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MINUTES OF THE 292ND SESSION OF THE GOVERNING BODY
OF THE INTERNATIONAL LABOUR OFFICE

Geneva, Tuesday, 22 to Thursday, 24 March 2005

First item on the agenda

APPROVAL OF THE MINUTES OF THE 291ST SESSION
OF THE GOVERNING BODY

(GB.292/1)

1. The Chairperson introduced document GB.291/PV/Draft, which contained the minutes of the 291st Session of the Governing Body and the decisions adopted by it. The Office had brought together in a single document all the information that it had hitherto presented in two separate documents entitled Minutes and Record of Decisions, respectively. The aim of this amalgamation was to make consultation easier. Debates were shown according to the order of agenda items and were followed by the relevant decisions. The Minutes could be consulted online once they had been adopted.

Governing Body decision:

2. The Governing Body approved the minutes of its 291st Session, as amended. (GB.292/1, paragraph 3.)

Second item on the agenda

DATE, PLACE AND AGENDA OF THE 96TH SESSION (2007)
OF THE INTERNATIONAL LABOUR CONFERENCE

(GB.292/2 (& Add.))

3. The Employer Vice-Chairperson welcomed the fact that so many interesting subjects were being proposed, even if that made the choice more difficult. To ensure that the content of the agenda for the 96th Session (2007) of the Conference would be attractive and balanced, he proposed that the Governing Body defer the decision on the agenda of the abovementioned session of the Conference to its 294th (November 2005) Session.

4. The Worker Vice-Chairperson was prepared to support deferral of the decision until the November session, on condition that consultations also included the elements contained in the addendum, namely “to consider whether and in what way the core missions of the ILO could be updated and reaffirmed in the light of the concept of decent work, with a view to enhancing their relevance and impact in the current context of economic globalization”. With regard to the other proposed items, the speaker stressed that the language in which they were couched had to be very precise. For example, he thought that the title of the item referring to the promotion of sustainable enterprises might suggest that a certain scaling down of standards for promoting employment was being advocated. Hence, the Workers’ group could support an item on this subject only if the promotion of sustainable enterprises was accompanied by the guarantee of decent work, thereby removing any doubts that the one might be achieved at the expense of the other. Although there were already six items, there might be a need for further discussion concerning the work on migration planned in the course of the year. However, if the Governments wished to open the debate now, the Workers’ group would state its position on each of the proposed items.
5. A Government representative of New Zealand, taking the floor on behalf of the Governments of Australia, New Zealand and the United Kingdom, reiterated the importance of linking International Labour Conference agenda proposals to the ILO’s strategic objectives. In her opinion, little would be gained by delaying the decision. The Governments on whose behalf she was speaking supported the following three items: skills for improved productivity, employment growth and development, an area in line with the ILO’s strategic objectives and the Decent Work Agenda; employment and social protection in the new demographic context; and the promotion of sustainable enterprises.

6. A Government representative of the United States thought that, if a decision was deferred until November, the constituents would have six months less to prepare for the discussions. However, if those six months were used to define more clearly what it was hoped to achieve by consideration of the five topics proposed, he would then be in agreement with deferral, while recognizing that all the topics were relevant. He would be prepared to select two items now and leave the third for discussion in November.

7. A Government representative of France understood that the reason which would justify deferral of the decision was the holding of consultations which appeared necessary in relation to the matter raised in paragraph 7 of the document, namely “in what way the essential missions of the ILO could be reaffirmed and updated in the light of the concept of decent work”. Without minimizing the importance of examining that subject, he wondered whether a decision should not be taken today on one or two of the listed technical items which had been prepared in detail. Accordingly, he endorsed the items concerning child labour and protection of young workers, and employment and social protection in the new demographic context.

8. A Government representative of Belgium agreed that the decision should be deferred until November, especially as the composition of the Governing Body would have been renewed by then. He did not wish to commit other constituents for a period in which Belgium would no longer be represented in the Governing Body.

9. A Government representative of Brazil supported the statement made by the Government representative of France. He considered that the time had come to choose one or two items and defer the decision on the third. Hence, adopting a coherent approach, he would support the items on child labour and protection of young workers, and employment and social protection in the new demographic context.

10. The Government representatives of Norway, Nigeria, Libyan Arab Jamahiriya, Germany and China agreed that adoption of the decision should be deferred until the November 2005 session of the Governing Body.

11. A Government representative of India said that the subjects chosen by his Government were as follows: skills for improved productivity, employment growth and development, for general discussion; gender equality in the world of work, for a general discussion based on an integrated approach; and promotion of sustainable enterprises, for general discussion.

12. A Government representative of Spain supported the following items, by order of priority: child labour and protection of young workers; skills for improved productivity, employment growth and development; and gender equality in the world of work.

13. A Government representative of Barbados, speaking on behalf of the Bahamas, Barbados and the English-speaking Caribbean, supported the items on gender equality in the world of work, on employment and social protection in the new demographic context, and on child labour and protection of young workers. However, to address those subjects, it would
also be necessary to consider the issue of employment creation and training at the same time. At all events, she was prepared to agree to the decision being deferred until November, if so agreed by the meeting.

14. A Government representative of El Salvador supported the following three points, by order of priority: child labour and protection of young workers, complementing the discussion which would be held on the promotion of employment for young people at the 2005 session of the International Labour Conference; skills for improved productivity, employment growth and development; and gender equality in the world of work.

15. A Government representative of the Russian Federation suggested that the second variant be chosen, namely selecting and placing two of the five proposed items on the agenda of the 96th Session (2007) of the International Labour Conference and deferring the decision on the third item until November. In that case, she would support the items on skills for improved productivity, employment growth and development, and employment and social protection in the new demographic context, since she thought that those two items covered all the proposals that had been made.

16. A Government representative of Italy supported the proposal to defer adoption of the decision until November 2005 and wished to emphasize that, in relation to defining the additional proposal, the subject of skills for improved productivity, employment growth and development was a crucial part of the Decent Work Agenda.

17. A Government representative of Japan also agreed that the decision be deferred until November 2005. He indicated that, if he had to support one proposal as being particularly important for his country, it would be the one on skills for improved productivity, employment growth and development, a subject closely linked to the Decent Work Agenda.

18. A representative of the Director-General confirmed that there was a substantial majority in favour of deferring adoption of the decision until November 2005. The Office would therefore launch a series of consultations with the Government group, the Employers’ group and the Workers’ group on all the items indicated, with a view to presenting a potential consensus proposal in November.

Governing Body decision:

19. The Governing Body decided:

- that the 96th (June 2007) Session of the International Labour Conference would be held in Geneva;

- to defer to its 294th (November 2005) Session the decision on the three proposals that would complete the agenda of the 96th (2007) Session of the International Labour Conference, in the light of the outcome of further consultations.

(GB.292/2, paragraphs 2 and 8.)


20. The Worker Vice-Chairperson referred to the importance of this session of the Conference, which certainly justified the expenditure involved. He was aware that measures were being
adopted with a view to achieving greater efficiency and he would appreciate the Governing Body being informed in March 2006, after the end of the Maritime Session of the Conference, of the initial results obtained after application of these measures.

21. The Employer Vice-Chairperson, recognizing that it was for the Governing Body to create the necessary conditions for that session to be held, announced that his group endorsed the point proposed for decision.

Governing Body decision:

22. The Governing Body decided that, subject to the approval of funding by the International Labour Conference in its decisions on the Programme and Budget for 2006-07, the 94th (Maritime) Session of the International Labour Conference would be held in Geneva from 7 to 23 February 2006. (GB.292/2/1, paragraph 8.)

Third item on the agenda

THE FUNCTIONING OF DECISION-MAKING BODIES

(a) The International Labour Conference

23. The Employer Vice-Chairperson stated the importance of ensuring that the International Labour Conference remained relevant, dynamic and had the greatest impact possible on the world of work. It was vital for preserving the Organization’s visibility and credibility.

24. If the ILO were to reflect the reality of the current labour situation, then the discussions that were going on during the Conference meetings could not function in the same way they had 50 years before. He called for greater use of modern technology, in particular with regard to the preparation of documents, which needed to be more concise and focused, and to the functioning of the technical committees, the need for which was not being called into question. Furthermore, the structure of the plenary sessions needed to be thoroughly overhauled, to avoid monologues being delivered to empty seats. During the discussion of the report presented by the Chairperson of the Governing Body and the Report of the Director-General, interventions should be strictly limited to the issue at hand and should not be diverted to national situations, which should be addressed at another time. The provisions in force did not make provision for reducing the duration of the Conference, but he recognized that it was very difficult for some participants to remain in Geneva for three weeks.

25. He suggested that, in the second week, interactive panels should be set up, with high representatives of governments, the employers and the workers, and, as the case might be, special guests in attendance, to examine a given issue or a national situation, along the lines of the Seventh European Regional Meeting. To enable the maximum number of speakers to take the floor, interventions should be grouped together by region, or certain statements should be presented in written form.

26. He proposed expanding on paragraph 23 of the document presented by the Office, to make it clear that the Governing Body should not simply limit itself to taking note of the improvements that had already been made but, in light of the discussions of the present meeting, the Office should be entrusted to implement various practical measures aimed at improving the functioning of the Conference.
27. The Worker Vice-Chairperson stated that, for workers around the world, the International Labour Conference was the most important body in terms of international relations and the only guarantee of a moral commitment by the employers, governments, non-governmental organizations and the trade unions themselves with regard to the value of work and its role as a basis for the development of people all over the world. The principle enshrined in the ILO Constitution that work was not a commodity, was as true today as it was in 1919.

28. It was extremely important that, as always been the case, the Conference should be held annually. It should be recalled that the Conference provided the workers with a place where they could meet with the political authorities and other social partners and a forum in which they could express, and have recorded, their views about the treatment they received in their home countries.

29. He asked the member countries to assist Worker delegates in travelling to Geneva, so that they might play an active part in the various activities that went on during the Conference. He recognized that it was difficult for some people to stay in Geneva for the whole three weeks. However, constituents should not be punished through the reduction of group meetings or others taking place as part of the Conference. The issues discussed by the tripartite delegations were of the utmost importance to the member countries and resulted in the adoption of measures leading to practical action. All participants should have the right to speak.

30. He recognized that, over the last few years, the Organization’s profile had been raised, thanks to the work of the Director-General, the staff of the Office and the successive Chairpersons of the Governing Body. The same should be achieved for the Conference. In this regard, he agreed with the Employer Vice-Chairperson in that public interest in the Conference needed to be heightened, without the whole process being turned into a meaningless spectacle in which certain serious issues were sidelined because they did not create enough excitement. There was clearly a need to manage available time better and make the Conference more efficient. Thus, for example, the delegates should not simply come prepared to read out a speech but to adopt decisions in the interest of the people they represented.

31. As to the proposal that, from June 2006, the Provisional Records should no longer be printed on a daily basis, he considered that this measure was not an improvement and was not viable, given the interest that the written record of the discussions always generated.

32. A Government representative of Ethiopia made a statement on behalf of the Government group. He pointed out that the most important challenge was finding a way to improve the quality of the participation of all constituents and implementing more effective arrangements. With regard to the plenary, he proposed that the Office should work closely with a team made up of Geneva-based representatives of the social partners and the Government group to address this issue in the run-up to the June session of the Governing Body and to seek practical solutions. Delegates should respect time limits on interventions.

33. The Government group requested the Office to improve the methodology employed with regard to the interactive discussion of the Global report. As to technical committees, he proposed that preparatory discussions be conducted on subjects that were to be studied in those committees, for example, by including such issues as extraordinary items on the agenda of the Governing Body’s committees. The number of committees and the agendas of the various meetings should remain flexible.

34. The Government group requested the Office to present a document on possible modifications that could be introduced with regard to the points mentioned above. As to the distribution of documentation, the Office was also requested to ensure that documents
were distributed in a timely and cost-effective manner. The Government group was in favour of limiting the number of side events and off-agenda activities to secure the smooth coordination of the Conference.

35. A Government representative of El Salvador, speaking on behalf of the Latin American and Caribbean Group (GRULAC), considered that the reduction in the duration of the Conference should not be carried out at the expense of the delegates’ interventions, but should instead be the result of the implementation of more efficient working methods. The necessary cuts contained in the Programme and Budget proposals for 2006-07 should not affect the publication of the Provisional Records, as this would make the plenary sessions even less efficient: it would no longer be possible to have immediate access to a written version of the speeches made by the delegates. He agreed that the number of technical committees should be limited to two and that side events should not be organized. In this respect, it would also be useful to encourage greater participation on the part of the Governments and the social partners in the consultation process and the completion of questionnaires leading to the elaboration of standards. He recommended improving the way in which technology was used to streamline the discussion of the amendments and subamendments that were presented to the committees.

36. GRULAC reiterated the need to continue with the efforts that had already been made to improve the working methods of the Conference Committee on the Application of Standards. The lack of objectivity and transparency affecting the process of selection and discussion of some individual cases meant that there was a risk that the Committee’s work might become politicized and that the credibility of the ILO’s regular supervisory system might be endangered. Another factor to be taken into consideration was the extra time spent dealing with such cases in the plenary, when an issue that had already been looked at by the Committee, but not resolved, had to be discussed further. GRULAC requested the Office, using the practices followed within other international organizations as a model, to prepare detailed proposals regarding the optimization of the work of the Conference and its committees.

37. A Government representative of Malawi noted that paragraph 3 of the document presented by the Office revealed that there was widespread dissatisfaction with the general debate in the plenary but few suggestions as to how the problems should be addressed. He also stated, as was indicated in paragraph 4, that the three groups wished to maintain plenary speeches, in spite of the lack of significant interest on the part of the delegates to listen to such presentations. He proposed that this practice, which was popular with politicians, should be maintained until such a time as it might be replaced by something more appropriate. As to the publication of the Provisional Records, he confirmed that the daily distribution of those documents was an essential part of the Conference because it made it possible to keep the authorities of each country informed about events at the Conference and to prepare replies to some of the queries that certain delegations put forward in their speeches.

38. A Government representative of India associated his country with the statement made on behalf of the Government group. He reiterated his delegation’s deep concern regarding the working methods of the Conference Committee on the Application of Standards and, in particular, the need for the criteria for selection of cases for discussion at that Committee to be more transparent and objective. Lack of transparency in the selection of countries had distorted the principle of tripartism, which was a cornerstone of the ILO, and had diluted the supervisory mechanism of the Conference Committee on the Application of Standards. The decision-making process should be entirely tripartite and the Governments should be given a role in the selection of cases for discussion.
39. The speaker considered that, as the report of the Committee of Experts on the Application of Conventions and Recommendations was presented to the Governing Body at its March session, the Governing Body was the appropriate forum in which to achieve a tripartite consensus on the selection of the cases to be discussed by the Conference Committee on the Application of Standards. The Governing Body would not only generate transparency but would also provide countries with adequate time to prepare their respective responses to the Conference Committee on the Application of Standards.

40. A representative of the Director-General, summing up the discussion, proposed that, at the end of the point for decision an addition should be made to read: “and request the Office to examine and propose other practical measures”. He was confident that a solution to the problem of constituents addressing empty rooms could be found. On this and other issue, he proposed that, in March 2006, the Office should present the Governing Body with a paper containing proposals regarding further improvements to the functioning of the Conference and that, in the meantime, consultations should be held with the groups on that matter.

41. The Chairperson proposed to replace the word “improvements” in the point for decision by “changes”.

**Governing Body decision:**

42. The Governing Body took note of the changes in the functioning of the International Labour Conference and requested the Office to examine and propose other practical measures. (GB.292/3/1, paragraph 23 and summary by the Chairperson.)

(b) The Governing Body (GB.292/3/2)

43. The Employer Vice-Chairperson agreed that the Governing Body should be responsible for the governance of the Organization. It was logical that discussions of a political nature, which reflected the reality of the problems regarding policies on employment, social protection, the growth of investment and the creation of enterprises, should be carried out within that body. There was a need to continue to seek a way of improving management of both time and priorities, in order that the Governing Body could better deal with the issues at hand.

44. He had certain reservations as to the length and number of documents that needed to be discussed in a brief period of time. He also asked for a certain amount of flexibility when discussing those documents and referred to the case of the document on developments in the United Nations which had previously been presented as an information document and which, given the way in which relations between the ILO and the United Nations were evolving, now merited consideration as a point for discussion.

45. The Governments frequently claimed that their chances of speaking during the Governing Body plenary were limited. He believed that this situation could be resolved in part if the Governments were to decide to express themselves through spokespersons who would set out the consensus opinions of each of the various groups.

46. He supported the proposal made by the Government representative of India, to the effect that, during its March meeting, the Governing Body could explore which cases should be dealt with subsequently by the Conference Committee on the Application of Standards. This search for transparency, applied in this case to the Conference, might also have repercussions within the Governing Body. Thus, the question arose as to whether the
current method employed to discuss the report of the Committee on Freedom of Association, which involved the Reporter presenting the report and speaking officially on behalf of the Committee, the Employers’ and Workers’ representatives then taking the floor and, finally, the Chairperson submitting each case for consideration prior to a new discussion, was the best way of proceeding or not.

47. The speaker also wondered whether it was necessary for all the committees meeting in March, to do so in November as well and whether, each time that a meeting was organized, it was truly responding to a need to discuss a previously established agenda. He insisted on the need for greater flexibility when supporting those activities most in need of assistance through the provision of the necessary resources at the right moment and that those resources that could be assigned to other areas and those savings that might have been made elsewhere should be channeled towards technical cooperation activities. An effort should be made to ensure that certain activities were not perpetuated merely through force of habit, or simple resistance to change.

48. The Worker Vice-Chairperson pointed out that his group was very much aware of the need for discipline when making presentations or intervening in a discussion. He, himself, had attempted to reduce the length of his own submissions so that the representatives of the other groups could take the floor in a truly interactive discussion. In this regard, he stressed that his group not only spoke for the Workers but was equally committed to the countries it represented as a whole.

49. Referring to the document presented by the Office, he agreed that efforts to improve time management should be continued, and repetitive or congratulatory statements, or statements on non-substantial issues should be avoided. A way also needed to be found to reduce the volume of documents, without sight being lost of the fact that the documents, which must be clear, concise and focused, should continue to present a full description of the various issues at hand. Documents produced by important organizations like the ILO had value beyond the immediate and the short term, and, given this fact, should not be discarded simply because they did not contain a decision. He agreed that the various documents might be marked with a symbol indicating which of them were for action, policy guidance or information. He was also in favour of the minutes of the Governing Body sessions being more of a summary record than a verbatim transcript of the interventions, as long as the essence of each of those interventions was put across.

50. With regard to the function and structure of the committees, his group welcomed the fact that the technical committees were now being used as decision-making committees, as was the case with the Technical Cooperation Committee. There was also a possibility that the activities of some of the committees or bodies overlapped, as for example in the case of the Committee on Employment and Social Policy and the Working Party on the Social Dimension of Globalization; or the Technical Cooperation Committee and the Committee on Legal Issues and International Labour Standards. In order to save time and in the interest of greater efficiency, the issues dealt with by each committee should be more clearly defined.

51. As to the proposal put forward by the Government representative of India that the selection of cases for discussion by the Conference Committee on the Application of Standards should be left in the hands of the Governing Body, he did not believe that it was up to the Governing Body to make pronouncements regarding issues which fell within the remit of the International Labour Conference. To proceed in such a fashion would result in the Conference Committee on the Application of Standards functioning in the same way as the Committee on Freedom of Association and the Workers did not wish to lose what had historically been a forum where they had the opportunity to bring a certain number of cases to the attention of the world at large.
52. He supported the statement made by the Government representative of Malawi. Once the meetings came to an end, the members of the Governing Body could be sure that it had played its part as an oversight committee, within its wider role as an executive board.

53. A Government representative of Ethiopia made a statement on behalf of the Government group. Any reform of the Governing Body must focus on the authority of the Governing Body as a decision-making organ. With regard to the functioning and structure of the committees, their agendas should be directly related to the governance of the Governing Body. This meant that debates on similar subjects in the past should be taken into account; agenda items should be grouped into items for information and items for decision; committee officers should consult with government coordinators and, to make this idea workable, draft agendas should be presented beforehand, so that they could be discussed in each regional group or Government group before decisions were reached.

54. Regarding the distribution of documents, the Office was requested to ensure that all documents were circulated, when practicable, at least four weeks prior to the Governing Body. In this regard, greater use needed to be made of information technology concerning the delivery, printing and circulation of documents. He trusted that efforts would continue to be made with regard to adequate time management. The Government group agreed that the mandate of the Committee on Sectoral and Technical Meetings and Related Issues should be widened to cover social dialogue, and that the Committee on Employment and Social Policy should deal with social protection, as was currently the case. As to the Committee on Technical Cooperation, the group welcomed a discussion on modalities for improved functioning. He recognized the need for inter-session, informal consultations to secure more efficient discussions in the Governing Body and the committees, on the condition that the constituents understood that the Government group required time to consult with capitals. The Government group could not accept any agreements reached through consultations from which it was excluded. He endorsed paragraph 26 on the understanding that the search for improvements to the functioning of the Governing Body should continue.

55. A Government representative of Malawi stated that his country’s Government supported the statement made by the Government group. Referring to the document presented by the Office, he said that his Government had taken note of the emphasis that paragraphs 3-5 placed on governance as the main function of the Governing Body, which should fully exercise its role as the highest decision-making body of the Organization between sessions of the International Labour Conference. Change was a never-ending process and there was nothing more important than continuous improvement in whatever was being done. In this regard, it was essential that both the Office and the Governing Body continued to identify improvements in the functioning of the Governing Body.

Governing Body decision:

56. The Governing Body took note of the improvements in the functioning of the Governing Body and requested the Director-General to pursue their implementation, taking into account any further views expressed. (GB.292/3/2, paragraph 26.)
Fourth item on the agenda

REVIEW OF ANNUAL REPORTS UNDER THE FOLLOW-UP TO THE ILO DECLARATION ON FUNDAMENTAL PRINCIPLES AND RIGHTS AT WORK (GB.292/4)

57. The Worker Vice-Chairperson congratulated the governments of countries which had ratified some of the ILO fundamental Conventions during the previous year, and encouraged those countries where ratification had not yet taken place to do the same. Countries wishing to be part of the ILO supervisory bodies, such as the Committee on Freedom of Association, should obligatorily have ratified the Conventions on those subjects themselves. However, ratification was not sufficient in itself. The focus had to be on compliance with the obligations arising from the Conventions, and governments therefore had to harmonize their legislation with the provisions of international instruments. Governments needed to be fully aware of the fact that conformity of national law and practice with the ILO Conventions did not constitute a prerequisite for the ratification thereof, but could rather be a consequence of ratification. The speaker, concerned because forced labour appeared to be the order of the day in various countries, appealed to the countries concerned to examine their respective situations and rectify them if appropriate.

58. Quoting a few sentences from paragraph 19 of the Introduction by the Expert-Advisers, the speaker had the impression that governments and donors appeared to be losing interest in issues relating to freedom of association, the right to organize and the right to collective bargaining, and seemed to be disregarding the supervisory role required here. That was a source of concern. He pointed out to the Office that, if such a trend became widespread, it might undermine the nature and purpose of the annual reports. So how could certain governments reply to the Office that there had been no change when there was clearly an enormous need for change?

59. Information had to reach the constituents in a comprehensible form. He understood that the methodology had changed for financial reasons but this did not have to be at the expense of the constituents’ understanding of the subjects raised. For example, what were the Expert-Advisers referring to when they said in paragraph 23 of the Introduction that there was a need for “information that is different from that provided under the supervisory system”? Why did the ILO have to obtain information outside the mechanisms which it had established for that purpose? The Workers’ group was opposed to any watering down of the methods used by the ILO to find out what was happening in the countries. This had also been made clear by the Workers when they were fighting for the elimination of child labour in all its forms, not just the worst ones.

60. Finally, the speaker emphasized the need for technical cooperation to be recognized as a crucial part of the assistance provided by the ILO to member States to help them apply the core labour standards and fundamental principles and rights at work. He proposed that support be given to governments which were making real efforts to bring their law and practice into line with ILO instruments. The Introduction by the Expert-Advisers did not show clearly what each country was doing. Annual reports could only be consulted on the public web site. The speaker proposed that, in order to give more effective assistance to each country, information be presented in relation to countries, not to groups of Conventions.

61. The Employer Vice-Chairperson welcomed the fact that the number of countries presenting reports had increased. The ILO Declaration was of the utmost importance for the Employers’ group, which had promoted its adoption with conviction and enthusiasm. He recalled that the fundamental aim of the Declaration was to promote respect for
fundamental principles and rights at work in countries which had not ratified the relevant Conventions. Ratification was a way to implement standards and for that purpose there were precise supervisory mechanisms at the ILO. But what led to the implementation of principles were forms of conduct, and the relevance of the examination by the Expert-Advisers lay in the fact that it was based on knowledge of national contexts and realities, and the report presentation procedure had to retain its voluntary nature.

62. The solution to the problems lay, in the context of the Declaration, in strong support for technical cooperation. This was the way ahead for Governing Body discussions to achieve greater cohesion and closer coordination between the global and the annual follow-up to the Declaration. Efforts had to be made here as a matter of urgency, as suggested by the data contained in table 4 of the Introduction. Referring to export processing zones, the speaker recognized that they might entail problems but also provided opportunities and that, ultimately, the prime objective was progress.

63. A Government representative of Barbados, speaking on behalf of the English-speaking Caribbean, noted that, in paragraph 5 of the Introduction, the need to promote fundamental rights and economic development together was emphasized. Obviously, employment itself had to precede employment rights. She welcomed the fact that Trinidad and Tobago had ratified the Minimum Age Convention, 1973 (No. 138), in 2004, thus bringing the region closer to achieving 100 per cent ratification of the core Conventions. The ILO’s work on child labour had awakened fresh awareness in the region and led many countries to redefine the definition of child labour. In paragraph 228 of the Introduction, Saint Kitts and Nevis, Saint Lucia and Saint Vincent and the Grenadines were listed among the countries which had requested technical cooperation from the ILO to achieve effective abolition of child labour. The speaker repeated the request made by those countries and asked that it be given favourable consideration during the next biennium. In light of the comments made in paragraphs 23 and 28 of the Introduction, she supported the recommendations in paragraphs 30 and 31.

64. A representative of the Director-General assured the Worker Vice-Chairperson that the Expert-Advisers had never intended to water down the ILO supervisory mechanism, something which, in any case, would be impossible. Paragraph 23 reflected the explanation given by the Legal Adviser in 1998 on the nature of the follow-up in countries which had not ratified some of the ILO fundamental Conventions. It was not a question of making comparisons between countries or of drawing up some kind of “blacklist”. The aim was merely to measure the progress made by a given country compared to its previous situation. Once the information from governments and employers’ and workers’ organizations had been collected, countries indicated the measures they intended to take and the needs and possibilities for technical cooperation. This was the underlying idea in paragraphs 30 and 31 of the Introduction.

65. Following the experience accumulated in five years of follow-up to the Declaration, it was now very important that the ILO achieve greater cohesion between the following three elements: the Global Report and the way in which it was used for analysing experiences and defining programmes of action; the annual report process; and the action programmes which were presented to the Governing Body through the Committee on Technical Cooperation. Maintaining cohesion between these three key components was fundamental to the report process and the way ahead for the Office’s activities. They would also be essential elements in any review of the functioning of the follow-up mechanisms of the Declaration.

66. The speaker recalled that in 1998, a meeting of experts was held on export processing zones. He referred anyone interested in discussing the matter to the conclusions of that report that indicated the conditions under which export processing zones could be
mainstreamed into the economic development of a country, and also the negative aspects, the impact of which needed to be minimized.

67. A Government representative of Malawi noted that the independent examination conducted by the Expert-Advisers had intended to go beyond information and legislation to consider realities through national policies, programmes and institutions and thus be able to implement measures in the spirit of the Declaration. The situation described in paragraph 5 of the Introduction was alarming. It was a warning against the danger of growing insecurity in employment leading those in positions of power to deny fundamental principles and rights at work. It was now more necessary than ever to work together on both rights and development.

68. It would appear that the developing countries now had less power in the world than some decades previously. It was as if they had been denied a say in the management of the global economy and the control of private economic and financial forces. The prevalent views on trade, the free circulation of capital, deregulation of financial markets or the increase in competition through cuts in labour costs had direct and indirect consequences, because of their global scale, for the principles and rights outlined in the ILO Declaration. Public policies now had such an obligation to create attractive conditions for investors and financial markets that the financial sectors seemed to be more powerful than the productive sectors of the economy and the other sectors and institutions of society. Owners of capital and managers seemed to have more power over workers and employees, and the same thing seemed to be happening between employers’ organizations and trade unions. This situation was therefore a real threat to the principles and rights set out in the Declaration.

69. An organization was therefore needed which gave a voice to both those who were in power and those who were not, and which could provide dialogue, reform and cooperation between and within countries. The ILO was such an organization.

70. The speaker supported the recommendations in paragraphs 30 and 31 of the Introduction.

Governing Body decision:

71. The Governing Body examined the Introduction by the ILO Declaration Expert-Advisers to the compilation of annual reports and adopted the appropriate decisions on the recommendations in paragraphs 30 and 31 of the Introduction. (GB.292/4, paragraph 4.)

Fifth item on the agenda

REPORT AND CONCLUSIONS OF THE
SEVENTH EUROPEAN REGIONAL MEETING
(BUDAPEST, 14-18 FEBRUARY 2005)
(GB.292/5)

72. A representative of the Director-General said that the Seventh European Regional Meeting had been preceded by a series of consultations with the tripartite constituents and with the Governments of Hungary and Luxembourg, which had led to the Director-General’s proposal to the Governing Body in November 2003 to hold the Meeting in Budapest in February 2005.

73. During the consultations the constituents had requested the Office to present a thematic report on the following four items of extreme relevance in Europe and Central Asia: youth employment, flexibility in the labour markets, labour migration and sustainability of
pension schemes. They had also asked the Office to look for new formats for the Meeting to achieve greater interactivity. A high-level panel on social dialogue and globalization, an informal ministerial meeting dealing with the follow-up to the report of the World Commission on the Social Dimension of Globalization and the thematic discussions on the abovementioned items had been held, each of the latter being opened with a keynote speech and comprising a tripartite panel.

74. Globalization and regional integration in Europe offered the space for a wider political discussion between prime ministers, ministers from various departments and employers’ and workers’ representatives in the context of the Decent Work Agenda. The meeting of east and west in the capital of a Central European member State was a further building block in the construction of a common future.

75. The Seventh European Regional Meeting was attended by 46 tripartite delegations from 50 countries and representatives of 30 ministers. The European Union was represented by Mr. Jean-Claude Juncker, President of the Council of Ministers, and Mr. Vladimir Spidla, European Commissioner for Employment, Social Affairs and Equal Opportunities.

76. The Meeting received wide coverage in the media, thanks to the policy of the ILO Department of Communication. That was an important aspect, as Regional Meetings offered a unique opportunity to review the ILO’s field operations and look for future guidance from all constituents. Accordingly, the speaker paid tribute to the Governing Body’s proposal on tripartite initiatives for decent and productive work for young people.

77. A representative of the Employers endorsed the recommendations in paragraph 112 of the report and reiterated his group’s support for the conclusions adopted by the Meeting, which contained positive elements for the development of employers’ organizations in the region, and urged governments to apply the recommendations contained in the text, in particular on freedom of association and deduction of union dues. Nevertheless, his group considered that the debate held in Budapest, especially during the panel discussion, was not fully reflected in the conclusions. Another matter of concern for his group was the length of the Meeting, which obliged participants to be present for a whole week, making it difficult for high-level representatives to attend. He therefore requested the Office to prepare an amendment to the Rules for Regional Meetings, so that the next European Regional Meeting would last no more than two or three days. He also asked for the length of plenary sittings to be reduced and for only two topics to be selected for the panel discussion.

78. A representative of the Workers supported the recommendations in paragraph 112 and considered that Regional Meetings were very important for the opportunities they provided and their length should not be reduced. The Seventh European Regional Meeting had brought together for the first time the 25 Member States of the enlarged European Union and representatives of the other 25 ILO Members from Europe and Central Asia. The Meeting highlighted the importance of its tripartite structure and the need to continue developing it at a time when the former socialist countries were adopting democratic systems. In addition, the ILO was concerned with pursuing balanced economic and social development, and this principle was deeply rooted in the continent of Europe, from where it had to continue spreading to the rest of the world. The ILO also had a key role to play in developing cooperation between governments and social partners, as well as relations with financial institutions such as the World Bank and the International Monetary Fund. The time had come to put into practice the conclusions adopted at the Meeting following tough negotiations. The speaker urged the Office to monitor closely the practical application of the conclusions, and recalled that the mere privatization of pension schemes did not reflect ILO concerns, particularly those of a social nature.
79. A representative of the European Commission welcomed the holding of the Meeting, which allowed dialogue and cooperation between the countries of Europe and Central Asia to be deepened. As indicated in paragraph 39 of the report, the European Commission and the ILO had converging programmes in various important fields. In this respect, mention could be made of the European Social Agenda, which the European Commission had adopted a few days before the ILO’s Seventh European Regional Meeting.

80. A representative of the Director-General confirmed that the ILO was fully committed to putting into practice the conclusions adopted by the Seventh European Regional Meeting. The matter of the length of the Meeting would be submitted for consultation between the constituents. He accepted the comments that the conclusions could not fully reflect the discussions within the panel discussions owing to time constraints. In future, efforts would be made to improve the preparation of the conclusions, which had to fulfil the dual requirement of providing a draft on time at the same time as encapsulating the diversity of discussions.

Governing Body decision:

81. The Governing Body requests the Director-General to:

   – draw the attention of the governments of member States of the European region and, through them, that of their national employers’ and workers’ organizations, to the conclusions adopted by the Meeting;

   – bear the conclusions in mind in executing ongoing programmes and in preparing future programme and budget proposals;

   – transmit the text of the conclusions to:

      (i) the governments of all member States and, through them, to national employers’ and workers’ organizations;

      (ii) the international organizations concerned, including the international non-governmental organizations having consultative status.

(GB.292/5, paragraph 112.)

Sixth item on the agenda

DEVELOPMENTS IN THE UNITED NATIONS

(GB.292/6)

82. The Employer Vice-Chairperson was aware that the document before the Governing Body was for information purposes. However, given the interaction with the other organizations and institutions of the United Nations, he felt that the Governing Body should discuss these exchanges and the possible consequences for the ILO. The Office should also give indications regarding the course that its activities were to take. Thus, he wished to be informed as to the future role of the ILO and of the social actors concerning the following issues: the question that was brought up by the United Nations Economic and Social Council (ECOSOC) in its report; the United Nations Development Group (UNDG) Guidance Note, the Millennium Development Goals (MDGs); the United Nations Conference on Trade and Development (UNCTAD) report; and the measures that the Chief Executives Board would adopt to optimize the collective effect of the activities of the United Nations system. He requested that the Governing Body be informed as to how
activities taking place at the time with regard to the Working Party on the Social Dimension of Globalization were to be coordinated between the various bodies, including the Bretton Woods institutions.

83. The Worker Vice-Chairperson, highlighting in particular the issue of migration, insisted on the importance of combining and uniting the focus and activities of the various international agencies, especially within the United Nations system. A similar approach should be adopted in the cases of HIV/AIDS, disability, gender and indigenous and tribal people in disadvantaged situations. As to the attainment of the MDGs, he wished to hear the opinion of the United Nations on that issue and requested the ILO to make greater efforts when playing its part in achieving the Goals.

84. A Government representative of Spain referred to the report of the Secretary-General’s High-Level Panel on reform at the United Nations and, more specifically, to the part dedicated to ECOSOC. He asked if the ILO had been requested to make a contribution with regard to reforms to ECOSOC, the body which coordinated the work of all the institutions in the field of social and labour issues.

85. A representative of the Director-General, responding to the questions put forward by the Employers’ and Workers’ spokespersons, stated that the ILO was striving to assert the distinctive nature of its mandate, its programme of work and its tripartite structure, unique within the multilateral system, throughout the United Nations bodies and forums, where discussions tended to be almost exclusively intergovernmental in nature.

86. The international community was preparing to take part in the United Nations Millennium +5 Summit in New York, from 14 to 16 September 2005, which would see a review of the progress made regarding the implementation of the Millennium Declaration and the MDGs. The report that the Secretary-General had presented for the Summit, entitled In larger freedom: Towards development, security and human rights for all, contained an indirect reference to the issues dealt with by the ILO. It was, therefore, extremely important to continue to promote the idea that poverty could only be combated in the long term through the creation of dignified, good-quality employment opportunities, that was to say, decent work for all. Although not explicitly included in the list of MDGs, the international community was becoming more and more convinced that the questions of labour and employment should be viewed as cross-cutting in nature and intrinsically linked to the achievement of the Goals.

87. Thus, the ILO was designing a series of actions within the framework of the preparatory activities for the Millennium +5 Summit. Its aim was, in particular, to take up and promote the essential message of the Millennium Declaration regarding the challenge that was presented by an inclusive and equitable globalization, as well as the emphasis placed by the Declaration on giving young people the chance to find decent and productive work.

88. The speaker stated that the ILO had not directly taken part in the elaboration of the so-called Cardoso Report, which was prepared by the Panel of Eminent Persons on United Nations – Civil Society Relations. With regard to the UNDG, although the ILO, alongside the other specialized agencies of the United Nations system, was a member, it did not belong to the Group’s Executive Committee. A way was being sought to ensure that the specialized agencies could more effectively participate in the UNDG and that they might be able to influence the Group in the adoption of its decisions, with account being taken of the proposed reforms of the United Nations, especially at country level, that the Secretary-General had presented for a decision at the Millennium +5 Summit. The ILO was working with UNCTAD and was encouraging coherence with regard to policies on employment, growth and investment. The Director-General was a member of the Geneva Migration Group. As to HIV/AIDS, the ILO was an active member and cosponsor of UNAIDS. The
Director-General would personally attend the meetings of the Bretton Woods institutions that were to take place in April 2005.

89. Finally, in response to the question put forward by the Government representative of Spain, the speaker explained that the ILO had not participated in the elaboration of the proposals for the reform of ECOSOC because the specialized agencies of the United Nations did not tend to be consulted with regard to such matters, which were examined directly by the United Nations Secretariat, together with the Member States.

90. The Governing Body took note of the report.

Seventh item on the agenda

DEVELOPMENTS CONCERNING THE QUESTION OF THE OBSERVANCE BY THE GOVERNMENT OF MYANMAR OF THE FORCED LABOUR CONVENTION, 1930 (NO. 29)

(GB.292/7/1; GB.292/7/2; GB.292/7/2(& Add.); GB.292/7/3)

91. The Ambassador of Myanmar said that between May 2000 and February 2005, Myanmar had received five technical cooperation missions, one High-Level Team, and one very High-Level Team (vHLT). Much had been achieved. The vHLT, led by Sir Ninian Stephen, former Governor-General of Australia, and including Ms. Ruth Dreyfuss, former President of Switzerland, and Mr. Eui-yong Chung, former Chairperson of the Governing Body and a Member of Parliament of the Republic of Korea, had visited Myanmar from 21 to 23 February 2005. The very highest authorities were unable to receive the vHLT, as the country was very occupied with the National Convention, but Lieutenant-General Soe Win, Prime Minister of Myanmar, and a member of the State Peace and Development Council, was mandated to receive the vHLT, which he did on 22 February. On 10 March 2005, the Prime Minister followed up this meeting in a letter addressed to Sir Ninian Stephen, stressing Myanmar’s commitment to the elimination of all traces of forced labour, in close cooperation with the ILO. The Prime Minister also stated that Myanmar was willing to give very careful consideration to the aide-memoire presented by the vHLT.

92. The vHLT had specifically requested a meeting with the highest authorities in Myanmar, in order to address cases of forced labour involving the military. In its report, the vHLT proposed that an executive instruction prohibiting the use of forced labour be issued to all military units, and a focal point should be established within the army to deal with questions related to Convention No. 29. By an Order of 1 March 2005, this focal point had been created. It was headed by Deputy Adjutant-General, Colonel Khin Soe, with seven officers as members. Orders prohibiting use of forced labour by the army had been issued as early as 15 May 1999, 11 July and 6 November 2000.

93. Of the 50 cases of forced labour reported by the Liaison Officer a.i., during the period from 1 January 2004 to 15 February 2005, 48 had been dealt with, and two were under consideration. In five cases, local authorities had been found guilty, and jail sentences had been given. Action was also taken in cases of military violation. A lieutenant-colonel, four captains and two sergeants had received sentences of between one to five years, and dismissed from the service. Seventeen cases of forced recruitment were identified in 2002, and five in 2003; action was taken against the military personnel responsible. The Penal Code allowed recourse to the courts in cases of forced labour, and a mechanism had been put in place to enable the public to register complaints at police stations and relevant authorities.
94. The reconvening of the National Convention represented a major step in the country’s seven-stage road map to democracy. The Convention was in the process of adopting the Constitution, and had already adopted basic principles for the social sector, including the rights of workers in respect of working hours, breaks, holidays, occupational safety, labour disputes and social security. The joint Plan of Action between the ILO and Myanmar was the fruit of intensive negotiations. It had been postponed on the basis of an incident which was not related to the issue of forced labour, and since then Myanmar had instigated a number of programmes to eliminate forced labour. These included giving explanations of orders prohibiting the use of forced labour, the dispatch of observation teams to investigate allegations of incidences, the holding of workshops on Convention No. 29, and the monthly publication of workers’ affairs bulletins. The joint Plan of Action should be revived.

95. The ILO presence in Myanmar was unique in the country’s history. The Liaison Officer a.i. had been allowed the same freedom of movement as that accorded to diplomats and United Nations personnel. He had been able to assist the authorities in screening and processing allegations of forced labour, and had promoted further cooperation with the authorities. At the 291st Session of the Governing Body, members had called for the immediate release or pardon of the three persons imprisoned on the basis of having contacted the ILO. Nai Min Kyi and U Aye Myint were released from prison on 3 January 2005, while U Shwe Mahn’s capital sentence for high treason had been reduced to five years’ imprisonment.

96. Myanmar had striven to fulfil its constitutional obligations throughout the many years of its association with the ILO. In recent years the Organization had been used by some powerful and influential nations as a political tool to put pressure on Myanmar. This was unacceptable. Nevertheless, Myanmar wished to cooperate with the ILO on the outstanding issues and, although it was a developing country with limited resources, it was committed to the elimination of forced labour.

97. The Worker Vice-Chairperson wished to place on record the group’s appreciation of the previous Ambassador of Myanmar, whose contribution to the process was very significant. The group hoped that the new Ambassador would continue in the same positive vein. However, he was wrong to suggest that the ILO was being manipulated by powerful nations for political purposes. If such nations were taking up positions on this question, it was because they had responded positively to the views expressed by trade unions around the world. The trade union movement wanted global peace, global democracy and global social justice. It was for this reason that the workers called for the release of Daw Aung San Suu Kyi, and not because they had been instructed to do so by governments.

98. The Ambassador should provide evidence of punishments given to military personnel for making use of forced labour. Moreover, the group was disturbed by his apparent pride in informing the Governing Body that no person had ever previously been allowed the degree of freedom of movement in Myanmar that had been granted to the Liaison Officer. This did not seem to present a state of affairs deserving congratulations. The group understood that the Myanmar generals were struggling to deal with the consequences of the political reshuffle of 2004. However, to use the National Convention as a pretext for not being able to meet the vHLT, when the date of the vHLT’s visit had been very carefully negotiated and confirmed, was tantamount to an insult to the Governing Body. The other ASEAN countries would very shortly have to decide about it being Myanmar’s turn to preside over the region. The European Union would in April be called on to decide on its common position in respect of Myanmar, including on economic measures against the military junta.
99. The challenge before the Governing Body was how best to continue to assist the working people of Myanmar and, where the Government wished for support, to provide that also. This challenge placed the credibility of the Governing Body at stake. The Workers’ group questioned whether the Myanmar authorities had genuinely taken positive action. It had not been shown conclusively that the forced labour situation had improved; that the military had ceased imposing forced labour on civilians; that military officers had been prosecuted for imposing forced labour; that detained trade union and other political prisoners had been released; or that the authorities had made progress towards political reconciliation, national dialogue, the restoration of democracy and the rule of law. The vHLT was unable to meet with the highest authorities and therefore could not fulfil its mandate. However, one positive development was the appointment of a military focal point for Convention No. 29 in Myanmar. The vHLT noted strong support for the ILO office in Yangon and suggested it should be strengthened. The Ambassador appeared to indicate government approval for this.

100. The Liaison Officer a.i. reported that wide-scale use of forced labour continued, particularly in border regions with a strong army presence. Some local officials had been prosecuted, but the Workers’ group believed they were acting as scapegoats. No action was taken in cases where the army was involved, though reports of forced recruitment of children raised by the Liaison Officer a.i. had led to some children being released. The Office’s report on action taken subsequent to the resolution of June 2000 was not adequate: it provided no assessment of the effect the various measures were having today. The National Convention took place without the presence of the main opposition party: the National League for Democracy. Daw Aung San Suu Kyi remained under house arrest. Little progress towards democracy was apparent. The release of the two trade unionists was welcome, but they should be declared innocent of the charges, or not guilty as charged. The third imprisoned trade unionist, U Shwe Mahn, still serving a sentence for treason, should be released. The maintenance of this judgement called into question the mechanisms established by the Government for the public to come to denounced cases of forced labour. Similar sentences might be given to complainants making use of these mechanisms.

101. The press statement of 15 March in the New Light of Myanmar newspaper was also of great concern. The article, couched in belligerent language, gave a different impression from that given by the Ambassador. It was strongly critical of the ILO, the International Confederation of Free Trade Unions (ICFTU), the American Federation of Labor-Congress of Industrial Organizations (AFL-CIO) and the Free Trade Unions, Burma (FTUB). It repeatedly accused Maung Maung, FTUB general secretary, of terrorism.

102. In the light of this, the only response possible to the Governing Body was to consider further action under article 33 and the June 2000 resolution, including action in respect of foreign direct investment. Accordingly, the Director-General should write to governments, and employers’ and workers’ organizations, calling on them to review and report on new measures taken under the resolution. These reviews should focus carefully on foreign direct investment, and describe explicitly action taken in respect of state-owned enterprises, or enterprises owned by members of the army or by their families. The Office should report to the Conference in June, assessing the measures taken, and suggesting further measures that could be taken to implement the resolution fully. The Director-General should also write to the United Nations Secretary-General, to the United Nations Economic and Social Council and to United Nations specialized agencies, advising them of decisions taken by the Governing Body, and calling on them to take appropriate and effective measures within their own mandates. The Director-General should urgently restore the Liaison Office in Yangon to its full strength, increasing the ILO presence there.
103. The Employer Vice-Chairperson associated his group with the Worker Vice-Chairperson’s remarks concerning the former Ambassador of Myanmar.

104. The present Ambassador had suggested that his Government considered the ILO to be a political instrument manipulated by powerful nations. This was to ignore the objectives of the Organization, and its way of acting. The ILO had been brought into being by governments to allow employers and workers the right to participate in the political process, and to exercise this right in conformity with the ethical principles as set out in the Declaration on Fundamental Principles and Rights at Work and enshrined in the normative system. There was only one reason for the years of discussion on the question of Myanmar, and that was forced labour. The Governing Body was motivated by one thing alone: to guarantee to the inhabitants of Myanmar the eradication of forced labour. Crimes must not go unpunished, and the impunity in Myanmar showed that forced labour was tolerated. Any State which did not have the judicial mechanisms to deal with crimes against humanity were in violation of the principles upheld by the ILO. Forced labour was a violation of the most fundamental human right. There had been moments of optimism in dealing with this question: for example, when the Governing Body learned that persons had access to the Liaison Officer, had been able to file a complaint, or that the ILO had contributed to reducing or commuting a sentence. The vHLT was a means of facilitating dialogue between Myanmar and the ILO at the highest possible level. The presence on the vHLT of Ms. Ruth Dreyfuss, former President of Switzerland – a country which fully recognized human rights – showed how serious the vHLT’s intentions were. Moreover, Ms. Dreyfuss’ career before becoming President had been in the trade union world.

105. The press release of 15 March was insulting, and called into question the usefulness of the Governing Body’s approach. The Employers’ group expected the Government to issue a clear official statement refuting it. The explanations given by Myanmar were not sufficient; the efforts made by the Office, which the group wholeheartedly supported, had not met with the cooperation necessary from the Government. The Conference would start in a few weeks’ time. By then, Myanmar must provide real answers, concrete action taken to eliminate forced labour, true collaboration with the ILO, and real proof of sanctions being applied in cases of violation. Failing this, the Conference and the Governing Body would be obliged to adopt more serious measures.

106. A Government representative of Indonesia, speaking on behalf of the ASEAN member States of the ILO, expressed satisfaction at the ILO’s efforts in assisting the Myanmar authorities in the observance of Convention No. 29. He welcomed the Government’s commitment to eliminate forced labour. The joint Plan of Action agreed on by the Government and the ILO on 27 May 2003 should be implemented as soon as possible. The visit of the vHLT had resulted in a renewed statement of commitment by the Government, and the vHLT had held useful meetings with the Prime Minister. This process of dialogue should take precedence over harsher measures, and should be promoted. Myanmar was cooperating with the ILO in handling complaints alleging forced labour, and should continue to do so. Prisoners had been released and action taken against military and civilian officials for violations. The momentum should continue, building on a constructive, cooperative approach.

107. A Government representative of Luxembourg spoke on behalf of the European Union, the associated countries Bulgaria and Romania, candidate countries Turkey and Croatia, the Stability Pact countries and potential EU candidates, Albania, Bosnia and Herzegovina and The former Yugoslav Republic of Macedonia, as well as Serbia and Montenegro. Norway and Switzerland also associated themselves with the statement. The EU remained gravely concerned by the situation in Myanmar. Expressions of good will from the Government had not resulted in significant progress, and forced labour was still current practice, especially in areas of high military presence. The EU firmly condemned this violation of
human rights. The Government’s response to complaints, including those made under article 374 of the Penal Code, was inadequate: some civilians had been prosecuted, but most cases had been rejected. It was regrettable that the vHLT had not met with the highest authorities; the EU agreed that only the most senior leadership could provide a creditable response to this issue. Clear and effectively conveyed instructions by the State Peace and Development Council (SPDC) through the military were needed. The EU remained committed to the Plan of Action, when circumstances within the country permitted.

108. The EU noted from the Liaison Officer’s report that a focal point had been created in the army to facilitate cooperation with the ILO. The Liaison Office should be strengthened, and obstacles to its effective functioning removed. Senior leadership in Myanmar should implement concrete steps to follow the aide-memoire provided by the vHLT. The Director-General should address a letter to the Myanmar senior leadership demanding the immediate implementation of these steps. The EU would base its decision on action to be taken under the June 2000 resolution on the Government’s subsequent behaviour in the light of these demands.

109. A Government representative of Belarus appreciated all the efforts made by the Office in respect of the very complicated situation of forced labour in Myanmar. The problem dated from long before the current leaders came to power. The Government should continue to cooperate with the ILO, and take the administrative and penal steps necessary to change mentalities which arose from centuries-old traditions. More cases should be brought to trial, since although the number of complaints had diminished, the Liaison Officer a.i. made the true situation in the country quite clear. The vHLT’s mission was a good example of continuing cooperation, as it had been able to evaluate the situation. But such evaluations should be balanced and present positive as well as negative aspects. Belarus would prefer a more even-handed assessment of the state of affairs, to allow the Governing Body to draw up the most efficient strategy possible. Constructive dialogue based on mutual cooperation would lead to positive results. Experience had shown that social problems could take a long time to solve, and it was for this reason that Belarus had serious doubts about the measures listed in document GB.292/7/1. The Government of Myanmar should be supported in their attempts to rectify the situation.

110. A Government representative of India noted that the vHLT had met with the Prime Minister, the Minister for Labour and the Minister for Foreign Affairs of Myanmar. The Governing Body should view positively the Prime Minister’s statement in his letter to Sir Ninian Steven that Myanmar intended to continue its cooperation with the ILO. India had welcomed the initialling of the joint Plan of Action in May 2003: cooperation should continue with a view to implementing this Plan. Myanmar should receive ILO technical assistance to this end.

111. A Government representative of the United States, speaking also on behalf of Canada, praised the leading role the ILO had played in seeking to end the practice of forced labour in Myanmar. The report stated that this practice remained widespread and the junta had only made token efforts to eliminate it. The vHLT had not been able to meet with the top leadership. Four civilian officials had been punished for authorizing the use of forced labour, but countless went unpunished. The military used forced labour with impunity. One of the three persons convicted for contacting the ILO in 2003 remained in prison. The Liaison Officer’s movements through the country were limited, and citizens contacting the ILO risked imprisonment, or worse.

112. None of the recommendations made by the 1998 Commission of Inquiry had resulted in action on the part of the Government. The authorities had recently acknowledged that forced labour was a problem in the country, and a military focal point had been established to deal with Convention No. 29 complaints. The Government had still not established a
national programme to end forced labour. The Plan of Action was a valid way forward, but could not proceed until the Government had created an environment in which victims of forced labour would not be punished for cooperating with the programme. The United States supported strengthening measures taken under the 2000 resolution. The ILO presence should be increased in Myanmar, with a more senior Liaison Officer and additional staff: the Office had demonstrated an ability to monitor the situation. The junta should release all political prisoners immediately and unconditionally, allow the National League for Democracy to reopen its offices and engage in dialogue including the ethnic minorities leading to national reconciliation. The National Convention lacked the legitimacy to draft a true democratic Constitution, representative of the will of all the people of Myanmar.

113. A Government representative of China said that the progress made in Myanmar bore witness to the Government’s will to continue cooperating with the ILO. Dialogue and cooperation with the international community was the best path: confrontation would not solve the problems. The ILO should provide technical assistance and maintain the dialogue.

114. A Government representative of the Republic of Korea said his delegation was concerned at the reception accorded to the vHLT, and at the fact that the authorities gave no clear answer in respect of dealing with cases of forced labour involving the military. It was not clear that the Government genuinely wished to eradicate forced labour. The Governing Body was increasingly frustrated at the lack of significant progress, but the reports noted some positive developments, including the prison sentences applied to four local officials for imposing forced labour, and other prosecutions initiated by the authorities. The ILO engagement should be maintained as long as it facilitated progress, and a further decision on action should be taken in June, at the Conference. The Myanmar Government should continue to cooperate fully with the ILO.

115. A Government representative of New Zealand, speaking also on behalf of Australia, said their Governments strongly supported the ILO role in Myanmar, and would support the expansion of the ILO’s Yangon office to allow it to provide more technical assistance. New Zealand was concerned to learn that the Liaison Officer a.i.’s freedom of movement appeared to have been curtailed. It was also regrettable that the vHLT had not been received as planned. Positive developments included the prison sentences imposed for use of forced labour, and the establishment of a Convention No. 29 military focal point to deal with the urgent issue of requisition in the army. The joint Plan of Action remained worthwhile, but recent action by the Government called Myanmar’s commitment to the Plan into question. The Government must take concrete steps to allow its citizens to cooperate with the ILO in confidence that they would not suffer retribution. So far, little progress had been made towards political reform and national reconciliation.

116. A Government representative of the Libyan Arab Jamahiriya said his Government supported the statement made by Indonesia, and stressed the need to continue cooperating with the Government of Myanmar. The vHLT should be received by the highest authorities; dialogue should be maintained and the ILO should provide technical assistance to the Government and people of Myanmar.

117. A Government representative of Japan expressed disappointment at the failure of the Myanmar authorities to meet with the vHLT as planned. Japan expected more tangible improvements in Myanmar. The Government stated, in its letter to Sir Ninian Steven, that it was committed to the elimination of forced labour and would give careful consideration to the vHLT’s aide-memoire. Concrete results should follow from this. Myanmar wished to have an ILO presence on its territory: Japan believed this essential, to allow the
Organization to monitor developments. Cooperation between the ILO and the Government would produce further positive developments.

118. A Government representative of the Russian Federation supported the measures taken by the ILO in respect of Myanmar, which had resulted in a slight improvement in the situation. Cooperation should continue, with a view to the implementation of the joint Plan of Action.

119. The Chairperson read out the following conclusions, which had been approved by the Employer and Worker Vice-Chairpersons.

**Governing Body conclusions:**

120. On behalf of the Governing Body, I should like to convey our sincere gratitude to the members of the very High-Level Team (vHLT) for having accepted a very difficult assignment and for their dedication in discharging it scrupulously both in letter and spirit.

121. In drawing the conclusions of the present debate it is important to recall the conclusions reached by the Governing Body at its previous session, which set the parameters for our present consideration of the matter. Following recent leadership changes, the main preoccupation of the Governing Body in establishing the vHLT was to have an objective basis to evaluate the attitude and the real will of the authorities at the highest level, and their determination to continue their effective cooperation on the outstanding issues; this evaluation would then enable the Governing Body to draw the appropriate consequences in full knowledge of the facts, including as regards action under article 33.

122. In that framework, after hearing the message from the Ambassador, Mr. Nyunt Maung Shein, we have had a broad debate.

123. The most largely shared sentiment was one of condemnation over the failure of the highest authorities to take advantage of the unique opportunity that the visit of the vHLT represented to resume a credible dialogue on the issues of concern, and also the feelings of grave concern over the general situation that this reveals.

124. Indeed, the Prime Minister’s indications to the members of the vHLT as well as the comments of the Ambassador allege that the necessary political will exists. However, the attitude towards the vHLT, along with the press conference held in Yangon on 15 March and even some of the remarks made this morning by the Ambassador of Myanmar, cast into grave doubt the credibility of this message and the usefulness of the ILO approach.

125. Apart from the assurances and indications, there are the facts. Some of them seem to a number of us to go in the right direction, in particular the prosecutions and punishment of authorities responsible for having recourse to forced labour and the establishment of a focal point in the army on the initiative of the Commander-in-Chief of the Army.

126. But in the circumstances the overall assessment falls far short of our expectations. And this is the reason why, according to the Workers’ proposal, joined by certain Governments, the Governing Body has no other choice but to ask the Office to take a certain number of formal steps to strengthen the
measures under the resolution of June 2000, but also at the same time to
strengthen the Liaison Office.

127. Other Government members and the Employers, while sharing the same sense of
condemnation of the actions of the authorities, were, in view of the closeness of
the International Labour Conference, starting on 31 May, inclined to test, for the
last time, the true will of the authorities to cooperate with the ILO, before
resuming the examination of these measures and taking a decision on them.
Other Governments limited themselves to calling for an urgent restarting of an
effective and meaningful dialogue, without reference to specific measures.

128. In the treatment of this particularly difficult case, the solidarity of all the groups
has always given strength to the position of the ILO. It is the view of my
colleagues and myself that this strength should be maintained. Three
considerations may help us:

– First, strictly speaking, the question is not for us to adopt new measures
under article 33. These measures have already been taken under the
resolution adopted by the Conference in 2000, which is binding on the
Governing Body and the other organs of the ILO as long as it has not been
modified. These measures clearly remain in force with regard to all
constituents and others to whom the resolution is addressed.

– The next question is whether it is time for members to resume their
consideration of the action which they have been and still are called upon to
take under the resolution of June 2000. This question arises because most of
them have suspended their action since the beginning of 2001 as a result of
the progress which seemed to be under way at the time, and which resulted
in certain concrete developments in particular through the ILO presence. At
this stage, and on the basis of the information at our disposal, the growing
feeling is that the “wait-and-see” attitude that prevailed among members,
following the initiation of meaningful dialogue since 2001, appears to have
lost its raison d’être and cannot continue.

– A third consideration is that under the resolution the ILO cannot prejudge
the action which each individual member may find it appropriate to take as a
result of their review; the only thing which is expected from all of them is to
report at suitable intervals to explain what they have done and why.

129. At the same time it is clear that the ILO is not closing the door to the resumption
of a positive dialogue with the Myanmar authorities in line with the views wisely
expressed by the vHILT and a large number of those who took the floor during
the debate; it is clear in particular that the existence of such dialogue and the
concrete results it could produce should be taken objectively into account by
members when deciding the outcome of their review. The extent to which
progress will be achieved with regard to the strengthening of the ILO presence as
well as the other items covered by the vHILT’s aide-memoire, including the
immediate release of Shwe Mahn, should be a concrete test in this regard.

130. In the light of these considerations, the conclusions that myself and my
colleagues think the Governing Body could unanimously agree on taking is to
transmit to all those to whom the 2000 resolution was addressed – including
relevant agencies – the results of our deliberations reflected in the present conclusions, with a view to them taking the appropriate action resulting from the above considerations.

131. The Officers of the Governing Body are mandated to closely follow any developments. These developments will be the subject of a document before the Committee on the Application of Standards of the International Labour Conference in June.

(Summary by the Chairperson and Vice-Chairpersons.)

Eighth item on the agenda

336TH REPORT OF THE COMMITTEE ON FREEDOM OF ASSOCIATION
(GB.292/8)

132. The Reporter of the Committee on Freedom of Association said the report noted 134 pending cases, of which 30 had been examined on their merits. The Committee launched urgent appeals to the Governments of Nicaragua, in respect of Cases Nos. 2264 and 2275, and of Canada, on Case No. 2343, which had not supplied complete observations, despite the time elapsed since submission of the complaints.

133. The Committee examined 25 cases in which governments had provided information on the effect they had given to its recommendations. Developments were noted in three cases.

134. Case No. 2203, on Guatemala, concerned serious allegations of violence against trade unionists, dismissals, refusal to comply with reinstatement orders and undue delay in proceedings. The Government was urged to refer the cases speedily to the relevant judicial authorities. The Committee noted that reinstatement orders were rarely fulfilled, and called on the Government to revise the procedure for the protection of trade union rights in law.

135. Case No. 2340, on Nepal, should be qualified serious and urgent. The Government was requested to amend the Essential Services Act so that it prohibited strikes only in truly essential services. Workers should be allowed to enjoy the right to peaceful demonstration in defence of their occupational interests. Regarding allegations of violent intervention during a demonstration, the authorities should only resort to force in situations where law and order were in real jeopardy.

136. In Case No. 2353, on the Bolivarian Republic of Venezuela, the Committee once again objected to the role of the National Electorate Council in supervising trade union elections, which must be the affair of the industrial organizations concerned alone. Moreover, the power to suspend elections should be given only to an independent judiciary.

137. In respect of Zimbabwe, two cases under examination concerned allegations of anti-union dismissals of high-level trade union officers. The Government should implement independent inquiries, and reinstate the persons affected, or offer them equivalent positions, without loss of pay or benefits. In Case No. 2365, on Zimbabwe, the Government should refrain from the alleged intimidatory action, which included arbitrary arrest and detention of trade unionists, and allow normal trade union activities to take place. The atmosphere of trade union intimidation in Zimbabwe was apparent from the number of cases concerning that country that had recently been brought before the Committee.
138. The Employer spokesperson of the Committee supported the report with certain reservations. A welcome aspect was that it contained far fewer allegations of violence than was unfortunately habitual, and the group hoped that this might be the beginning of a trend.

139. In respect of the article 26 complaint against the Bolivarian Republic of Venezuela, the group hoped that the precedent set by paragraph 918, referring the complaint to the Governing Body for decision on the grounds that Employer members on the Committee had been signatory to the original complaint, would be followed in future in similar instances. The Committee had once again had cause to regret government interference in trade union elections in the Bolivarian Republic of Venezuela.

140. A number of cases involved the question of essential services. The Employers’ group believed that the Committee and the Committee of Experts both took an inflexible and restrictive view regarding the definition of such services, failing to take account of the interdependence of the various sectors of a modern economy, of the social and economic consequences of strikes in those sectors and of the highly individual circumstances in which strikes took place in them. The question re-arose in Case No. 2340, on Nepal, where the Government had classed some 14 sectors as essential, and the Committee had requested that this classification be restricted. The Committee also failed to regard ferry services from Canada to the islands of British Columbia, or the operation of Costa Rica’s only Atlantic port, as essential services, although in these two instances, it had made useful remarks about minimum services. The group concurred fully with the Committee in Case No. 2383, on the United Kingdom, where it found that prison officers provided an essential service.

141. In Case No. 2300, on Costa Rica, the group wished to make it clear that they believed that Conventions Nos. 87 and 98 did not deal with strikes per se, nor with strikes in the public sector, nor in the case of essential services. In Case No. 2239, on Colombia, the Committee might have been led into error by the Government’s failure to supply requested information. The members of the cooperative concerned should enjoy freedom of association, but it was not clear whether they had the right to join or form trade unions.

142. The Employers’ group continued to have serious reservations regarding reinstatement as a remedy for anti-trade union dismissals. Where the employment relationship had broken down, or a significant period of time had elapsed since the dismissal, reinstatement was not appropriate: this area required review by the Committee.

143. The Worker spokesperson recommended that the Governing Body adopt the report. In Case No. 2340, on Nepal, the Government had arrested 132 trade unionists and had restricted workers’ enjoyment of freedom of association and freedom of expression. Classification of sectors as essential had increased, in spite of the Committee’s earlier, clear request that such classification should not include non-essential services. The Government was called to amend its legislation in this field. The Committee also requested the Government of Costa Rica to amend its legislation, and allow the right to strike in non-essential public sector services.

144. In Case No. 2236, on Indonesia, the Committee again stressed that the examination of allegations of anti-union discrimination should take precedence over dismissal procedures. In Case No. 2336, also on Indonesia, workers attempting to form a union had been dismissed on spurious grounds. The investigating authorities had noted this, but no procedures were taken against the companies in question. The Committee concluded that workers in Indonesia were inadequately protected against anti-union discrimination, and that the national legislation should be amended, with the installation of prompt and impartial procedures.
Four cases concerned Zimbabwe. In Case No. 2328, the President of the Zimbabwe Congress of Trade Unions, Mr. Lovemore Matombo, was dismissed for taking unauthorized leave when he led the Zimbabwe delegation attending the Eighth OATUU Congress in Khartoum. The Government was asked to conduct an independent investigation and to supply additional information. Case No. 2365 dealt with arbitrary arrests, detentions and dismissals in Zimbabwe, indicative of the general trade union climate in the country. In Cases Nos. 1937 and 2027, the Committee again expressed its concern at the Government’s refusal to amend its legislation as requested.

Case No. 2324 concerned Canada, the Province of British Columbia. The Committee considered that with the Railway and Ferries Bargaining Assistance Act, the Government had introduced back-to-work legislation. It should not do so. Rather it should encourage voluntary mechanisms for dispute settlement, including agreed voluntary minimum services. The Health Sector Partnership Agreement Act and the Coastal Ferry Act also both set aside previously concluded collective agreements, and should be amended in line with Convention No. 87. This case and similar cases on Canada raised the question of who was responsible when the complaints concerned federal states. Central Government did no more than act as a means of transmission to and from the federal authorities. The federal Government was bound by constitutional obligations to the ILO and should take responsibility, as indeed it would in a case of child labour, forced labour or discrimination. The fundamental right of workers to organize freely appeared not to be taken seriously.

Case No. 2239, on Colombia, dealt with the dismissal of 100 unionized textile workers, by a company which replaced them with workers from a cooperative, who were not allowed to unionize. The Committee considered that these workers had the right to join a trade union, and requested the Government to ensure full respect for freedom of association. It also recommended that the Government accept ILO technical assistance.

Case No. 2203, on Guatemala, concerned allegations of assaults, death threats and intimidation against trade unionists and attacks against trade union headquarters. Judicial reinstatement orders of dismissed trade unionists were not acted upon; the length of time taken to conclude reinstatement proceedings constituted a denial of justice and of trade union rights. In Haiti, Case No. 2321 also involved violence and brutal physical attacks by the police. The Government had failed to reply to the Committee’s requests, reflecting the regrettable state of affairs in the country.

The Committee returned to Case No. 1996, on Uganda, which had been lodged eight years previously, owing to the failure of a number of textile companies to recognize the Ugandan Textile, Garment, Leather and Allied Workers’ Union. The legislation providing for compulsory recognition of the union by the employer remained unapplied in practice.

The Workers’ group was greatly concerned that freedom of association was denied in most export processing zones (EPZs). A growing number of cases had come before the Committee in this connection, of which Case No. 2380, on Sri Lanka, was an example. This case concerned the attempts by textile workers within an EPZ to form a trade union. The Government had indicated it would prosecute the management for unfair labour practices. The Workers’ group stressed that they would not allow an entire economic sector, such as textile and clothing, often located in EPZs as a result of intense global competition, to be operated by workers deprived of their basic trade union rights.

The Chairperson proposed the adoption of the introduction to the report, contained in paragraphs 1 to 144.

A Government representative of Belarus stated that the Government had drawn up a plan of action based on the recommendations of the Commission of Inquiry that had visited the
country. This included measures to improve national legislation in respect of establishing and registering trade unions, developing a mechanism to defend trade union rights and enhance tripartism and social dialogue. The Government had begun implementation of the plan and would inform the Committee of progress. The Government counted on the support of the ILO through technical cooperation in this implementation and had already consulted the Office as to how this might be achieved.

153. A Worker member from Germany welcomed the statement by the Government representative of Belarus; the group believed a follow-up mission was necessary, to verify implementation of the plan, and identify further areas in which ILO support could improve the situation.

Governing Body decision:

154. The Governing Body took note of the introduction to the report in paragraphs 1-144 and adopted the Committee’s recommendations in paragraphs 178 (Case No. 2153: Algeria); 193 (Case No. 2344: Argentina); 213 (Case No. 2369: Argentina); 232 (Case No. 2370: Argentina); 284 (Case No. 2324: Canada, Province of British Columbia); 326 (Case No. 2046: Colombia); 359 (Case No. 2239: Colombia); 386 (Case No. 2300: Costa Rica); 404 (Case No. 2214: El Salvador); 430 (Case No. 2203: Guatemala); 465 (Case No. 2259: Guatemala); 478 (Case No. 2295: Guatemala); 497 (Case No. 2321: Haiti); 539 (Case No. 2336: Indonesia); 554 (Case No. 2315: Japan); 575 (Case No. 2381: Lithuania); 604 (Case No. 2338: Mexico); 630 (Case No. 2347: Mexico); 654 (Case No. 2340: Nepal); 685 (Case No. 2354: Nicaragua); 705 (Case No. 2332: Poland); 721 (Case No. 2358: Romania); 777 (Case No. 2383: United Kingdom); 797 (Case No. 2380: Sri Lanka); 812 (Case No. 2087: Uruguay); 823 (Case No. 2174: Uruguay); 843 (Case No. 2359: Uruguay); 865 (Case No. 2353: Bolivarian Republic of Venezuela); 890 (Case No. 2328: Zimbabwe); 914 (Case No. 2365: Zimbabwe); and adopted the 336th Report of the Committee on Freedom of Association as a whole.

Complaint concerning non-observance by the Bolivarian Republic of Venezuela of the Freedom of Association and Protection of the Right to Organise Convention, 1948 (No. 87), and the Right to Organise and Collective Bargaining Convention, 1949 (No. 98), made by various delegates at the 92nd Session (2004) of the Conference under article 26 of the ILO Constitution

155. The Employer spokesperson noted the problem arising from the fact that many of the Employer delegates who had submitted the complaint were present at the meeting of the Committee on Freedom of Association (CFA) designated to examine it. He requested clarification from the Legal Adviser as to whether this situation was legal or ethical, as did the Worker spokesperson.

156. The Legal Adviser stated that his reply to the secretariat of the CFA, which had requested information in this connection, had been negative: it was not possible to be complainant and judge at the same time.

157. The Employer spokesperson asked whether, in the absence of a written rule, the Employers could select an ad hoc group of their members who had not signed the complaint.

158. The Worker spokesperson suggested that since the matter had been referred to the CFA, it was for the Committee simply to disqualify it.
159. The Legal Adviser referred to the rules governing the composition of the CFA. It was made up of three regular members and three deputy members. The purpose of the deputy members was to replace the regular members in cases of conflict of interest – where a regular member’s country was implicated in a complaint, for example. As to whether the Governing Body could designate an ad hoc membership of the Committee to examine a particular question, given that the membership was decided for the duration of the Governing Body’s mandate, this appeared difficult. Other procedures could be initiated.

160. The classic solution to the problem would be to follow article 26 procedure, under which the Governing Body would decide on the complaint after considering it against the Government’s reply, either by appointing a commission of inquiry, or by closing the procedure.

161. A further solution, which might be wiser, would be to wait until June, when the Governing Body was due for renewal; a CFA could then be appointed that would be able to examine this complaint. Yet further solutions could be found if needed.

162. The Employer spokesperson said that his group could not accept closure of the procedure. The question was therefore to choose between a commission of inquiry and waiting for a new CFA in June.

163. The Worker spokesperson agreed to examination of the case by the new CFA in November 2005.

164. A Government representative of El Salvador, speaking on behalf of the governments of the Group of Latin American and Caribbean States (GRULAC), noted that the case had been referred to the CFA by the 291st Session of the Governing Body. He further noted that the Committee had not been able to examine the complaint and make recommendations, given that all Employer members present on the Committee had signed the complaint. GRULAC observed that the Government of the Bolivarian Republic of Venezuela had responded rapidly to the complaint, and had provided information which proved that its validity was questionable. Moreover, the arguments put forward in the complaint were closely related to Case No. 2254, without bringing any new element into play. In the latter case, the CFA had only produced an interim report. Given that the matter had been sufficiently discussed, the Governing Body should declare that the complaint did not merit examination by a commission of inquiry, and close the procedure.

165. GRULAC also believed that the criteria for receipt and receivability of complaints made under article 26 should be reviewed, to prevent automatic consideration and duplication of procedures. The Committee on Legal Issues should present a document on criteria for receivability to the 293rd Session of the Governing Body. Furthermore, the legal consultations that the ILO had been called on to carry out by its Members should take place in an appropriate manner, and not in the hurried way in which document GB.291/17 had been examined by the last session of the Governing Body. GRULAC therefore approved the letter sent from the ILO to the Government of the Bolivarian Republic of Venezuela, which stated that the Office took great care to maintain clear rules, in order to ensure adequate legal security.

166. The Employer spokesperson said that GRULAC was opening a discussion on the substance of the question. This was proper to a supervisory body, not to the Governing Body, which simply had to chose between the three proposed options.

167. A Government representative of the Bolivarian Republic of Venezuela recalled that the previous session of the Governing Body had decided to refer this case to the CFA and had invited the Government of the Bolivarian Republic of Venezuela to supply additional information. This the Government had rapidly done. He welcomed the recognition by the three experts and Employer representatives on the CFA that they were unable to consider
the case. In recognizing this, the CFA concurred with the arguments for non-receivability put forward by the Government during the discussion of the case in November. Moreover, as GRULAC had stated, another procedure was under way in the same field, causing inefficient duplication. The representative noted with approval the Legal Adviser’s opinion that experts could not be complainant and judge at the same time. This careful and considered opinion appeared to have cancelled the delay incurred in respect of a previous inquiry made by the Government of the Bolivarian Republic of Venezuela.

168. The report submitted by the Government to the Director-General gave details of measures taken to guarantee the rights of freedom of association and collective bargaining. There was at present in the country an intense process of debate, dialogue and interaction between the social actors, including social actors who had not, by their own choice, previously been included in the debate. The president of FEDECAMARAS, the employers’ organization at the origin of this complaint, had last week recognized the Government’s will to promote dialogue, and had agreed to work willingly with the government authorities. These meetings of the social actors had been examining and revising the Government’s policies in respect of labour and of social security. It was therefore no longer necessary to retain this question on the agenda of the Governing Body. The procedure should be declared closed because it no longer corresponded to the reality in the Bolivarian Republic of Venezuela, but referred to facts already outdated.

169. A Government representative of Uruguay supported the GRULAC statement, and requested that the procedure be closed.

170. A Government representative of China believed that the reply given by the Government of the Bolivarian Republic of Venezuela was complete and clear, and that the Government had taken appropriate measures. Moreover, the complaint was almost identical to that in Case No. 2254, which had been examined carefully by the Governing Body. The Governing Body should continue to work closely with the Government to reach a solution.

171. A Government representative of India noted that the Government of the Bolivarian Republic of Venezuela was collaborating well with the Office. This process should not be disrupted, and the complaint should not be referred to a commission of inquiry.

172. A Government representative of the Libyan Arab Jamahiriya said the efforts undertaken by the Government of the Bolivarian Republic of Venezuela should be encouraged, and the present procedure closed.


174. The Chairperson noted that the Governing Body contained a small minority supporting referral to a commission of inquiry, a small minority for closing the procedure, and a large degree of agreement in support of referral to the new committee that would be established in June 2005.

Governing Body decision:

175. The Governing Body decided that the complaint concerning non-observance by the Bolivarian Republic of Venezuela of the Freedom of Association and Protection of the Right to Organise Convention, 1948 (No. 87), and the Right to Organise and Collective Bargaining Convention, 1949 (No. 98), made by various delegates at the 92nd Session (2004) of the Conference under article 26 of the ILO Constitution should be referred to the Committee on Freedom of
Association, after the renewal of the Committee in June, for examination at its November 2005 session. (Chairperson's summary.)

Ninth item on the agenda

REPORTS OF THE PROGRAMME, FINANCIAL AND ADMINISTRATIVE COMMITTEE

First report: Financial questions and programme implementation (GB.292/9/1 and GB.292/9(Add.))

Programme and Budget for 2004-05

Follow-up to the report of the Chief Internal Auditor for the year ended 31 December 2003

Report of the Chief Internal Auditor for the year ended 31 December 2004

Follow-up to the report of the External Auditor on the accounts for 2002-03

Information Technology Systems Fund

176. The Governing Body took note of these parts of the report. (GB.292/9/1, paragraphs 1-58.)

Report of the Building Subcommittee

Governing Body decision:

177. The Governing Body:

(a) noted the policy and practices currently governing accommodation decisions, and requested that they be compiled in a compendium to be regularly updated by the Office, as a first step towards a more comprehensive accommodation strategy;

(b) requested that the Office monitor and update its accommodation standards, as appropriate, according to evolving needs, especially in the area of safety and health;

(c) requested the Office to prepare and distribute before the November 2005 session an accommodation strategy which sets out clearly the details of all ILO established offices, their running costs, the countries they cover, the staff they employ, whether the premises are owned, rented, provided by the host country or are United Nations common premises, as well as a prioritized list of any urgent security, health and safety and renovation work requirements;

(d) requested the Office to evaluate the accommodation arrangements relating to technical cooperation projects and to report to the Building Subcommittee in November 2005;
(e) requested the Office to commission as soon as possible an independent technical survey of the headquarters building as a first step towards a ten- to 15-year investment plan, and to consider possible sources of financing of such an investment plan for the updating and modernization of the headquarters building and the field offices, including possible changes to the rules governing the use of the Building and Accommodation Fund.

(GB.292/9/1, paragraph 62.)

Report on programme implementation in 2004

178. The Governing Body took note of this part of the report. (GB.292/9/1, paragraphs 63-96.)

Proposed expenditure on the headquarters building

Governing Body decision:

179. The Governing Body agreed that the cost of urgent repairs and refurbishment to be carried out on the interpreters’ equipment and booths, the escalators and fire protection equipment in the headquarters building, estimated at 2,334,000 Swiss francs, should be charged to the Building and Accommodation Fund. (GB.292/9/1, paragraph 103.)

Delegation of authority under article 18 of the Standing Orders of the International Labour Conference

Governing Body decision:

180. The Governing Body decided to delegate to its Officers, for the period of the 93rd (June 2005) Session of the International Labour Conference, the authority to carry out its responsibilities under article 18 of the Standing Orders of the International Labour Conference. (GB.292/9/1, paragraphs 105 and 106.)

Review of the ILO’s collaboration with the United Nations Joint Inspection Unit

Governing Body decision:

181. The Governing Body decided the discussion on this matter would be deferred to the 294th (November 2005) Session. (GB.292/9/1, paragraph 109.)

Other financial questions

The United Nations System Chief Executives Board (CEB) for Coordination: Statistical report on the budgetary and financial situation of organizations of the United Nations system

182. The Governing Body took note of this part of the report. (GB.292/9/1, paragraph 110.)
Funding of a technical survey of the headquarters building

Governing Body decision:

183. The Governing Body, in order to avoid delay in commencing an urgent comprehensive technical survey of the headquarters building, agreed that any costs incurred during 2005 in carrying out the survey, not exceeding 270,000 Swiss francs, would be charged to the Building and Accommodation Fund on the understanding that the amount charged would be reimbursed to the Fund in 2006 from any provisions made in the 2006-07 programme and budget for such a survey. (GB.292/9(Add.), paragraph 2.)

Second report: Personnel questions
(GB.292/9/2(Rev.) and GB.292/9(Add.))

I. Statement by the staff representative

II. Amendments to the Staff Regulations

III. Exceptions to the Staff Regulations

IV. Composition and structure of the staff

184. The Governing Body took note of these parts of the report. (GB.292/9/2(Rev.), paragraphs 1-16.)

V. ILO Human Resources Strategy

Governing Body decision:

185. The Governing Body:

(a) decided to provide guidance to the Office in relation to the proposals identified for revising the Human Resources Strategy;

(b) requested that, in November 2005, the Office provide for the Committee’s approval a revised Human Resources Strategy, including targets and indicators in relation to each of its core components; and

(c) requested that a report on implementation of the Strategy be provided in November 2006 and annually thereafter.

(GB.292/9/2(Rev.), paragraph 44.)

VI. Decisions of the United Nations General Assembly on the report of the International Civil Service Commission

Governing Body decision:

186. The Governing Body:

(a) endorsed the decisions of the United Nations General Assembly and authorized the Director-General to give effect in the ILO to these decisions (relating to new levels of education grant; paternity leave entitlements; and a
new salary scale for officials in the Professional category and above),
through amendments to the Staff Regulations, as necessary; and

(b) authorized the Director-General to determine the administrative details of
implementing the revised paternity leave provisions in the ILO.

(GB.292/9/2(Rev.), paragraph 49.)

VII. Pensions questions

(a) Decisions of the United Nations General Assembly on the report of the
Board of the United Nations Joint Staff Pension Fund

187. The Governing Body took note of this part of the report. (GB.292/9/2(Rev.),
paragraphs 51-52.)

(b) Report of the Board of the Special Payments Funds

Governing Body decision:

188. The Governing Body:

(a) appointed Ms. G. Stoikov and Mr. T. Montant as members of the Board of
Trustees of the Special Payments Fund;

(b) decided to amend the terms of reference of the Special Payments Fund, as
from 1 April 2005, so as to provide for payments on an ex gratia basis,
without entailing any contractual entitlement, to former ILO officials (or
their surviving spouses) irrespective of age, provided that they are United
Nations Joint Staff Pension Fund beneficiaries, that they have had at least
ten years of United Nations system employment, and that the last five years
of employment were with the ILO;

(c) authorized the Board of Trustees of the Special Payments Fund to make
such payments to the former ILO officials and surviving spouses mentioned
in subparagraph (a) above; and

(d) considered this amendment to be subject to annual review, to ensure that it
will not entail any large unforeseen expenditures.

(GB.292/9/2(Rev.), paragraphs 56 and 57.)

VIII. Matters relating to the Administrative Tribunal of the ILO

(a) Composition of the Tribunal

Governing Body decision:

189. The Governing Body:

(a) expressed its gratitude to Ms. Flerida Ruth P. Romero for her contribution
over the last five years to the work of the Administrative Tribunal of the
International Labour Organization and recommended to the International
Labour Conference that it also express its gratitude to Ms. Flerida Ruth P. Romero;

(b) decided to propose to the International Labour Conference, at its 93rd Session, that it renew the term of office of Ms. Geneviève Gaudron for three years;

(c) authorized its Officers to submit a proposal on its behalf directly to the Conference for the replacement of the judge whose term of office expires in June 2005.

The International Labour Conference,

Decides, in accordance with article III of the Statute of the Administrative Tribunal of the International Labour Organization, to renew the term of office of Ms. Geneviève Gaudron for three years;

Expresses its gratitude to Ms. Flerida Ruth P. Romero for her contribution over the last five years to the work of the Administrative Tribunal of the International Labour Organization.

(GB.292/9/2(Rev.), paragraph 58, and GB.292/9(Add.), paragraph 4.)

(b) Statute of the Tribunal

(c) Recognition of the Tribunal’s jurisdiction by the Agency for International Trade Information and Cooperation

Governing Body decision:

190. The Governing Body approved the recognition of the Tribunal’s jurisdiction by the Agency for International Trade Information and Cooperation, with effect from the date of such approval. (GB.292/9/2(Rev.), paragraph 66)

Third report: Programme and Budget proposals for 2006-07

(GB.292/9/3(Rev.))

191. The Government representative of the United States, speaking on behalf of Canada, Japan and the United Kingdom, recalled that, although he supported the ILO and its work, he did not support the proposed budget level and that the Governing Body’s recommendation should reflect that position.

192. The Employer Vice-Chairperson stated that his group wished to be associated with the process that would allow for priorities of programmes to be redefined and for a consensus to be reached prior to the Conference in June.

193. The Worker Vice-Chairperson recalled that his group had, in the end, agreed to the Director-General’s proposal but nevertheless considered that certain expenses could not be reduced. He recalled that all the members of the Governing Body had been elected to their positions and that they were all on an equal footing, regardless of the levels of contributions made by the countries they represented.
Governing Body decision:

194. Subject to the positions taken and opposition expressed during the course of the discussion and during the debate of the Programme, Financial and Administrative Committee, as noted in its report, the Governing Body:

(a) recommended to the International Labour Conference at its 93rd (June 2005) Session a provisional programme level of US$568,589,939, estimated at the 2004-05 budget exchange rate of 1.34 Swiss francs to the US dollar, the final exchange rate and the corresponding US dollar level of the budget and Swiss franc assessment to be determined by the Conference;

(b) proposed to the Conference at the same session a resolution for the adoption of the programme and budget for the 70th financial period (2006-07) and for the allocation of expenses among member States in that period in the following terms:

The General Conference of the International Labour Organization, in virtue of the Financial Regulations, passes for the 70th financial period, ending 31 December 2007, the budget of expenditure for the International Labour Organization amounting to US$ … and the budget of income amounting to US$ …, which, at the budget rate of exchange of Swiss francs … to the US dollar amounts to Swiss francs …, and resolves that the budget of income, denominated in Swiss francs, shall be allocated among member States in accordance with the scale of contributions recommended by the Finance Committee of Government Representatives.

(GB.292/9/3(Rev.), paragraph 207.)

Fourth report: Report of the Government members of the Committee on Allocations Matters
(GB.292/9/4)

Scale of assessments of contributions to the budget for the 2006-07 financial period

Governing Body decision:

195. The Governing Body decided that, in accordance with the established practice of harmonizing the rates of assessment of ILO member States with their rates of assessment in the United Nations, it should base the ILO scale of assessments for 2006 on the United Nations scale for 2004-06, and that it would accordingly propose to the Conference the adoption of the draft scale of assessments for 2006 as set out in column 3 of document GB.292/PFA/GMA/1(Rev.), subject to such adjustments as might be necessary following any further change in the membership of the Organization before the Conference is called upon to adopt the recommended scale. (GB.292/9/4, paragraph 3.)

Assessment of the contributions of new member States

Governing Body decision:

196. The Governing Body decided that, in accordance with the established practice of harmonizing the rates of assessment of ILO member States with their rates of assessment in the United Nations, it would propose to the Conference that the
contribution of Samoa to the ILO budget for the period of its membership in the Organization in 2005 be based on an annual assessment rate of 0.001 per cent. (GB.292/9/4, paragraph 5.)

Tenth item on the agenda

REPORT OF THE COMMITTEE ON LEGAL ISSUES AND INTERNATIONAL LABOUR STANDARDS

(GB.292/10(Rev.))

Legal issues

I. Possible improvements in the standards-related activities of the ILO:
   Proposals regarding submission to competent authorities

Governing Body decision:

197. The Governing Body adopted the draft revised Memorandum concerning the obligation to submit Conventions and Recommendations to the competent authorities concerning the obligation to submit Conventions and Recommendations to the competent authorities contained in Appendix I to the report. (GB.292/10(Rev.), paragraph 21.)

   II. Practical arrangements for the discussion, at the 93rd Session (June 2005) of the International Labour Conference, of the Global Report prepared under the follow-up to the ILO Declaration on Fundamental Principles and Rights at Work

Governing Body decision:

198. The Governing Body invited the Conference, at its 93rd Session, to adopt the provisional ad hoc arrangements set out in the appendix to document GB.292/LILS/2 concerning the discussion of the Global Report under the follow-up to the ILO Declaration on Fundamental Principles and Rights at Work, with effect for the rest of the current four-year cycle, starting with the present session, or until such further time as the Governing Body might decide. (GB.292/10(Rev.), paragraph 30.)

   III. Practices for the preparation of international labour Conventions:
       Handbook on good drafting practices

Governing Body decision:

199. The Governing Body:

   (a) took note of the document entitled Manual for drafting ILO instruments;

   (b) requested the Office to adapt the Manual along the lines indicated in paragraphs 8-10 of document GB.292/LILS/3, financing this work through savings;
(c) requested the Office to inform the Governing Body of progress in work to adapt the Manual at its 294th Session (November 2005).

(GB.292/10(Rev.), paragraph 39.)

IV. Consolidation of rules applicable to the Governing Body

Governing Body decision:

200. The Governing Body approved the detailed plan of the compendium of rules that govern it, with a view to the submission by the Office of a draft compendium at the 294th Session of the Governing Body (November 2005). (GB.292/10(Rev.), paragraph 53.)

V. Flag of the International Labour Organization

Governing Body decision

201. The Governing Body approved:

(a) the draft resolution concerning the flag of the International Labour Organization, with a view to its adoption by the International Labour Conference;

(b) the code and regulations for the use of the flag of the International Labour Organization, as amended, subject to their coming into force after adoption by the Conference of its resolution concerning the flag of the International Labour Organization.

(GB.292/10(Rev.), paragraph 59.)

International labour standards and human rights

VII. Improvements in the standards-related activities of the ILO: A progress report

Governing Body decision:

202. The Governing Body:

(a) invited the Director-General to launch, as a priority, a campaign for the ratification or acceptance of the Constitution of the International Labour Organization Instrument of Amendment, 1997;

(b) invited the Office to prepare for its 294th Session (November 2005) a document on improvements in ILO standards-related activities: outlines of a future strategic orientation for standards and for implementing standards-related policies and procedures.

(GB.292/10(Rev.), paragraph 110.)
VIII. General status report on ILO action concerning discrimination in employment and occupation

203. The Governing Body took note of this part of the report. (GB.292/10(Rev.), paragraphs 111-123.)

IX. Form for reports on the application of unratified Conventions (article 19 of the Constitution): The Forced Labour Convention, 1930 (No. 29), and the Abolition of Forced Labour Convention, 1957 (No. 105)

Governing Body decision:

204. The Governing Body adopted the report form on the application of unratified Conventions (article 19 of the Constitution): the Forced Labour Convention, 1930 (No. 29), and the Abolition of Forced Labour Convention, 1957 (No. 105), as amended (see Appendix III to the report). (GB.292/10(Rev.), paragraph 144.)

X. Form for reports on the application of ratified Conventions (article 22 of the Constitution): The Human Resources Development Convention, 1975 (No. 142)

Governing Body decision:

205. The Governing Body adopted the report form on the application of ratified Conventions (article 22 of the Constitution): the Human Resources Development Convention, 1975 (No. 142), contained in Appendix IV to the report. (GB.292/10(Rev.), paragraph 149.)

XI. Arrangements and procedures under Article 5, paragraphs 6-8, of the Seafarers’ Identity Documents Convention (Revised), 2003 (No. 185)

Governing Body decision:

206. The Governing Body:

(a) approved the arrangements, as amended, set out in Appendix V to the report;

(b) took note of the elements contained in Appendices VI and VII to the report.

(GB.292/10 (Rev.), paragraph 158.)

XII. Other questions

Agenda of the next session of the Committee on Legal Issues and International Labour Standards

207. The Governing Body took note of this part of the report. (GB.292/10(Rev.), paragraph 159.)
Eleventh item on the agenda

REPORT OF THE SUBCOMMITTEE ON MULTINATIONAL ENTERPRISES
(GB.292/11)


Update of the Tripartite Declaration of Principles concerning Multinational Enterprises and Social Policy

Composition of the Subcommittee on Multinational Enterprises

Other questions

208. The Governing Body took note of these parts of the Subcommittee’s report. (GB.292/11, paragraphs 1-20.)

Governing Body decision:

209. The Governing Body:

- expressed its satisfaction with the work undertaken by the Office that resulted in the signing of a Memorandum of Understanding with the ISO concerning its work in the area of social responsibility;

- requested the Office to assign responsibility for the coordination of its work in the area of corporate social responsibility to the Employment Sector and to ensure that the Subcommittee on Multinational Enterprises is regularly informed and consulted on the work proposed and carried out in this area by the Office;

- requested the Office to include in its proposals for use of the Technical Meetings Reserve in 2006-07 a proposal to organize a forum on CSR on the occasion of the 30th anniversary of the MNE Declaration to position the MNE Declaration as a key reference in the CSR debate;

- requested the Office to communicate its concern to the United Nations secretariat about the Global Compact’s endorsement of the decision by the ISO to develop a standard in the area of social responsibility before negotiations between the ILO and the ISO on this matter had been concluded and to enter into discussions with the Global Compact Office to ensure that no further Global Compact inter-agency statements be issued in this context without the ILO’s agreement;

- requested the Office to remind the Office of the High Commissioner for Human Rights of the importance of recognizing the ILO’s constituents as the legitimate representatives of employers and workers worldwide in the context of its consultation process on the subject of business and human rights;
approved the Subcommittee’s recommendation that, when deciding on the functioning and size of its committees for the period 2005-08, it establish a Subcommittee on Multinational Enterprises with a membership of eight titular and eight substitute members from each tripartite group.

(GB.292/11, paragraphs 21-26.)

210. The Employer Vice-Chairperson expressed her group’s particular satisfaction at the signing of the Memorandum of Understanding with the ISO. It was a clear affirmation of the ILO’s tripartite mandate.

Twelfth item on the agenda

REPORT OF THE COMMITTEE ON EMPLOYMENT AND SOCIAL POLICY
(GB.292/12(Rev.))

I. An overview of the World Employment Report 2004-05

II. Implementation of the Global Employment Agenda: An update

III. HIV/AIDS and employment

IV. Promoting technological change for higher productivity, job creation and improved standards of living

211. The Governing Body took note of these parts of the report. (GB.292/12(Rev.), paragraphs 1-110.)

V. Microfinance and decent work

Governing Body decision:

212. The Governing Body requested the Officers of the Committee on Employment and Social Policy to draft a short statement of ILO policy, to be submitted to the Governing Body in November 2005. (GB.292/12(Rev.), paragraph 127.)

Thirteenth item on the agenda

REPORT OF THE COMMITTEE ON SECTORAL AND TECHNICAL MEETINGS AND RELATED ISSUES
(GB.292/13(Rev.))

Sectoral Activities Programme: Proposals for activities in 2006-07

Governing Body decision:

213. The Governing Body decided that:

(a) new sectoral action programmes should take place in 2006-07 in the following sectors on the nominated topics:
(i) Health services: International migration of health service workers: The supply side;

(ii) Telecommunication services: (topic to be decided);

(iii) Public service: Promoting and strengthening social dialogue in the public service and public service reform in a changing environment;

(b) current action programmes, recommended by the sectoral steering groups in September 2005, continue in 2006-07;

(c) tripartite sectoral meetings should take place in 2006-07 in the following sectors on the nominated topics:

(i) Chemicals: A meeting of experts to examine instruments, knowledge, advocacy, technical cooperation and international collaboration as tools with a view to developing a policy framework for hazardous substances;

(ii) Mining (coal and other mining): A meeting of experts to revise the 1984 code of practice on safety and health in coalmines;

(iii) Transport (including civil aviation, railways, road transport) and ports: A meeting on the labour and social issues affected by problems of cross-border mobility of international drivers in the road transport sector;

(iv) Commerce (topic to be decided).

(GB.292/13(Rev.), paragraph 28.)

Effect to be given to the recommendations of sectoral meetings


Governing Body decision:

214. The Governing Body decided:

(a) to authorize the Director-General to communicate the Note on the proceedings to:

(i) governments, requesting them to communicate these texts to the employers’ and workers’ organizations concerned;

(ii) the international employers’ and workers’ organizations concerned; and

(iii) the international organizations concerned;
(b) to request the Director-General to bear in mind, when drawing up proposals for the future work of the Office, the wishes expressed by the Meeting in paragraphs 26-29 of the conclusions.

(GB.292/13(Rev.), paragraph 33.)


Governing Body decision:

215. The Governing Body decided:

(a) to authorize the Director-General to communicate the Note on the proceedings to:

(i) governments, requesting them to communicate these texts to the employers’ and workers’ organizations concerned;

(ii) the international employers’ and workers’ organizations concerned; and

(iii) the international organizations concerned;

(b) to request the Director-General to bear in mind, when drawing up proposals for the future work of the Office, the wishes expressed by the Meeting in paragraph 7 of the conclusions.

(GB.292/13(Rev.), paragraph 39.)

Reports of meetings of experts

Tripartite Meeting of Experts on the Fishing Sector
(Geneva, 13-17 December 2004)

216. The Governing Body took note of this section of the report.

(GB.292/13(Rev.), paragraphs 40-44.)

Meeting of Experts to Develop Guidelines for Labour Inspection in Forestry
(Geneva, 24-28 January 2005)

Governing Body decision:

217. The Governing Body:

(a) took note of the report of the Meeting of Experts and authorized the Director-General to publish the Guidelines for labour inspection in forestry; and
(b) requested the Director-General to bear in mind, when drawing up proposals for the future work of the Office, the wishes expressed by the Meeting in the recommendations for follow-up action by the ILO.

(GB.292/13(Rev.), paragraph 52.)

*Meeting of Experts to Develop a Revised Code of Practice on Safety and Health in the Iron and Steel Industry (Geneva, 1-9 February 2005)*

**Governing Body decision:**

**218. The Governing Body:**

(a) took note of the report of the Meeting of Experts and authorized the Director-General to publish the code of practice on safety and health in the iron and steel industry; and

(b) requested the Director-General to bear in mind, when drawing up proposals for the future work of the Office, the wishes expressed by the Meeting in the recommendations for follow-up action by the ILO.

(GB.292/13(Rev.), paragraph 59.)

*Development of a Joint FAO/ILO/IMO Code and Voluntary Guidelines on Safety and Health on Fishing Vessels*

**219. The Governing Body took note of this part of the report.** (GB.292/13(Rev.), paragraphs 60-68.)


**Governing Body decision:**

**220. The Governing Body decided:**

(a) to authorize the holding of a second session of the Joint ILO/IMO/Basel Convention Working Group on Ship Scrapping in Geneva in late 2005 or early 2006, with a composition of ten ILO (five Employer and five Worker) representatives, five Basel Convention representatives and five IMO representatives; and

(b) to request the Director-General to communicate its decision to the Executive-Secretary of the secretariat of the Basel Convention and to the Secretary-General of the International Maritime Organization.

(GB.292/13(Rev.), paragraph 73.)
Other questions


Governing Body decision:

221. The Governing Body:

(a) took note of the information provided; and

(b) approved the terms of the draft resolution proposed at the first session of the Joint ILO/IMO Ad Hoc Expert Working Group on the Fair Treatment of Seafarers in the Event of a Maritime Accident.

(GB.292/13(Rev.), paragraph 81.)

Proposals for a Tripartite Meeting on Promoting Fair Globalization in Textiles and Clothing in a Post-MFA Environment

Governing Body decision:

222. The Governing Body decided that a Tripartite Meeting on Promoting Fair Globalization in Textiles and Clothing in a Post-MFA Environment would be held during the second half of 2005. (GB.292/13(Rev.), paragraph 98.)

Fourteenth item on the agenda

REPORT OF THE COMMITTEE ON TECHNICAL COOPERATION (GB.292/14(Rev.))

I. Thematic evaluation report: Gender issues in technical cooperation

Governing Body decision:

223. The Governing Body requested the Director-General:

(a) to work with constituents, donors and the beneficiaries so that all future ILO technical cooperation programmes and projects systematically mainstream gender throughout the project cycle. Specifically, this implies the involvement of both women and men in constituents’/beneficiaries’ consultations and analysis; the inclusion of data disaggregated by sex and gender in the background analysis and justification of project documents; the formulation of gender-sensitive strategies and objectives and gender-specific indicators, outputs and activities consistent with these; striving for gender balance in the recruitment of project personnel and experts and in representation in institutional structures set up under projects; and, finally, in the terms of reference for evaluations, requiring the inclusion of impact assessment on gender equality and gender expertise in the evaluation team;
(b) to work with donors so that all future ILO technical cooperation partnership agreements make specific provisions to guarantee and support gender mainstreaming in all the programmes included in the agreement;

c) to increase, through technical cooperation, the capacity of ILO constituents and implementing partners to promote gender equality in the world of work.

(GB.292/14(Rev.), paragraph 22.)

II. On-the-spot review in Europe: Oral presentation

224. The Governing Body took note of this section of the report. (GB.292/14(Rev.), paragraphs 23-32.)

III. The Committee on Technical Cooperation:
   Modalities for improved functioning

Governing Body decision:

225. The Governing Body decided:

(a) to endorse the proposed modalities for improved functioning of the Committee on Technical Cooperation as recommended by the Committee’s meeting;

(b) to request the Director-General to instruct the secretariat to make the necessary arrangements to implement the agreed modalities in accordance with the priorities indicated by the Committee taking account of their feasibility and resource implications;

(c) to consider in its future deliberations on “The functioning of decision-making bodies: The Governing Body” any proposals concerning the functioning of the Committee on Technical Cooperation affecting modalities governed by rules and decisions established by the Governing Body for the functioning of its committees.

(GB.292/14(Rev.), paragraph 49.)

IV. Operational aspects of the International Programme on the Elimination of Child Labour (IPEC)

226. The Governing Body took note of this part of the report. (GB.292/14(Rev.), paragraphs 50-61.)

V. Follow-up to the ILO Declaration on Fundamental Principles and Rights at Work: Technical cooperation priorities and action plans regarding freedom of association and the effective recognition of the right to collective bargaining

Governing Body decision:

227. The Governing Body endorsed the priorities for the continuation of the action plan on freedom of association and the effective recognition of the right to collective bargaining, as outlined in document GB.292/TC/5, and requests that it
be kept informed, through the Committee on Technical Cooperation, of the implementation of the activities proposed. (GB.292/14(Rev.), paragraph 77.)

VI. Office-wide implementation of the resolution concerning tripartism and social dialogue

Governing Body decision:

228. The Governing Body requested the Director-General:

(a) to ensure that the principles of tripartism and social dialogue are further embedded in technical cooperation activities through various means, including the active participation of governments, through the ministries of labour and other ministries concerned and their administration, and employers’ and workers’ organizations in their preparation, implementation and evaluation;

(b) to develop clear protocols for consultations and for facilitating the relationships between all departments and the Bureaux for Employers’ and Workers’ Activities, recognizing their unique role in presenting the priorities and views of workers and employers within the ILO;

(c) to strengthen training initiatives on the importance of tripartism and social dialogue – including the key roles played by labour administration, workers and employers – particularly with respect to new staff orientation and management training.

(GB.292/14(Rev.), paragraph 85.)

VII. Special technical cooperation programme for Colombia (2001-03)

229. The Worker spokesperson stated that the report presented on this subject did not give a true impression of the situation in Colombia. The group would prepare a letter to the Director-General giving its point of view.

Governing Body decision:

230. The Governing Body requested the Director-General:

(a) to seek to maintain, with all means necessary, the continuation of the special programme of technical cooperation for Colombia, particularly as regards strengthening social dialogue, improving labour relations, and promoting freedom of association and the right to collective bargaining;

(b) to implement an effective resource mobilization strategy in order to continue and strengthen the programme;

(c) to keep the Governing Body regularly informed on the implementation of the programme and on the results achieved.

(GB.292/14(Rev.), paragraph 97.)
VIII. Other questions

231. The Governing Body took note of this section of the report. (GB.292/14(Rev.), paragraphs 98-101.)

Fifteenth item on the agenda

REPORT OF THE WORKING PARTY ON THE SOCIAL DIMENSION OF GLOBALIZATION
(GB.292/15(Rev.))

Oral report by the Chairperson of the Working Party, Mr. Philippe Séguin
(Government delegate, France)

232. The Employer Vice-Chairperson regretted that discussions such as those which had taken place within the Working Party were not the subject of a more detailed written record. He also wished that press releases, as far as possible, would reflect the positions of the social players in the debate.

233. The Governing Body noted the oral report presented by the Chairperson of the Working Party.

Sixteenth item on the agenda

REPORT OF THE DIRECTOR-GENERAL
(GB.292/16 (& Add.))

I. Obituary

Governing Body decision:

234. The Governing Body invited the Director-General to convey its condolences to the family of Mr. Roger Louet and to the General Confederation of Labour-Force Ouvrière (CGT-FO) and to the family of Mr. André Muyumbu and to the Association of Employers of Burundi. (GB.292/16, paragraph 6, and GB.292/16(Add.), paragraph 5, respectively.)

II. Progress in international legislation

III. Internal administration

IV. Publications and documents

235. The Governing Body took note of these sections of the report. (GB.292/16, paragraphs 7-24.)

First Supplementary Report: Report of the Committee of Experts on the Application of Conventions and Recommendations
(GB.292/16/1)

237. The Employer Vice-Chairperson expressed his group’s satisfaction at the increase in the number of biometric products that complied with the requirements for worldwide interoperability established under Convention No. 185.

238. The Governing Body took note of the report.

239. The Worker Vice-Chairperson recalled that this was a subject of great importance. Jobs could alienate people or motivate them: by establishing a system that took this into account, social disruption could be avoided. The conclusions of the Meeting held last year revealed the common ground shared by the three groups. The Meeting had been successful and would certainly contribute to a successful Conference item in this field, as well as assist the Global Employment Agenda and the Youth Employment Network. However, all three groups should be aware of the need to concentrate also on the employment of disabled people, and of those suffering from life-threatening diseases, including HIV/AIDS. The task was not easy, but was of tremendous significance. The group supported the point for decision.

240. The Employer Vice-Chairperson fully endorsed the Worker spokesperson’s statement. The Meeting had been very successful. However, the important feature of such meetings was the exchange of views and of experience, and the sense of the meetings could be distorted by seeking to extract conclusions from the discussions. The theme of the Meeting was of great importance, and the group looked forward to the discussion on this subject at the Conference. It was important to focus on practical questions and projects, based on experience in this field.

241. A Government representative of the United Kingdom supported particularly the suggestion in paragraph 11 of the conclusions, suggesting the possibility of a panel of experts and round table discussions during the discussion on youth employment at the International Labour Conference in June.

242. A Government representative of Canada noted that there was no single response to the promotion of youth employment. In its preparations for the discussion at the Conference, the Office should facilitate a wide exchange of experience among participants, so that practical lessons might point the way to future ILO action. A panel discussion was a good idea.

Governing Body decision:

243. The Governing Body authorized the Director-General:

(a) to communicate the Note on the proceedings and the conclusions of the Meeting:

(i) to governments, requesting them to communicate these texts to the employers’ and workers’ organizations concerned;
(ii) to the international employers’ and workers’ organizations concerned;

(iii) to the international organizations concerned;

(b) to undertake consultations with the constituents prior to the 93rd Session (2005) of the International Labour Conference regarding the proposal in paragraph 11 of the conclusions.

(GB.292/16/3, paragraphs 6 and 7.)

Fourth Supplementary Report: ILO response to the earthquake and tsunami disaster in the Indian Ocean

(GB.292/16/4)

244. The Chairperson paid tribute to the victims of the disaster triggered by the earthquake and tsunami in the Indian Ocean on 26 December 2004, which caused thousands of deaths and deprived over 4 million people, the majority of them workers of the countries most affected, of their sources of livelihood. He requested a minute’s silence as a mark of solidarity with the populations struck by the catastrophe.

(A minute’s silence was observed in the room.)

245. The Chairperson exceptionally gave the floor to the representatives of those countries that had been affected by the disaster, in order that they might speak for a few minutes.

246. A Government representative of Sri Lanka, speaking in the name of the Sri Lankan Ambassador, Ms. Sarala M. Fernando, said that the response of the international community had been overwhelming. The ILO had carried out an assessment of the labour market situation in the areas affected by the tsunami in order to quantify the productive assets and jobs lost. The ILO had also collaborated with the national authorities and other international institutions, at all times promoting the optimum use of local consultants and local resources during the reconstruction phase, so as to maximize employment opportunities.

247. Supplementary Report 4, presented by the Office, stated that, to date, the projects proposed by the ILO as a part of the UN flash appeal had not received any support. This was for two reasons: firstly, whenever a natural disaster occurred, initial efforts were concentrated on immediate relief and less on subsequent recovery processes; secondly, the ILO was largely seen as a standard-setting institution and less well-known for its technical assistance and operational activities. This might indeed have been a wake-up call for the ILO to review the role it could take in crisis response, including the use of available local expertise.

248. According to the last assessment carried out by the United Nations Organization, those most in need were the thousands of fishermen who had lost their boats, small entrepreneurs and those working in the tourism industry. Those sectors were not addressed during the initial phase of the relief. However, the aid agencies could adjust their programmes and funding requirements to meet the needs of those sectors following the mid-term review of the UN flash appeal, which had been planned for April.

249. A Government representative of Indonesia stated that emergency relief, rehabilitation and reconstruction efforts would take between five and ten years to complete. There was little doubt that the resources that these efforts would require could not be borne by any individual country working alone. The Government of Indonesia had divided the task into three phases: emergency relief; rehabilitation, which included the restoration of services to
their minimum levels; and the reconstruction and recovery phase which would take at least another five years.

250. The Government remained determined to rebuild infrastructure and improve the lives of devastated communities, whilst paying heed to the aspirations of the people. The Government counted on the cooperation of social partners in the provinces affected, in order to ensure that rehabilitation efforts undertaken with the international community would be transparent and well planned, without losing sight of the fact that programmes should be implemented locally and should encourage the economic development of the provinces. Currently, the ILO organized a short course targeting young people between the ages of 15 and 17 concerning access to decent work. Finally, the Government called on all donors, and especially the member countries of the ILO, to fulfil the pledges that they had made to assist all the affected countries in meeting their rehabilitation and reconstruction obligations.

251. The Governing Body took note of the report. (GB.292/16/4.)

Fifth Supplementary Report: Appointment of a Regional Director and of a Treasurer and Financial Comptroller
(GB.292/16/5)

252. Mr. Shinichi Hasegawa and Mr. Gregory Johnson, who respectively took up the posts of Director of the Regional Office for Asia and the Pacific and Treasurer and Financial Comptroller on 1 January 2005, made and signed the prescribed declaration of loyalty stipulated in paragraph b) of article 1.4 of the ILO Staff Regulations.

Sixth Supplementary Report: Report of the Committee set up to examine the representation alleging non-observance by Uruguay of the Occupational Safety and Health Convention, 1981 (No. 155), made under article 24 of the ILO Constitution by the Inter-Union Assembly of Workers – National Convention of Workers (PIT-CNT) (GB.292/16/6)

Governing Body decision:

253. The Governing Body:

(a) approved this report, in particular the conclusions contained in paragraphs 30 to 40;

(b) urged the Government of Uruguay to continue to take the necessary measures in order:

(i) to continue to strengthen occupational safety and hygiene legislation and to regulate those areas where legal vacuums exist;

(ii) to ensure compliance with current occupational safety and hygiene legislation at both national and enterprise level;

(iii) to examine periodically the situation as regards the safety and health of workers in both the public and private sectors, in order to identify problems which exist and take effective measures to resolve them;
(iv) to provide information on the health and safety problems which, according to the PIT-CNT, have arisen as a result of the reform of the state enterprises;

(v) to continue to strengthen the inspection system at both national and enterprise level and increase, if appropriate, the number of labour inspectors, and to improve the imposition of the relevant sanctions;

(vi) to provide official information both on occupational risks and accidents and on investigations carried out in this area, and to state whether the body responsible for publishing the relevant statistical information has failed to do so since 1997;

(vii) to continue to increase training and qualification activities, especially at enterprise level; and

(viii) to continue to facilitate and to promote cooperation between employers and workers or their representatives at the enterprise level, in order to overcome, if applicable, the reticence which employers may have in facilitating such cooperation;

(c) requested the Government to include, in the reports it submits on the application of Convention No. 155 under article 22 of the ILO Constitution, information on the application of any measures adopted in order to achieve effective compliance with the recommendations made in the above paragraphs so that the Committee of Experts on the Application of Conventions and Recommendations can examine progress in these matters; and

(d) to declare closed the procedure initiated as a result of the present representation.

(GB.292/16/6, paragraph 41.)

Seventh Supplementary Report:
Arrangements for the Fourteenth Asian Regional Meeting
(GB.292/16/7)

Governing Body decision:

254. The Governing Body decided that the Fourteenth Asian Regional Meeting to take place in Busan, Republic of Korea, would be held from 10 to 13 October 2005.

(GB.292/16/7, paragraph 3.)
Seventeenth item on the agenda

REPORTS OF THE OFFICERS OF THE GOVERNING BODY

First report: Representation alleging non-observance by Chile of the Old-Age Insurance (Industry, etc.) Convention, 1933 (No. 35), and the Invalidity Insurance (Industry, etc.) Convention, 1933 (No. 37), made under article 24 of the ILO Constitution by the Colegio de Profesores de Chile A.G. (GB.292/17/1)

Governing Body decision:

255. The Governing Body:

(a) decided that the representation was receivable;

(b) decided to defer to June 2005 the decision on the composition of the Committee responsible for examining the representation.

(GB.292/17/1, paragraph 6)

Second report: Procedure and criteria applied to initial requests by international non-governmental organizations to be invited to be represented at the International Labour Conference (GB.292/17/2)

Governing Body decision:

256. The Governing Body decided to propose to the Conference an amendment to its Standing Orders as indicated in paragraph 9 of document GB.292/17/2.

(GB.292/17/2, paragraph 11.)

Eighteenth item on the agenda

COMPOSITION AND AGENDA OF STANDING BODIES AND MEETINGS

(GB.292/18)

Committee of Experts on the Application of Conventions and Recommendations

Reappointment

Governing Body decision:

257. The Governing Body reappointed, for a period of three years, the following members of the Committee of Experts on the Application of Conventions and Recommendations:

– Ms. Robin A. Layton (Australia);
– Mr. Amadou Sô (Senegal);
– Mr. Yozo Yokota (Japan).

(GB.292/18, paragraph 1.)
Vacancies

Governing Body decision:

258. The Governing Body requested the Director-General to convey to Mr. Prafullachandra Natvarlal Bhagwati (India) and Mr. Benjamin Obi Nwabueze (Nigeria) its deep gratitude for the services they have rendered to the ILO. (GB.292/18, paragraph 3.)

Tripartite Meeting of Experts to Develop Joint ILO/WHO Guidelines on Health Services and HIV/AIDS
(Geneva, 19-21 April 2005)

Governing Body decision:

259. The Governing Body authorized the Director-General to invite the following international non-governmental organizations to be represented at the Meeting as observers:

– Global Business Coalition on HIV and AIDS;
– Global Health Initiative/World Economic Forum;
– International Commission on Occupational Health;
– International Council of Nurses;
– International Pharmaceutical Federation;
– Public Services International;

(GB.292/18, paragraph 8.)

Tripartite Intersessional Meeting on the Follow-up to the Preparatory Technical Maritime Conference
(Geneva, 21-27 April 2005)

Governing Body decision:

260. The Governing Body authorized the Director-General to invite the following international non-governmental organizations to be represented at the Meeting as observers:

– International Association of Classification Societies;
– International Christian Maritime Association;
– International Federation of Shipmasters Associations;
– International Group of P and I Associations;
– International Shipping Federation;
– International Transport Workers’ Federation.

(GB.292/18, paragraph 13.)


Governing Body decision:

261. The Governing Body authorized the Director-General to invite the following international non-governmental organizations to be represented at the session of the Joint Working Group as observers:

– International Collective in Support of Fishworkers;
– International Christian Maritime Association;
– Mission to Seamen;
– International Committee on Seafarers’ Welfare;
– International Maritime Committee.

(GB.292/18, paragraph 17.)

International Symposium on the Role of Trade Unions in the Global Economy and the Fight against Poverty (Geneva, 17-21 October 2005)

Governing Body decision:

262. The Governing Body:

(a) approved the following composition formula: the Symposium should be attended by 45 trade union representatives, nominated after consultation with the Workers’ group of the Governing Body and coming from both industrialized and developing countries in Africa, the Americas, Asia and the Pacific, Europe and the Arab region. Efforts will be made to ensure that at least 30 per cent of the participants selected are women, in compliance with the Workers’ group’s policy on gender equality; and

(b) approved the following agenda for the Symposium:

– to review the state of the global economy in the light of the report of the World Commission on the Social Dimension of Globalization. An assessment will be made on the progress being made towards building a just globalization and the roles unions are playing in this regard;
– to focus on the Millennium Development Goals, particularly that of reducing extreme poverty, and consider the role of trade unions in the fight against poverty and social exclusion.

(GB.292/18, paragraphs 21 and 24)

**Information notes**

**PROGRAMME OF MEETINGS AS APPROVED BY THE OFFICERS OF THE GOVERNING BODY**

(GB.292/Inf.1)

**APPROVED SYMPOSIA, SEMINARS, WORKSHOPS AND SIMILAR MEETINGS**

(GB.292/Inf.2)

**REQUESTS FROM INTERNATIONAL, NON-GOVERNMENTAL ORGANIZATIONS WISHING TO BE REPRESENTED AT THE 93RD SESSION OF THE INTERNATIONAL LABOUR CONFERENCE**

(GB.292/Inf.3)

263. The Governing Body took note of the information presented in the above documents.
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Mr. M. MADI, First Counsellor, Department of International Organisations, General People’s Committee.

Mr. V. RUPSYS, Under-Secretary, Ministry of Social Security and Labour.

accompanied by:

Mr. A. ZANANAVICIUS, Chargé d’Affaires, a.i., Permanent Mission, Geneva.

Ms. R. JAKUCIONYTE, First Secretary, Permanent Mission, Geneva.

Ms. K. JUODPUSYTE, Specialist, European Integration and International Relations Department, Ministry of Social Security and Labour.

M. B. GANFOUD, ministre de la Fonction publique, de la Réforme de l’Etat et des Relations avec les institutions.

suppléant(s):

M. L. BASTIDE, ambassadeur, Mission permanente, Genève.

accompagné(s) de:

M. S. KASSÉ, Premier conseiller, Mission permanente, Genève.

M. B. MAHAMANE, conseiller technique, ministère de la Fonction publique et du Travail.

M. M. DIAKITE, directeur national du travail, ministère du Travail et de la Fonction publique.

Sr. L. DE ALBA GONGORA, Embajador, Misión Permanente, Ginebra.

suplente(s):

Sr. P. MACEDO, Embajador, Representante Alterno, Misión Permanente, Ginebra.

Sra. S. ROVIROSA, Ministra, Misión Permanente, Ginebra.

Sra. G. MORONES, Subcoordinadora de Política Laboral Internacional, Secretaría del Trabajo y Previsión Social.

Sr. A. ROSAS, Subdirector de la Dirección para la OIT, Secretaría del Trabajo y Previsión Social.

Sr. J. SANCHEZ, Jefe de Departamento para Asuntos de la OIT, Dirección General de Organismos Económicos Regionales y Multilaterales, Secretaría de Relaciones Exteriores.

Sra. C. GONZALEZ, Tercera Secretaria, Misión Permanente, Ginebra.

Sr. V. GENINA, Asesor, Misión Permanente, Ginebra.
Mr. H. LAWAL, Minister.

*substitute(s):*
Ms. T. KORIPAMO-AGARY, Permanent Secretary, Federal Ministry of Labour and Productivity.

*accompanied by:*
Mr. V. TUKURA, Special Assistant to the Minister.
Mr. I. ISA, Personal Assistant to the Minister.
Ms. B. EDEM, Director, PM.
Ms. O. AJAYI, DD, Lagos State Office.
Mr. M. BANJO, DD, Factory Inspectorate.
Mr. I. OFOEDU, Assistant Chief Administration Officer.
Mr. A. OGUNTOYINBO, DD, Oyo State.
Mr. A. YAHAYA, CLO, Bauchi State Office.
Mr. M. MORAH, Deputy Director (IR).
Mr. P. AJUZIE, Chief Labour Officer.
Mr. I. BABUWA, Assistant Director, PRS.
Mr. D. NEBURAGHO, Chief Labour Officer.
Ms. V. EGHOBAMIEN, Director, TUSIR.
Mr. M. OBI, CLO, Kwara State Office.
Ms. O. AIMIWU, Chief Labour Officer.
Ms. V.E. JEMIDE, Assistant Chief Labour Officer.
Mr. A. RUFA’I MUHAMMAD, MD, Nigerian Social Insurance Trust Fund.
Ms. S. AJAYI, Director-General, National Productivity Centre.
Mr. S.O. ADELODUN, Director-General, National Directorate of Employment.
Mr. A. AHMAD, DD, Labour.
Mr. B. EWA-HENSHAW, Senator.
Mr. J. BRAMBAIF, Senator.
Mr. J. KOLAWALE, Senator.
Mr. S. AGIDANI, House of Representatives.
Mr. A. MOMOH, House of Representatives.
Mr. J. ADUN, House of Representatives.
Mr. A. RAMALAN, Joint-Secretary, Joint Maritime Labour Industrial Council.
Mr. N. TANKO, Joint Maritime Labour Industrial Council.

Mr. W. STROMMEN, Ambassador, Permanent Mission, Geneva.

*substitute(s):*
Mr. O. VIDNES, Counsellor, Permanent Mission, Geneva.
Mr. O. BRUAAS, Adviser, Ministry of Labour and Social Affairs.

*accompanied by:*
Mr. K. PAULSEN, Minister, Permanent Mission, Geneva.
Mr. T. STENVOLD, Adviser, Ministry of Foreign Affairs.

Mr. M. HAYAT, Secretary, Ministry of Labour, Manpower and Overseas Pakistanis.

*substitute(s):*
Mr. M. KHAN, Ambassador, Permanent Mission, Geneva.

*accompanied by:*
Ms. T. JANJUA, Minister and Deputy Permanent Representative, Permanent Mission, Geneva.
Mr. A. MALIK, Joint-Secretary, Ministry of Labour, Manpower and Overseas Pakistanis.
Mr. F. TIRMIZI, First Secretary, Permanent Mission, Geneva.

Mr. S. RICHARDS, Head of ILO & UN Employment Team, Joint International Unit, Department for Work and Pensions and the Department for Education and Skills.

*substitute(s):*
Ms. S. BRATTAN, Senior Policy Advisor, Joint International Unit, Department for Work and Pensions and Department for Education and Skills.
Ms. H. NELLTHORP, First Secretary, Permanent Mission, Geneva.
Ms. P. TARIF, Second Secretary, Specialised Agencies, Permanent Mission, Geneva.
accompanied by:

Mr. N. THORNE, Ambassador and Permanent Representative, Permanent Mission, Geneva.

Mr. C. TUCKER, Director, Joint International Unit, Department for Work and Pensions and the Department for Education and Skills.

Ms. M. NIVEN, Head of International Relations Division, Joint International Unit, Department for Work and Pensions and the Department for Education and Skills.

Mr. S. PENNEY, Policy Adviser, International Relations Division, Joint International Unit, Department for Work and Pensions and the Department for Education and Skills.

Mr. C. ROWLAND, Policy Adviser, International Relations Division, Joint International Unit, Department for Work and Pensions and the Department for Education and Skills.

Ms. A. GUTHRIE, Policy Adviser, International Relations Division, Joint International Unit, Department for Work and Pensions and the Department for Education and Skills.

Mr. M. DUNNERY, Manager, Institutional Relationships, Department for International Development.

Mr. B. MCLEISH, Programme Officer, Specialised Agencies, Department for International Development.


Mr. A. LEVITSKAYA, Deputy Minister of Health and Social Development.

accompanied by:

Mr. I. SHERBAK, Deputy Director, Department of International Organizations, Ministry of Foreign Affairs.

Mr. N. LOZINSKIY, Senior Counsellor, Permanent Mission, Geneva.

Mr. E. ZAGAYNOV, Counsellor, Permanent Mission, Geneva.

Mr. S. KARTASHOV, Deputy Head of Division, Federal Labor and Employment Service.

Mr. N. POCHINOV, Head of Section, Federal Labour and Employment Service.

Mr. V. STEPANOV, Counsellor, Department of Legal and International Activities, Ministry of Health and Social Development.

Mr. I. GRIBKOVI, Third Secretary, Permanent Mission, Geneva.

Mr. E. STROYEV, Third Secretary, Department of Economic Cooperation, Ministry of Foreign Affairs.

Mr. M. KOCHETKOV, Attaché, Permanent Mission, Geneva.

Fédération de Russie
Russian Federation
Federación de Rusia

Ms. A. MAGAYA, Minister of Labour and Administrative Reform.

accompanied by:

Mr. M. ELHAJ, Ambassador, Permanent Mission, Geneva.

Mr. A. EL HASSAN, Director, External Relations Department, Ministry of Labour and Administrative Reform.

Ms. I. ELAMIN, Third Secretary, Permanent Mission, Geneva.

Soudan
Sudan
Sudán

Mr. A. MAGAYA, Minister of Labour and Administrative Reform.

accompanied by:

Mr. M. ELHAJ, Ambassador, Permanent Mission, Geneva.

Mr. A. EL HASSAN, Director, External Relations Department, Ministry of Labour and Administrative Reform.

Ms. I. ELAMIN, Third Secretary, Permanent Mission, Geneva.
Membres gouvernementaux adjoints
Miembros gubernamentales adjuntos

**Bangladesh**

Mr. M. ISLAM, Secretary, Bangladesh Secretariat, Ministry of Labour and Employment.

*substitute(s):*

Mr. T. ALI, Ambassador, Permanent Mission, Geneva.

*accompanied by:*

Mr. N. AHMED, Third Secretary, Permanent Mission, Geneva.

**Barbade Barbados Barbados**

Mr. T. CLARKE, Ambassador, Permanent Mission, Geneva.

*accompanied by:*

Ms. E. LOWE, Chief Labour Officer, Labour Department.

Mr. M. WILSON, First Secretary, Permanent Mission, Geneva.

**Bélarus Belarus Belarús**

Ms. E. KOLOS, First Deputy Minister, Ministry of Labour and Social Protection.

*substitute(s):*

Mr. S. ALEINIK, Ambassador, Permanent Mission, Geneva.

*accompanied by:*

Mr. I. STAROVOYTOV, Director of External Relations and Partnership Policy Department, Ministry of Labour and Social Protection.

Mr. A. MOLCHAN, Counsellor, Permanent Mission, Geneva.

Ms. I. VASILEUSKAYA, First Secretary, Permanent Mission, Geneva.

**Belgique Belgium Bélägica**

M. M. JADOT, président du comité de direction, Service public fédéral emploi, travail et concertation sociale.

*suppléant(s):*

M. F. ROUX, ambassadeur, Mission permanente, Genève.

*accompagné(s) de:*

M. F. VANDAMME, conseiller général de la division des affaires internationales, Service public fédéral emploi, travail et concertation sociale.

M. J. CLOESEN, conseiller à la division des affaires internationales, Service public fédéral emploi, travail et concertation sociale.

M. J. DE PRETER, Premier conseiller, Mission permanente, Genève.

Mme L. EVEN, attachée à la division des affaires internationales, Service public fédéral emploi, travail et concertation sociale.

M. H. NAJJAR, attaché à la division des affaires internationales, Service public fédéral emploi, travail et concertation sociale.

M. D. MAENAUT, délégué du gouvernement flamand auprès des organisations multilatérales à Genève.

Mme M. TIMMERMANS, déléguée de la communauté française de Belgique et de la région wallonne à Genève.
Burundi

M. D. NDITABIRIYE, ministre du Travail et de la Sécurité sociale.

suppléant(s):
M. N. NKUNDWANABAKE, Premier conseiller, Mission permanente, Genève.
M. J. HATUNGIMANA, conseiller à la Vice-présidence.

Cameroun  Cameroon  Camerún


suppléant(s):
M. J. NDJEMBA ENDEZOUMOU, ambassadeur, Mission permanente, Genève.

accompagné(s) de:
M. F. NGANTCHA, ministre-conseiller, Mission permanente, Genève.
M. C. MOUTE À BIDIAS, directeur général, Fonds national d’emploi.
Mme I. GWENANG NÉE NGO NONYOU, chef de service des relations internationales du travail, ministère de l’Emploi, du Travail et de la Sécurité sociale.

Canada  Canada  Canadá

Mr. J. MCKENNIReY, Assistant Deputy Minister, Human Resources and Skills Development Canada.

substitute(s):
Ms. D. ROBINSON, Director, International Labour Affairs, Labour Program, Human Resources and Skills Development Canada.
Mr. D. MACPHEE, Counsellor and Consul, Permanent Mission, Geneva.

accompanied by:
Ms. A. PEART, Senior Adviser, UN and Commonwealth Division, Foreign Affairs Canada.
Ms. S. FORTIN, Senior Analyst, International Labour Affairs, Labour Program, Human Resources and Skills Development Canada.

El Salvador

Sr. J. ESPINAL ESCOBAR, Ministro de Trabajo y Previsión Social.

suplente(s):
Sr. B. LARIOS LOPEZ, Embajador, Misión Permanente, Ginebra.

acompañado(s) de:
Sr. M. CASTRO GRANDE, Encargado a.i., Misión Permanente, Ginebra.
Sr. C. RODRIGUEZ, Director de Relaciones Internacionales de Trabajo, Ministerio de Trabajo y Previsión Social.
Sr. J. ANDINO RAMIREZ, Asistente del Señor Ministro.

Espagne  Spain  España

Sra. A. DOMINGUEZ GONZALEZ, Subsecretaria del Ministerio de Trabajo y Asuntos Sociales.

suplente(s):
Sr. J. MARCH PUJOL, Embajador, Misión Permanente, Ginebra.

acompañado(s) de:
Sr. F. ARNAU NAVARRO, Consejero de Trabajo y Asuntos Sociales, Misión Permanente, Ginebra.
Sr. G. LOPEZ MACLELLAN, Consejero Diplomático, Misión Permanente, Ginebra.
Ethiopie     Ethiopia     Etiopía

Mr. H. ABDELLA, Minister of Labour and Social Affairs.

substitute(s):
Mr. F. YIMER ABOYE, Ambassador, Permanent Mission, Geneva.

accompanied by:
Ms. E. TEFERA, Expert, International Relations, Ministry of Labour and Social Affairs.
Mr. S. NMENGESHA, Counsellor, Permanent Mission, Geneva.
Mr. A. SHIKETA ANSA, First Secretary, Permanent Mission, Geneva.

Ghana

Mr. J. ADDA, Minister for Manpower, Youth and Employment.

substitute(s):
Mr. K. BAWUAH-EDUSEI, Ambassador, Permanent Mission, Geneva.

accompanied by:
Mr. P. OKOH, Chairman, Parliamentary Select Committee on Manpower Development and Employment.
Mr. A. KYEREMEH, Ag. Chief Director, Ministry for Manpower, Youth and Employment.
Mr. P. AMEGEE, Greater Accra Regional Labour Officer.
Ms. M. AMADU, Director, Department of Social Welfare.
Ms. V. TETTEGAH, Counsellor, Permanent Mission, Geneva.

Iran, Rép. Islamique d’ Islamic Republic of Iran República Islámica del Irán

Mr. M. SALAMATI, Deputy Minister, Ministry of Labour and Social Affairs.

accompanied by:
Mr. M. KHAJEHNOURI, Deputy Minister, Ministry of Labour and Social Affairs.
Mr. S. HEFDAHTAN, Director-General for International Relations, Ministry of Labour and Social Affairs.
Mr. M. RAJABIE, Director, Labour Relations Coordination, Ministry of Labour and Social Affairs.
Mr. S. HOOSHMAND RABIEE, Director, Employer and Labour Associations, Ministry of Labour and Social Affairs.
Ms. S. TASDIGHI, Director, International Labour Studies, Ministry of Labour and Social Affairs.
Mr. B. JANGJOU, Director, International Labour Conferences, Ministry of Labour and Social Affairs.
Ms. A. MAJDADEH-GHAEMMAGHAMI, Officer, Foreign Nationals Directorate, Ministry of Labour and Social Affairs.
Ms. M. SADAT SHARIFIE, Officer, International Labour Conferences Directorate, Ministry of Labour and Social Affairs.
Mr. R. BAYAT MOKHTARI, Counsellor, Permanent Mission, Geneva.
Mr. A. MOMENI SANGDEH, Officer, Logistics, Ministry of Labour and Social Affairs.

Jordanie     Jordan     Jordania

Mr. M. HABASHNEH, Secretary-General, Ministry of Labour.

substitute(s):
Mr. M. BURAYZAT, Ambassador, Permanent Mission, Geneva.

accompanied by:
Mr. S. DAJANI, Counsellor for ILO affairs.
Mr. H. QUDAH, Attaché, Permanent Mission, Geneva.
Ms. Z. SOUFAN, Official, Ministry of Labour.
Kenya

Ms. N. KIRUI, Permanent Secretary, Ministry of Labour and Human Resource Development.  
*accompagnied by:*

Mr. P. OWADE, Deputy Permanent Representative, Permanent Mission, Geneva.
Mr. G. OMONDI, Counsellor (Labour), Permanent Mission, Geneva.

substitute(s):

Mr. M. MONONGA, Principal Secretary for Labour and Vocational Training, Ministry of Labour and Vocational Training.  
*accompagné de:*

Mr. Z. KAMBUTO, Labour Commissioner, Ministry of Labour and Vocational Training.

Maroc  Morocco  Marruecos

M. O. HILALE, ambassadeur, Mission permanente, Genève.

*accompagné(e)s de:*

Mme S. BOUASSA, ministre plénipotentiaire, Mission permanente, Genève.
Mme S. FAHEM, chef du service des organismes internationaux du travail, ministère de l’Emploi, de la Formation professionnelle, du Développement social et de la Solidarité.

Niger  Niger  Níger

Mme S. KANDA, ministre de la Fonction publique et du Travail.  
*accompagné(e)s de:*

M. S. HAMADOU, directeur général de l’administration du travail, ministère de la Fonction publique et du Travail.
M. K. MAINA, conseiller technique, ministère de la Fonction publique et du Travail.
M. A. IDRISSA, directeur, ANPE, ministère de la Fonction publique et du Travail.

Nouvelle-Zélande  New Zealand  Nueva Zelandia

Ms. R. STEFFENS, Director, International Services, Department of Labour.

Malawi

Mr. J. MUSSA, Minister of Labour and Vocational Training.

substitute(s):

Mr. M. MONONGA, Principal Secretary for Labour and Vocational Training, Ministry of Labour and Vocational Training.

*accompagné de:*

Mr. Z. KAMBUTO, Labour Commissioner, Ministry of Labour and Vocational Training.
 substitute(s):
Ms. C. INDER, Adviser, International Services, Department of Labour.

accompanied by:
Mr. T. CAUGHLEY, Permanent Representative, Permanent Mission, Geneva.
Ms. J. DEMPSTER, First Secretary, Permanent Mission, Geneva.

Philippines

Mr. B. BITONIO, Under-Secretary, Department of Labor and Employment.

substitute(s):

Roumanie

M. D. COSTEA, ambassadeur, Mission permanente, Genève.

accompagné(s) de:
Mme G. CONSTANTINESCU, Premier secrétaire, Mission permanente, Genève.
Mme D. DIRINEA, expert, ministère du Travail, de la Solidarité sociale et de la Famille.

Singapour

Mr. B. GAFOOR, Ambassador, Permanent Mission, Geneva.

accompanied by:
Ms. S. WONG, Senior Assistant Director, Labour Relations Department, Ministry of Manpower.
Mr. S. ONG, First Secretary, Permanent Mission, Geneva.

Slovénie

Ms. T. CESEN, State Under-Secretary, Labour Market, Employment and Education Department, Ministry of Labour, Family and Social Affairs.

accompanied by:
Ms. K. RIHAR BAJUK, Adviser, International Relations and European Affairs Department, Ministry of Labour, Family and Social Affairs.

Turquie

Mr. H. KIVANC, Counsellor, Permanent Mission, Geneva.

accompanied by:
Mr. H. ERGANI, Second Secretary, Permanent Mission, Geneva.
Mr. K. ISIKCI, Expert, Research, Planning and Coordination, Ministry of Labour and Social Security.
Mr. H. BASESGIOGLU, Intern, Permanent Mission, Geneva.

Uruguay

Sr. G. VALLES GALMES, Embajador, Misión Permanente, Ginebra.

acompañado(s) de:
Sr. R. POLLAK, Ministro, Misión Permanente, Ginebra.
Sra. A. ROCANOVA, Secretaria, Misión Permanente, Ginebra.
Sr. C. PEREIRA, Misión Permanente, Ginebra.
Srta I. AMEZAGA, Misión Permanente, Ginebra.

Sra. M. IGLESIAS, Ministra de Trabajo.

suplente(s):

Sr. R. DORADO CANO MANUEL,
Viceministro del Trabajo.
Sr. R. DARIO MOLINA, Director de la Oficina de Relaciones Internacionales y Enlace con la OIT, Ministerio del Trabajo.

acompañado(s) de:

Sr. B. CARRERO CUBEROS, Embajador, Misión Permanente, Ginebra.
Sr. O. GARCÍA, Director de Concertación, Ministerio del Trabajo.
Sra. R. POITEVIEN, Embajadora Alterna, Misión Permanente, Ginebra.
Sr. R. HANDS, Consejero, Misión Permanente, Ginebra.
Sr. J. ARIAS, Asesor Político, Misión Permanente, Ginebra.
Sr. T. JIMENEZ, Diputado de la Comisión de Desarrollo Social Integral de la Asamblea Nacional.
Sr. J. KHAN, Diputado de la Comisión de Desarrollo Social Integral de la Asamblea Nacional.

Viet Nam

Mr. Q. NGO, Ambassador, Permanent Mission, Geneva.

accompanied by:

Mr. Q. PHAM, Minister-Counsellor, Permanent Mission, Geneva.
Mr. H. PHAM, Counsellor, Permanent Mission, Geneva.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Membres employeurs titulaires</th>
<th>Regular Employer members</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Vice-président du Conseil d’administration:</strong></td>
<td><strong>Sr. D. FUNES DE RIOJA (Argentina),</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Vice-Chairperson of the Governing Body:</strong></td>
<td><strong>Presidente del Departamento de Política Social, Unión Industrial Argentina (UIA)</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Vicepresidente del Consejo de Administración:</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

M. B. BOISSON (France), conseiller social, Mouvement des entreprises de France (MEDEF).

Mr. A. DAHLAN (Saudi Arabia), Representative, Council of Saudi Chamber of Commerce and Industry.

Sr. J. DE REGIL (México), Vicepresidente, Comisión de Trabajo, Confederación de Cámaras Industriales de los Estados Unidos Mexicanos.

Ms. R. HORNUNG-DRAUS (Germany), Director, European Affairs and International Social Policy, Confederation of German Employers’ Associations (BDA).

Mr. A. JEETUN (Mauritius), Director, Mauritius Employers’ Federation.

Mr. M. LAMBERT (United Kingdom), Representative, Confederation of British Industry.

M. A. M’KAISSI (Tunisie), conseiller directeur central, Union tunisienne de l’industrie, du commerce et de l’artisanat (UTICA).

Mr. T. NILES (United States), President, United States Council for International Business.

Mr. B. NOAKES (Australia), Advisor, International Affairs, Australian Chamber of Commerce and Industry.

Mr. T. SUZUKI (Japan), Executive Adviser, Nippon-keidanren International Cooperation Center.

Mr. A. TABANI (Pakistan), President, Employers’ Federation of Pakistan.

Mr. G. TROGEN (Sweden), Director-General, ALMEGA.

M. Y. WADE (Sénégal), président, Conseil national du patronat du Sénégal.

Ms. A. GERSTEIN, accompanying Ms. Hornung-Draus.
Mr. A. GREENE, accompanying Mr. Niles.
Mr. H. YANO, accompanying Mr. Suzuki.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Membres employeurs adjoints</th>
<th>Deputy Employer members</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Miembros empleadores adjuntos</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Mr. I. ANAND (India), Chairman, Shivathene Corporate Centre.

M. M. BARDE (Suisse), secrétaire général, Fédération des syndicats patronaux.

Mr. J.W. BOTHA (South Africa), Business South Africa.

Mr. N. CHO (Republic of Korea), Vice-Chairman, Korea Employers’ Federation.

Sr. B. DE ARBELOA (Venezuela), Promotores y Consultores Asociados.

Sr. F. DIAZ GARAYCOA (Ecuador), Asesor Jurídico, Federación Nacional de Cámaras de Industrias del Ecuador.

Mr. O. EREMEEV (Russian Federation), Chairman, Coordinating Council of Employers’ Unions of Russia (CCEUR).

Mr. A. FINLAY (Canada), Vice-President and Assistant General Counsel, Employee Relations and Employment Group, The Bank of Nova Scotia.

M. L. GLÉLÉ (Bénin), président, Conseil national du patronat du Bénin.

Mr. W.A. HILTON-CLARKE (Trinidad and Tobago), Vice-Chairman, Employers’ Consultative Association of Trinidad and Tobago.

Ms. L. HORVATIC (Croatia), Director of International Relations, Croatian Employers’ Association.

Ms. R. KARIKARI ANANG (Ghana), Executive Director, Ghana Employers’ Association.

Sr. J. LACASA ASO (España), Director, Departamento de Relaciones Internacionales, Confederación Española de Organizaciones Empresariales (CEOE).

Mr. D. LIMA GODOY (Brazil), Vice-president, Confederación Nacional de la Industria (CNI).

Mr. K. MATTAR (United Arab Emirates), Board Director, Federation of Chambers of Commerce and Industry.

M. E. MEGATELI (Algérie), secrétaire général, Confédération générale des opérateurs économiques algériens.

M. B. NACOULMA (Burkina Faso), président de Comité statuaire, Conseil national du patronat burkinabé.

Mr. V.T. NATHAN (Malaysia), Vice-President, Malaysian Employers’ Federation (MEF).

Sr. G. RICCI (Guatemala), Comité Coordinador de Asociaciones Agrícolas, Comerciales, Industriales y Financieras (CACIF).

Mme L. SASSO MAZZUFFERI (Italie), conseiller spécial des affaires internationales, Confédération générale des employeurs d’Italie, CONFINDUSTRIA.

Mr. O. KOVALEV, accompanying Mr. Eremeev.

Mr. A. POLUEKTOV, accompanying Mr. Eremeev.

Mr. V. VAN VUUREN, accompanying Mr. Botha.
Membres suppléants assistant à la session:
Substitute members attending the session:
Miembros suplentes presentes en la reunión:

M. F. BALBOUL (Liban), membre, Association des industriels libanais.

Sr. A. ECHAVARRIA SALDARRIAGO (Colombia), Vicepresidente de Asuntos Jurídicos y Sociales, Asociación Nacional de Industriales (ANDI).

Mr. T. HUNTJENS (Netherlands), Adviser, International Social Affairs, Federation of Netherlands Industry and Employers.

Mr. O. OSHINOWO (Nigeria), Director-General, Nigeria Employers’ Consultative Association.

Mr. B. PIRLER (Turkey), Secretary-General, Turkish Confederation of Employers’ Associations.

Mr. P. PRIOR (Czech Republic), Confederation of Industry of the Czech Republic.

Mr. P. TOMEK (Austria), Director, Legal and Staff Division, Boehringer-Ingelheim Austria.
Ms. S. BURROW (Australia), President, Australian Council of Trade Unions.

Ms. B. BYERS (Canada), Executive Vice-President, Canadian Labour Congress.

Mr. U. EDSTRÖM (Sweden), Head of International Department, Swedish Trade Union Confederation (LO-S).

Ms. U. ENGELEN-KEFER (Germany), Vice-President, German Confederation of Trade Unions (DGB).

M. B. MAHAN GAHÉ (Côte d’Ivoire), secrétaire général, Confédération DIGNITE.

Mr. S. NAKAJIMA (Japan), Executive Director, Department of International Affairs, Japanese Trade Union Confederation - JTUC RENGO.

Mr. A. OSHIOMHOLE (Nigeria), President, Nigeria Labour Congress (NLC).

Mr. Z. RAMPAK (Malaysia), Malaysian Trade Union Congress (MTUC).

M. A. SIDI SAÏD (Algérie), secrétaire général, Union générale des travailleurs algériens.

Mr. E. SIDOROV (Russian Federation), International Secretary, Federation of Independent Trade Unions of Russia (FNPR).

Mr. S. STEYNE (United Kingdom), International Officer, EU and International Relations Department, Trades Union Congress.

Mr. J. VACCARI NETO (Brazil), Secretary-General, Central Unica dos Trabalhadores.

Mr. J. ZELLHOEFER (United States), European Representative, AFL-CIO European Office.

Mr. P. FISHMAN, accompanying Mr. Zellhoefer.
Ms. M. HAYASHIBALA, accompanying Mr. Nakajima.
Ms. A. OKUBO, accompanying Mr. Nakajima.
Mr. T. WALTER, accompanying Ms. Engelen-Kefer.
Mr. N. ADYANTHAYA (India), Secretary, Indian National Trade Union Congress.

Mr. K. AHMED (Pakistan), General Secretary, All Pakistan Federation of Trade Unions.

Sra. H. ANDERSON NEVAREZ (México), Secretaria de Acción Femina del Comité, Confederación de Trabajadores de México.

M. G. ATTIGBE (Bénin), secrétaire général, Centrale des syndicats autonomes du Bénin.

Mr. L. BASNET (Nepal), President, Nepal Trade Union Congress.

M. M. BLONDEL (France), Confédération générale du travail-Force ouvrière (CGT-FO).

Mme C. BRIGHI (Italie), Assistant Director International, C.I.S.L.

Mr. B. CANAK (Serbia and Montenegro), President, United Branch Trade Unions, UGS - Nezavisnost.

Sr. R. DAER (Argentina), Secretario General, Confederación General del Trabajo.

Mr. T. ETTY (Netherlands), International Department, FNV.

M. G. GHOSN (Liban), président, Confédération générale des travailleurs du Liban (CGTL).

M. S. KATALAY MULELI (Rép. Dém. du Congo), président, Union nationale des travailleurs du Congo (UNTC).

Ms. C. PANDENI (Namibia), Treasurer, National Union of Namibian Workers (NUNW).

Mr. E. PATEL (South Africa), National Labour Convenor, COSATU.

Ms. B. SWAI (United Republic of Tanzania), Trade Union Congress of Tanzania (TUCT).

Sr. J. URBIETA (Venezuela), Director General, Instituto de Altos Estudios Sindicales de la Confederación de Trabajadores de Venezuela.

Mr. T. WOJCIRK (Poland), National Commission Member, Solidarnosc.

Mr. Z. XU (China), Vice-Chairman, All-China Federation of Trade Unions.

Ms. H. YACOB (Singapore), Assistant Secretary-General, National Trade Unions Congress.

Ms. J. FAN, accompanying Mr. Xu.

Ms. Q. LI, accompanying Mr. Xu.

Sr. P. PARRA (Paraguay), Miembro, Central Nacional de Trabajadores.

Mr. K. GYÓRGY (Hungary), Member of the Executive Board, National Confederation of Hungarian Trade Unions.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Country</th>
<th>Delegation Details</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Algérie</td>
<td>M. I. JAZAİRY, ambassadeur, Mission permanente, Genève.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>M. B. SEDKI, ministre plénipotentiaire, Mission permanente, Genève.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Australie</td>
<td>Ms. L. LIPP, Assistant Secretary, Safety, Compensation and International Branch, Department of Employment and Workplace Relations.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Mr. M. SMITH, Ambassador, Permanent Mission, Geneva.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Mr. S. EVANS, International Relations Section, Department of Employment and Workplace Relations.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Mr. M. SAWERS, First Secretary, Permanent Mission, Geneva.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Ms. J. FEENEY, First Secretary, Permanent Mission, Geneva.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Autriche</td>
<td>Ms. I. DEMBSHER, Head of Unit, Federal Ministry of Economic Affairs and Labour.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Mr. A. WOJDA, First Secretary, Permanent Mission, Geneva.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chili</td>
<td>Sr. J. EGUIGUREN, Ministro Consejero, Misión Permanente, Ginebra.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Sr. R. ESPINOSA, Consejero, Misión Permanente, Ginebra.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Colombie</td>
<td>Sra. C. FORERO UCROS, Embajadora, Misión Permanente, Ginebra.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Sra. L. ARANGO DE BUITRAGO, Ministra Consejera, Misión Permanente, Ginebra.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Sra. V. GONZALEZ ARIZA, Ministra Consejera, Misión Permanente, Ginebra.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Côte d’Ivoire</td>
<td>M. B. N’GUESSAN, conseiller, Mission permanente, Genève.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cuba</td>
<td>Sr. J. MORA GODOY, Embajador, Misión Permanente, Ginebra.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Sra. M. HERRERA CASEIRO, Consejera, Misión Permanente, Ginebra.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Sr. C. HURTADO LABRADOR, Consejero, Misión Permanente, Ginebra.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Sr. O. LEON GONZALEZ, Segundo Secretario, Misión Permanente, Ginebra.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Sra. G. HERNANDEZ, Especialista del Ministerio del Trabajo y Seguridad Social.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Sr. M. SANCHEZ OLIVA, Tercero Secretario, Misión Permanente, Ginebra.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Country</td>
<td>City</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------------</td>
<td>------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Danemark</td>
<td>Denmark</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Egypte</td>
<td>Egypt</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Estonie</td>
<td>Estonia</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Finlanide</td>
<td>Finland</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Grece</td>
<td>Greece</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hongrie</td>
<td>Hungary</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Israil</td>
<td>Israel</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lettonie</td>
<td>Latvia</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Liban</td>
<td>Lebanon</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Malaisie</td>
<td>Malaysia</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
**Malta**

Mr. S. BORG, Ambassador, Permanent Mission, Geneva.
Mr. R. SARSERO, Counsellor, Permanent Mission, Geneva.
Mr. J. BUSUTTIL, First Secretary, Permanent Mission, Geneva.
Mr. T. BONNICCI, Second Secretary, Permanent Mission, Geneva.

Mr. N. SHEIN, Ambassador of Myanmar to Germany, Permanent Representative (designate), Permanent Mission, Geneva.
Ms. A. MU, Counsellor, Permanent Mission, Geneva.
Mr. T. NYUN, Counsellor, Permanent Mission, Geneva.
Mr. M. THU, First Secretary, Permanent Mission, Geneva.
Mr. K. NYEIN, Second Secretary, Permanent Mission, Geneva.
Mr. S. AUNG, Third Secretary, Permanent Mission, Geneva.
Mr. T. AUNG, Attaché, Permanent Mission, Geneva.

**Myanmar**

Mr. Z. RAPACKI, Ambassador, Permanent Mission, Geneva.
Ms. R. LEMIESZEWSKA, Counsellor, Permanent Mission, Geneva.

**Pays-Bas**

Ms. A. VAN LEUR, Deputy Director for International Affairs, Ministry of Social Affairs and Employment.
Ms. C. VAN DER LOUW, International Affairs, Ministry of Social Affairs and Employment.
Mr. J. VAN RENSELAAR, United Nations Directorate, Ministry of Foreign Affairs.
Mr. S. KAASJAGER, First Secretary, Permanent Mission, Geneva.
Mr. P. VAN DER HEIJDEN, Chairperson, Committee of Freedom of Association.

Ms. A. VAN LEUR, Deputy Director for International Affairs, Ministry of Social Affairs and Employment.
Ms. C. VAN DER LOUW, International Affairs, Ministry of Social Affairs and Employment.
Mr. J. VAN RENSELAAR, United Nations Directorate, Ministry of Foreign Affairs.
Mr. S. KAASJAGER, First Secretary, Permanent Mission, Geneva.
Mr. P. VAN DER HEIJDEN, Chairperson, Committee of Freedom of Association.

**Pérou**

Sra. E. ASTETE RODRIGUEZ, Embajadora, Misión Permanente, Ginebra.
Srta E. BERAUN ESCUDERO, Primera Secretaria, Misión Permanente, Ginebra.

**Pologne**

Mr. Z. RAPACKI, Ambassador, Permanent Mission, Geneva.
Ms. R. LEMIESZEWSKA, Counsellor, Permanent Mission, Geneva.

**Portugal**

M. J. SOUSA FIALHO, conseiller, Mission permanente, Genève.

**Saint-Siège**

Dr. P. GUTIERREZ, conseiller technique, Mission permanente, Genève.

**Slovaquie**

Ms. N. SEPTÁKOVÁ, First Secretary, Permanent Mission, Geneva.

**Sri Lanka**

Mr. S. PATHIRANA, Second Secretary, Permanent Mission, Geneva.
Suède     Sweden     Suecia
Ms. K. WIKLUND, Counsellor, Ministry of Industry, Employment and Communications.
Mr. J. STRÖM, Counsellor, Permanent Mission, Geneva.

Suisse     Switzerland     Suiza
M. J. ELMIGER, ambassadeur, chef des Affaires internationales du travail, secrétariat d’Etat à l’économie (SECO).
Mme B. SCHÄR BOURBEAU, Deuxième secrétaire, Mission permanente, Genève.
Mme S. GRATWOHL, division politique III, section organisations internationales et politique d’accueil, Département fédéral des affaires étrangères.
M. J. MARTIN, conseiller développement, Mission permanente, Genève.
Mme N. HUYNH, attachée, Mission permanente, Genève.
M. P. BENEY, Affaires internationales du travail, secrétariat d’Etat à l’économie (SECO).

Thaïlande     Thailand     Tailandia
Ms. K. CHANDRAPRABHA, Minister, Permanent Mission, Geneva.
Mr. P. AMORNCHWEWIN, Minister Counsellor, Permanent Mission, Geneva.
Mr. P. CHARNBHUMIDOL, Minister Counsellor, Permanent Mission, Geneva.
Ms. L. PHUMAS, First Secretary, Permanent Mission, Geneva.

République tchèque     Czech Republic     República Checa
Ms. O. ROZSÍVALOVÁ, Head of Unit, International Relations, Department for European Union and International Relations, Ministry of Labour and Social Affairs.
Mr. P. POKORNÝ, Department for European Union and International Relations, Ministry of Labour and Social Affairs.
Mr. J. BLAZEK, Second Secretary, Permanent Mission, Geneva.

Tunisie     Tunisia     Túnez
M. S. LABIDI, ambassadeur, Mission permanente, Genève.
M. H. LANDOULSI, conseiller, Mission permanente, Genève.
Représentants d’organisations internationales gouvernementales
Representatives of international governmental organizations
Representantes de organizaciones internacionales gubernamentales

Nations Unies
United Nations
Naciones Unidas

Mr. T. INOMATA, Inspector, Joint Inspection Unit.

Organisation des Nations Unies pour l’alimentation et l’agriculture
Food and Agriculture Organization of the United Nations
Organización da las Naciones Unidas para la Agricultura y la Alimentación

Mr. T. MASUKU, Director, FAO Liaison Office, Geneva.

Organisation mondiale de la santé
World Health Organization
Organización Mundial de la Salud

Mr. L. TILLFORS, External Relations Officer, Department of Governance.
Dr. A. CASSELS, Director, MDGs, Health and Development Policy.

Fonds monétaire international
International Monetary Fund
Fondo Monetario Internacional

Mr. J. CHAUFFOUR, Senior Economist, Representative in Geneva.
Ms. G. WEBER, Consultant, Geneva Office.
Ms. I. HAMDAN, Consultant, Geneva Office.

Organisation météorologique mondiale
World Meteorological Organization
Organización Meteorológica Mundial

Mr. C. WANG, External Relations Officer.

Organisation mondiale du commerce
World Trade Organization
Organización Mundial del Comercio

Ms. V. LIU, Counsellor, Trade and Environment Division.
Organisation internationale pour les migrations
International Organization for Migration
Organización Internacional para las Migraciones

Mr. N. BARUAH, Head, Labour Migration Service, Migration Management Services.
Ms. J. LEE, Programme Officer, Labour Migration Service, Migration Management Services Department.
Ms. S. NONNENMACHER, Programme Officer, Labour Migration Service, Migration Management Services Department.

Organisation internationale de la francophonie
Organización Internacional de la Francophonía

Mme S. COULIBALY LEROY, Représentant permanent adjoint.

Union africaine
African Union
Unión Africana

Ms. K. MASRI, Ambassador and Permanent Observer.
Mr. V. WEGE-NZOMWITA, Counsellor, Geneva.

Organisation arabe du travail
Arab Labour Organization
Organización Arabe del Trabajo

Dr. I. GUIDER, Director-General.
Mr. A. HUMSI, Head of the Permanent Delegation in Geneva.
Ms. A. HILAL, Permanent Delegation in Geneva.

Ligue des Etats arabes
League of Arab States
Liga de Estados Arabes

Mr. S. ALFARARGI, Ambassador, Permanent Observer.
Mr. M. MOUAKI BENANI, Counsellor.
Dr. O. EL-HAJJE, Member.

Organisation de coopération et de développement économiques
Organisation for Economic Co-operation and Development
Organización de Cooperación y Desarrollo Económicos

Mr. R. TORRES, Head, Employment Analysis and Policies Division, Directorate for Employment, Labour and Social Affairs.
Mr. V. SPIDLA, Commissioner in charge of Employment, Social Affairs and Equal Opportunities, Brussels.
Mr. C. TROJAN, Ambassador, Head of Delegation, Permanent Delegation, Geneva.
Ms. K. SCHREIBER, Member of Cabinet of Commissioner Spidla, Brussels.
Ms. L. PAVAN-WOOLFE, Director, Directorate General for Employment, Brussels.
Mr. T. BÉCHET, Minister Counsellor, Permanent Delegation, Geneva.
Mr. J. TRICART, Head of Unit, Directorate General for Employment, Brussels.
M. C. DUFOUR, Permanent Delegation, Geneva.

****

Mr. J. BRODIN, Ambassador, Head of the Liaison Office, Geneva, Council.
Mr. G. HOUTTUIN, Deputy Head, Liaison Office, Geneva, Council.
Mr. O. ALLEN, Counsellor, Liaison Office, Geneva, Council.
Mr. S. VAN THIEL, Counsellor, Liaison Office, Geneva, Council.
Représentants d’organisations internationales non gouvernementales assistant à titre d’observateurs
Representatives of international non-governmental organizations as observers
Representantes de organizaciones internacionales no gubernamentales presentes con carácter de observadores

Confédération internationale des syndicats libres
International Confederation of Free Trade Unions
Confederación Internacional de Organizaciones Sindicales Libres

Mr. G. RYDER, General Secretary.
Mr. J. OLIVIO OLIVEIRA, Assistant General Secretary.
Mr. J. KUCZKIEWICZ, Director, Trade Union Rights Department.
Ms. A. BIONDI, Director, Geneva Office.
Ms. R. GONZALEZ, Assistant Director.
Ms. E. BUSSER, Assistant, Geneva Office.
Ms. E. BLUMER, Secretary, Geneva Office.
Ms. J. PORTILHO LINS, Stagiaire.
M. H. DJEMAM, secrétaire général, Confédération internationale des syndicats arabes.

Confédération mondiale du travail
World Confederation of Labour
Confederación Mundial del Trabajo

M. E. ESTEVEZ, secrétaire général adjoint.
M. H. SEA, représentant permanent à Genève.
M. R. VIVANCO, représentant permanent à Genève.
Ms. M. MASPERO.

Fédération internationale des producteurs agricoles
International Federation of Agricultural Producers
Federación Internacional de Productores Agrícolas

Ms. G. OLSSON, Director, Policy Division.

Fédération syndicale mondiale
World Federation of Trade Unions
Federación Sindical Mundial

Mr. A. ZHARIKOV, General Secretary.
Mr. R. CARDONA NUEVO, Deputy Secretary-General, Permanent Representative, Geneva.
Organisation internationale des employeurs
International Organisation of Employers
Organización Internacional de Empleadores

Mr. A. PEÑALOSA, Secretary-General.
Mr. B. WILTON, Deputy Secretary-General.
Ms. N. WISEMAN, Specialist, International Shipping Federation.

Organisation de l’unité syndicale africaine
Organization of African Trade Union Unity
Organización para la Unidad Sindical Africana

Mr. H. SUNMONU, Secretary-General.
Mr. D. DIOP, Assistant Secretary-General.
Mr. A. DIALLO, Permanent Representative to the ILO and UN Mission in Geneva.

Association internationale de la sécurité sociale
International Social Security Association
Asociación Internacional de la Seguridad Social

Mr. D. HOSKINS, Secretary-General.
Mr. A. BONILLA-GARCIA, Chief, Studies and Operations Branch.
Mr. J. THIRION, Chief of Finance and Administration.
Mr. I. MUSA, First Secretary, Permanent Observer, Mission of Palestine in Geneva.