiations between governments and teachers’ organizations.

249. The Worker Vice-Chairperson agreed that the issue of special groups could be addressed in subsequent points. She welcomed the Employer Vice-Chairperson’s inclusion of the sentence dealing with the need for qualified teaching personnel but noted that the final sentence of the proposed amendment dealing with the potential constraints on seeking

qualified teaching personnel was also crucial. Additionally, the word “basic” should be deleted from the Office text before “education”.

- 250.** The Employer Vice-Chairperson stressed that it was important to retain the word “basic” as well as the term “initial training” or “pre-employment training”, and that he opposed the inclusion of the last sentence of the proposed amendment as the text should be kept succinct.
- 251.** The Government members of Australia and Poland also wished to retain the word “basic”, the former referring to Report IV(1) in which this terminology was well defined and meant to refer to more than just primary education. Moreover, the text should not create an open-ended obligation for governments, while the latter cited examples from her country in support of national policies on this issue as important determinants.
- 252.** The Worker Vice-Chairperson proposed a third subamendment to delete the final sentence of the proposed amendment, provided the words “working under conditions of decent work” be inserted after the words “Qualified teachers and trainers” in the preceding sentence, and retain the word “basic”.
- 253.** The Government members of Brazil, Finland, France, Indonesia and South Africa adhered to the position of the Worker Vice-Chairperson to delete reference to the word “basic”, citing variously clarity of the text, government responsibility for more than just basic education, and the fact that the text refers to primary responsibility only.
- 254.** The Government member of Thailand, supported by the Government members of Ireland and Namibia concurred on this point, and went further to propose a fourth subamendment to delete the word “initial” before “training”, since governments also had some responsibilities beyond initial training.
- 255.** The Employer Vice-Chairperson questioned the deletion of the word “initial”, as governments would have to take full responsibility for all types of training. The Government member of Switzerland shared the concerns of the Employer Vice-Chairperson. If the word “initial” was eliminated, the responsibilities of the Governments would go too far.
- 256.** In reply to a request for clarification, the deputy representative of the Secretary-General noted that “initial training” referred to “pre-employment training”; Report IV(1) discussed the issue of “pre-employment training” in detail.
- 257.** The Government members of the Congo, India and Turkey supported the retention of both the words “basic” and “initial”. The Government member of the Philippines noted that it was the Government’s mandate to ensure basic education and initial training. She urged the Drafting Committee, however, to settle on either the word “fundamental” or “key” regarding “teachers and trainers are”.
- 258.** The Worker Vice-Chairperson agreed with the argument of the Government member of Finland that the words “primary responsibility” qualified government responsibilities. In any case, the Universal Declaration of Human Rights adopted by the United Nations spoke of provision of basic and secondary education. Nowadays, given rapid technological change, primary education was not enough to face the demands of the labour market. The government did not have to assume responsibility for all forms of training but it did have responsibility for pre-employment training, which was key for entering the labour market. These issues were important and consistent with the past debate on clause (a).

-
- 259.** The Employer Vice-Chairperson accepted the omission of the word “basic” and the use of the words: “education and pre-employment training”. However, the government’s responsibility ended when the person entered the labour market. He also proposed a fifth subamendment to replace the words “conditions of decent work” by “decent conditions”.
- 260.** The Worker Vice-Chairperson agreed to remove the word “basic”, from the subamendment but did not agree with the replacement of the words “conditions of decent work”. Decent work was a familiar term endorsed by all ILO constituents, whereas “decent conditions” could raise the question of the meaning of “indecent conditions”.
- 261.** The Government members of Belgium, France, Papua New Guinea, Portugal and Thailand supported the amendment, as subamended.
- 262.** After requesting to know the position of Government members in support of and opposed to retention of the word “basic”, the Government member of Australia, reiterated for the record, his opposition to its removal from the clause.
- 263.** The amendment was adopted as subamended.

D.4

- 264.** This amendment was not considered.

D.6

- 265.** This amendment was withdrawn.

D.14

- 266.** The Government member of Switzerland speaking also on behalf of the Government members of Canada, Netherlands and Switzerland, introduced an amendment to delete clause (g). In addition to adding more text to the proposed Conclusions, the clause tended to give a “blank cheque” by assigning too much responsibility to governments. A request was made for examples of “other forms of training”. The deputy representative of the Secretary-General noted that this clause was based on the responses to the questionnaire, and could refer to other forms of training such as investment in the workplace learning.
- 267.** The Employer Vice-Chairperson agreed with the intent of the Government member of Switzerland but did not support the amendment. For the reasons mentioned earlier, the next amendment proposed to replace the words “invest in” by the word “enhance”. The Worker Vice-Chairperson agreed and indicated support for the next amendment to be introduced by the Employer Vice-Chairperson.
- 268.** The Government members of Israel, Portugal, Suriname and Thailand indicated support for the subamendment that would be put forward by the Employer Vice-Chairperson, variously noting examples of other forms of training, and retraining for those who are unemployed, and anticipatory training in those sectors or enterprises that were restructured.
- 269.** Expressing her surprise over governments’ support for funding of uncertain forms of training, the Government member of Switzerland noted that she would have preferred to delete this clause, but accepted to withdraw the amendment.

D.62

- 270.** The Employer Vice-Chairperson introduced an amendment to replace the word “invest“ by “enhance”. By using the word “enhance”, new methods of learning such as distance learning could be encompassed, and governments could concentrate on promotional action rather than taking on the sole responsibility for new forms of learning.
- 271.** The Worker Vice-Chairperson supported the amendment, which was adopted.

D.49

- 272.** The Worker Vice-Chairperson introduced an amendment stressing the responsibility of Governments for a general economic environment as well as the need for incentives to motivate individuals to participate in education and training. She proposed a subamendment to replace the second and third sentence with the following phrase: “To ensure sufficient investment in education and training, additional mechanisms can include: establishment of training funds, tax rebates, tax credits or a levy system accompanied by public grants.” Training funds were widely established in European countries. Other countries had other forms of incentives, for instance, Singapore’s Skills Development Fund which had a disbursement scheme that enhanced investment in training by enterprises. The biggest challenge was to find a way to ensure training in small and medium-sized enterprises. The Government member of India supported the subamendment proposed by the Workers’ group.
- 273.** The Employer Vice-Chairperson agreed to the first sentence along with a second subamendment to add after the word “enterprises” the words “and individuals”. It was unnecessary to list all the mechanisms, as these were already included in the *Conclusions concerning human resources training and development*, of the International Labour Conference at its 88th Session (2000). The core concept to recommend to Governments was that of incentives to motivate enterprises and individuals. There was a difference between individuals’ investing in training and being motivated to take advantage of opportunities; shared responsibility was important. The Government member of Gabon agreed that it was vital to motivate individuals to help finance their own training.
- 274.** The Government members of Ireland, Namibia, Papua New Guinea, Philippines, United Kingdom and the United States supported the subamendment proposed by the Employer Vice-Chairperson. Arguments advanced in support included the fact that listing mechanisms might give the impression that the list was exhaustive, and that it was important to state individuals’ responsibility to be active stakeholders.
- 275.** The Worker Vice-Chairperson then proposed a third subamendment to delete the second sentence as it could be covered elsewhere, to delete the words “and individuals” and to replace the words “participate in” by “make use of opportunities offered”. This subamendment was made in light of the previously adopted Preamble, and because the same opportunities were not available to all workers.
- 276.** The Employer Vice-Chairperson welcomed the text which reflected responsibilities for both enterprises and individuals but proposed a fourth subamendment to include the text: “and individuals to develop their own abilities and careers” based on the amended text adopted in Point 3. The Worker Vice-Chairperson finally agreed to support the Employer’s subamendment as re-read by the secretariat.
- 277.** The Chairperson noted a broad agreement in the meaning of the text, and declared that the amendment was adopted as subamended.

D.65

- 278.** The Employer Vice-Chairperson introduced an amendment to delete clause (i) as the substance was already captured in the amended clause (b), which no longer mentioned the involvement of social partners. The Government member of Papua New Guinea supported the amendment.
- 279.** The Worker Vice-Chairperson objected to the amendment and expressed the wish to retain the clause as social dialogue was a key principle of the ILO. The reference to social dialogue in clause (b) was only for a guiding framework and strategies, thus it was still important to retain clause (i) which highlighted broader principles.
- 280.** The Government members of Cameroon, Greece, Ireland, Mali and Portugal opposed the deletion of clause (i). Social dialogue was a principal tool for achieving all other training policies and the reference in clause (i) was complementary to that in clause (b). Its retention would fit with amendments still to be discussed. The Government member of France also supported retention of the clause for the same reasons, and proposed a subamendment to add the word “international” in front of “national” in the brackets.
- 281.** In light of the views expressed, the Employer Vice-Chairperson withdrew the amendment.

D.50

- 282.** The Worker Vice-Chairperson introduced an amendment to strengthen social dialogue and collective bargaining on training. She then proposed a subamendment to delete the words “and qualifications”, and to insert the word “international” as suggested in the previous discussion, and to delete the entire remaining sentences. Training clauses, based on tripartite partnership, were increasing, and Report IV(1) made clear the important role of collective bargaining to ensure training.
- 283.** The Employer Vice-Chairperson proposed a subamendment to delete the words “collective bargaining” and the bracketed text “(national, regional local, sectoral, enterprise)”. One of the outcomes of social dialogue could be collective agreement but it should not be the only focus, and leaving the level open reflected the differences among countries and situations, including the fact that social dialogue was mainly for the social partners.
- 284.** The Worker Vice-Chairperson objected to the subamendment from the Employer Vice-Chairperson, stating that it was puzzling given the level of agreement on the importance of collective bargaining. Collective bargaining was a mechanism for discussion and problem-solving between social partners, a mechanism through which governments could assist by helping the partners to strengthen the process of collective bargaining.
- 285.** The Government members of Botswana, Brazil, Ecuador, Greece, Malawi, Portugal and Switzerland supported the retention of the words “collective bargaining” as a part of social dialogue. It brought more precision and strength to the term “social dialogue”, and could be important in sectoral social dialogue especially in strengthening competitiveness.
- 286.** The Government members of Finland, India, Indonesia, Japan, Namibia, Papua New Guinea, Philippines and Suriname supported the subamendment by the Employer Vice-Chairperson to delete the words “collective bargaining”. For some, the Office’s original version was preferable, but for most the addition of collective bargaining did not add much to the term “social dialogue”. Training was not just for organized workers but for unorganized workers as well, and it was difficult to see how collective bargaining could address problems of the latter category which was growing. For this reason, the term

“collective negotiations” was preferable to “collective bargaining” and was proposed as a second subamendment by the Government member of the Philippines. The Government member of Papua New Guinea concurred with the overall view, but wished to see the word “international” inserted in the text.

- 287.** While supporting inclusion of collective bargaining in social dialogue, the Government member of France proposed a third subamendment to replace the words “different levels” by “all levels”. The Employer Vice-Chairperson supported the subamendment.
- 288.** Accepting the point of the Government member of the Philippines, the Worker Vice-Chairperson agreed to support “collective negotiations” if this would help achieve a compromise, but again drew the distinction between a weak and vague reference to social dialogue and collective bargaining which could be useful for a range of issues, including enterprise restructuring and performance-related pay.
- 289.** Following an indicative poll in which a clear majority of Government members expressed a preference for not retaining the words “collective bargaining”, the Worker Vice-Chairperson noted considerable government support to include collective bargaining in another context, and the reference to “international”, and agreed to withdraw the amendment.

D.13

- 290.** The Government member of Portugal introduced an amendment on behalf of the Government members of France and Portugal which sought to recognize the fact that social dialogue also took place at international levels.
- 291.** The Employer Vice-Chairperson did not support the amendment. Section III of the proposed Conclusions was about national policies, and was supposed to be treated as a Recommendation to individual national governments. Either all the words in the brackets should be deleted or the text should remain as it was. The Government member of Japan supported this position, noting that while there was general consensus on the need to strengthen social dialogue on training, the concern of the Employers’ group was whether this could be done internationally.
- 292.** On the contrary, the Worker Vice-Chairperson supported the amendment, arguing that inclusion of the word “international” was appropriate, as exchanges of experiences, benchmarking and international cooperation were very important for developing countries. The Government members of Cameroon, Congo, France, India, Malawi, Mali, Indonesia, Namibia, Papua New Guinea and Switzerland also supported the amendment for the same reasons raised by the Worker Vice-Chairperson. In addition, some of the developing countries noted that they engage with international financial institutions and that a reference to social dialogue in this context could help a great deal. Arguments were made that, as social dialogue contributes to the mobility of workers, it could be done at the national as well as international levels. The ILO was seen as an example of how social dialogue could take place at an international level.
- 293.** In his counter-argument the Employer Vice-Chairperson pointed out that the arguments presented by the different Government members were different from social dialogue at international levels which seemed to refer more to international cooperation. He was against making reference to strengthening social dialogue at international levels. The Government member of the Philippines suggested to reconsider this issue in section XII, of the proposed Conclusions but this suggestion was not favoured by the Government member of Switzerland.

294. Following an indicative poll in which a clear majority of governments supported inclusion of the word “international”, the Employer Vice-Chairperson noted this majority and while maintaining his opposition to the amendment, agreed to withdraw his subamendments.

295. The amendment was adopted as subamended.

D.22

296. The Government member of Greece, on behalf of the Government members of Australia, Belgium, Canada, Denmark, Finland, France, Greece, Luxembourg, Netherlands, Norway, Portugal, Switzerland, United Kingdom and the United States, introduced an amendment adding a new clause to Point 6 to address the importance of promoting equal opportunities for men and women in education and training.

297. The Employer Vice-Chairperson, declaring support for the issue in principle, noted that it was addressed in Point 10(i) of the proposed Conclusions and, therefore, did not support its inclusion in Point 6.

298. The Worker Vice-Chairperson supported the amendment, stating that non-discrimination was an extremely important concern, as expressed in the Discrimination (Employment and Occupation) Convention, 1958 (No. 111). The Government members of France, Jamaica, Japan, Malawi, Mali, Philippines, Poland and South Africa, supported the amendment as introduced by the Government member of Greece.

299. The Government member of Malawi proposed a subamendment to include the word “youth” in the amendment. The Government member of the Philippines did not support the proposed subamendment as she felt that inclusion of the word “youth” would require the consideration of other disadvantaged groups for inclusion in the text. The Government member of France agreed, adding that issues concerned with access to education and training by special groups, including youth, were covered in subsequent points of the Office text. The Worker Vice-Chairperson concurred.

300. The Employer Vice-Chairperson reiterated the opinion that the text was better placed in Point 10(i) but, given the overwhelming support, he agreed to its inclusion in Point 6.

301. The amendment was adopted.

D.12

302. The Government member of France, speaking on behalf of the Government members of France and Portugal, introduced an amendment to specify groups with special needs under Point 6. Furthermore, she proposed a subamendment to include “youth” at the beginning of the specified list.

303. The Employer Vice-Chairperson argued that it was more appropriate to include the amendment under Point 12, which addressed the issue of groups with special needs.

304. The Worker Vice-Chairperson supported the amendment, as subamended. However, she proposed a second subamendment to add, after the words “education and training”, the following text: “and equality of opportunities to counter social exclusion of poor/disadvantaged groups, in particular low skilled workers, workers in the informal economy, youth, older workers, migrant workers and people with disabilities”. She emphasized the importance of consolidating the list of those with special needs, at the outset, in order to avoid repetition throughout the text. The list reflected the groups

referred to in the Human Resources Development Recommendation, 1975 (No.150). The Government members of Belgium, Malawi and South Africa supported the amendment, as subamended by the Worker Vice-Chairperson.

- 305.** The Government members of Australia, Canada, Greece, Japan, Mexico, Papua New Guinea, Switzerland and the United States supported the amendment, as subamended, by the Government members of France and Portugal.
- 306.** The Employer Vice-Chairperson agreed to the amendment, as subamended, by the Government members of France and Portugal, but proposed a third subamendment to include workers in small and medium-sized enterprises, the informal economy, the rural sector and self-employment. He also suggested a fourth subamendment to add the text: “Identification of these groups should be left to national law and circumstances”, as this list would differ from country to country.
- 307.** The Government member of France clarified that the word “notably” implied that the list was to be adapted to different national situations and also allowed for a certain degree of flexibility. She suggested retaining the original proposal with the subamendment to include the word “youth”.
- 308.** The Worker Vice-Chairperson supported the third subamendment put forward by the Employer Vice-Chairperson and proposed a fifth subamendment to include “older workers” in the list. She suggested a rewording of the fourth subamendment by the Employer Vice-Chairperson as follows: “Identification should be done at the national level”. The Employer Vice-Chairperson agreed.
- 309.** The Government member of Switzerland remarked that the intent of the amendment from the Government members of France and Portugal, to promote access to education and training for groups with special needs, was lost in the subamendments. She expressed her support of the original amendment, as subamended, to include the word “youth”, as did the Government members of Mexico and Portugal.
- 310.** The Employer Vice-Chairperson emphasized that the groups in his proposed subamendment were those with special needs, though these needs changed from country to country.
- 311.** The Government member of South Africa supported the amendment, as subamended, by the Employer Vice-Chairperson. People with special needs differed from country to country. In South Africa it was necessary to talk about people working in the rural sector as well as those who were self-employed. Since this section dealt with scope and definition, the inclusion of these groups was crucial. The Worker Vice-Chairperson agreed with the comments by the Employer Vice-Chairperson as well as by the Government member of South Africa, adding that these groups were particularly relevant for developing countries.
- 312.** The Chairperson noted majority support for the amendment, as subamended by the Government members of France and Portugal, the Employer Vice-Chairperson and the Worker Vice-Chairperson.
- 313.** The amendment was adopted as subamended.

D.51

- 314.** The Worker Vice-Chairperson introduced an amendment to reaffirm the need for government support for the social partners so that they could fully participate in education and training. There was also a need for supportive policies to help individuals to take full advantage of training and development opportunities.
- 315.** The Employer Vice-Chairperson acknowledged the two points raised: the need for support from governments and the need for other supportive policies. He proposed a subamendment to replace the words “employers’ organizations, trade unions and community organizations” by “social partners”, and to delete all the words appearing in brackets. It would be left to the Drafting Committee to decide whether the remaining text should appear as one clause or two. The Worker Vice-Chairperson and the Government members of the Philippines and South Africa supported the subamendment.
- 316.** The Government member of Switzerland did not support the subamendment, as it did not clarify the obligations of governments. The Government member of Canada agreed, proposing a second subamendment which would capture the essence of what the Employers’ and Workers’ groups had agreed on. This subamendment was not supported by the Employer or Worker Vice-Chairpersons, therefore, was not further considered.
- 317.** The amendment was adopted as subamended.

D.7

- 318.** Since the substance of this amendment was addressed by the subamendments to the previous amendment, D.51, it was withdrawn.

D.61

- 319.** The amendment, submitted by the Employer members, sought to change the ordering of the clauses under Point 6 to reflect the changes already made. The amendment was referred to the Drafting Committee.
- 320.** Point 6 was adopted as amended.

IV. Implementation of training policies

Point 7

D.82

- 321.** The Employer Vice-Chairperson introduced an amendment which sought to change the title of section IV to “Development and implementation of education and training policies”, to better reflect the content of the section.
- 322.** The Worker Vice-Chairperson supported the amendment and the title was adopted, as amended.

D.83

- 323.** The Employer Vice-Chairperson introduced an amendment to clarify the responsibilities of governments and the social partners. He proposed a subamendment to delete the words

“and flexible” and “basic” in the first sentence; replace the words “pre-employment learning and training” in the second sentence by “training of the unemployed”; and add to the end the words “and the role of social partners for further training.”.

324. The Worker Vice-Chairperson supported the amendment, as subamended, noting that it took into account the basic elements that Point 7 wished to articulate.

325. The Government member of Switzerland proposed a second subamendment to replace the word “training” in the second sentence by the words “pre-employment training”. Both the Employer and Worker Vice-Chairpersons supported this subamendment and the amendment was adopted, as subamended, recognizing that the Drafting Committee should review the text for final polishing.

D.119, D.115, D.120 and D.114

326. As a result of the adoption of amendment D.83 as subamended, the amendments were not considered.

327. Point 7 was adopted as amended.

Point 8

D.163

328. The Government member of Switzerland introduced an amendment, on behalf of the Government members of Austria, Belgium, Canada, Finland, Japan, Netherlands, New Zealand, Norway, Switzerland and the United Kingdom, to capture the importance of other interested parties in training issues. The Employer and Worker Vice-Chairpersons did not support the amendment, with the latter pointing out that reference to “dialogue” alone without “social” was vague and not consistent with ILO terminology.

329. The Government member of Switzerland insisted that it was not the intention of the Government members sponsoring the amendment to downplay the importance of the social partners or to endanger the role of social dialogue on education and training, but to simply make a clear reference to other interested parties. However, due to lack of support from both the Employer and Worker members, the amendment was not adopted.

D.81

330. The Employer Vice-Chairperson introduced an amendment to replace the word “promote” by “enhance”. Since the social partners recognized the relevance of social dialogue the word “promote” was not appropriate. The Worker Vice-Chairperson supported the amendment and it was adopted.

D.121

331. The Worker Vice-Chairperson introduced an amendment to refer to collective bargaining by reminding the Committee of an earlier discussion on social dialogue and collective bargaining under Point 6. Collective bargaining was essential to reach the goals of the instrument, and the principle must be endorsed for workers to meet their training needs. Collective bargaining agreements on training existed in many countries. To demonstrate the importance of this point, attention was drawn to the Right to Organise and Collective Bargaining Convention, 1949 (No. 98), which had been ratified by 152 member States. On

further reflection, however, reference to the issue of collective bargaining would be better placed in another section of the instrument, and the amendment was withdrawn.

D.112

332. The Government member of France introduced an amendment on behalf of the Government members of Belgium, Finland, France, Japan, Norway and the United States, to remove the reference to “equality of opportunity”. The adoption of amendment D.22 meant that the issue had been addressed elsewhere in the instrument.

333. The Employer Vice-Chairperson supported the amendment, emphasizing the importance of promoting equality of opportunity, but acknowledging the redundancy. The Worker Vice-Chairperson, noting that equal opportunity was such an importance issue, suggested that it could be reflected more than once in the new instrument, but agreed to support the amendment.

334. The amendment was adopted.

D.123 and D.122

335. The Worker Vice-Chairperson withdrew the amendments as their content had been captured in previous amendments.

D.124

336. The Worker Vice-Chairperson introduced an amendment to address the question of benchmarks for countries, proposing a subamendment to: include the words “education and” before the word “training”; replace the words “must be based on a series” by “should take into account”; and delete the words “and companies”.

337. The Employer Vice-Chairperson supported the amendment, as subamended.

338. The amendment was adopted as subamended.

339. Point 8 was adopted as amended.