

International Labour Conference
91st Session 2003

Report IV (2)

Learning and training for work
in the knowledge society:
The constituents' views

Fourth item on the agenda

ISBN 92-2-112877-6

ISSN 0074-6681

First published 2003

The designations employed in ILO publications, which are in conformity with United Nations practice, and the presentation of material therein do not imply the expression of any opinion whatsoever on the part of the International Labour Office concerning the legal status of any country, area or territory or of its authorities, or concerning the delimitation of its frontiers.

Reference to names of firms and commercial products and processes does not imply their endorsement by the International Labour Office, and any failure to mention a particular firm, commercial product or process is not a sign of disapproval.

ILO publications can be obtained through major booksellers or ILO local offices in many countries, or direct from ILO Publications, International Labour Office, CH-1211 Geneva 22, Switzerland. A catalogue or list of new publications will be sent free of charge from the above address.

CONTENTS

	Page
LIST OF ABBREVIATIONS	V
INTRODUCTION	1
REPLIES RECEIVED AND COMMENTARIES	3
PROPOSED CONCLUSIONS	85

LIST OF ABBREVIATIONS

Employers' and workers' organizations

Australia	ACTU	Australian Council of Trade Unions
Austria	BAK	Federal Chamber of Labour
	ÖGB	Austrian Confederation of Trade Unions
Barbados	BEC	Barbados Employers' Confederation
	CTUSAB	Congress of Trade Unions and Staff Associations of Barbados
Brazil	CNI	National Confederation of Industry
Chile	CPC	Confederation of Production and Trade
Croatia	HUP	Croatian Association of Employers
	SSSH	Union of Autonomous Trade Unions of Croatia
Cyprus	PEO	Pan-Cyprian Federation of Labour
	SEK	Cyprus Workers' Confederation
Czech Republic	SPD ČR	Confederation of Industry and Transport
	ČMKOS	Czech-Moravian Confederation of Trade Unions
Denmark	FTF	Salaried Employees' and Civil Servants' Confederation
	LO	Danish Confederation of Trade Unions
Ecuador	CAPEIPI	Pichincha Chamber of Small Industry
Egypt	FEI	Federation of Egyptian Industries
France	MEDEF	Movement of French Enterprises
Gabon	CPG	Confederation of Gabonese Employers
Germany	BDA	Confederation of German Employers' Associations
Ghana	GEA	Ghana Employers' Association
	TUC	Trades Union Congress of Ghana
Greece	ESEE	National Confederation of Hellenic Commerce
	SEV	Federation of Greek Industries
	GSEE	General Confederation of Greek Workers

India	EAR	Employers' Association of Rajasthan
	EFI	Employers' Federation of India
	FKCCI	Federation of Karnataka Chambers of Commerce and Industry
	IMC	Indian Merchants' Chamber
Ireland	ICTU	Irish Congress of Trade Unions
Japan	Nippon Keidanren	Japan Business Federation
	JTUC-RENGO	Japanese Trade Union Confederation
Lebanon	ALI	Association of Lebanese Industrialists
	CCCIA	Confederation of Chambers of Commerce, Industry and Agriculture
Lithuania	LPK	Confederation of Lithuanian Industrialists
Mauritius	FSSC	Federation of Public Service Trade Unions
Morocco	FCCIS	Federation of Chambers of Commerce, Industry and Services
Netherlands	VNO-NCW	Confederation of Netherlands' Industry and Employers
	Unie mhp	Trade Union Federation for Middle and Senior Staff
New Zealand	Business NZ	Business New Zealand
	NZCTU	New Zealand Council of Trade Unions
Norway	NHO	Confederation of Norwegian Business and Industry
	LO	Confederation of Trade Unions in Norway
Pakistan	EFP	Employers' Federation of Pakistan
Peru	CCL	Lima Chamber of Commerce
	CONFIEP	National Confederation of Private Employers' Institutions
Portugal	CCP	Confederation of Trade and Services of Portugal
	CIP	Confederation of Portuguese Industry
	CGTP-IN	General Confederation of Portuguese Workers
	UGT	General Union of Workers
Russian Federation	FNPR	Federation of Independent Trade Unions
Slovakia	KOZ SR	Confederation of Trade Unions of the Slovak Republic

List of abbreviations

Slovenia	ZDODS	Association of Employers of Craft Activities of Slovenia
	ZDS	Association of Employers of Slovenia
South Africa	COSATU	Congress of South African Trade Unions
Sri Lanka	EFC	Employers' Federation of Ceylon
	LJEWU	Lanka Jathika Estate Workers' Union
Switzerland	UPS	Confederation of Swiss Employers
	USS/SGB	Swiss Federation of Trade Unions
Ukraine	FPU	Federation of Trade Unions of Ukraine
United States	USCIB	United States Council for International Business
	AFL-CIO	American Federation of Labor and Congress of Industrial Organizations

Other abbreviations used

BIAC and TUAC	Business and Industry Advisory Committee and Trade Union Advisory Committee to the Organisation for Economic Co-operation and Development (OECD)
HRD	Human resources development
HRDT	Human resources development and training
ICT	Information and communication technology
ILC	International Labour Conference
MNE	Multinational enterprise
SMEs	Small and medium-sized enterprises

INTRODUCTION

At its 280th Session (March 2001) the Governing Body of the International Labour Office decided to place the question of human resources training and development on the agenda of the 91st Session (2003) of the International Labour Conference.

In accordance with article 39 of the Standing Orders of the Conference, which deals with the preliminary stages of the double-discussion procedure, the Office drew up a preliminary report,¹ intended to serve as the basis for the first discussion of this question. The report contains an analysis of the law and practice in various countries in the area of human resources training and development. The report, accompanied by a questionnaire, was communicated to the governments of member States, which were invited to send their replies so as to reach the Office no later than 1 June 2002.

At the time of drawing up the present report, the Office had received replies from the governments of the following 96 member States:² Algeria, Argentina, Australia, Austria, Bahrain, Barbados, Belgium, Benin, Bolivia, Botswana, Brazil, Bulgaria, Burundi, Canada, Central African Republic, Chile, China, Costa Rica, Croatia, Cuba, Cyprus, Czech Republic, Denmark, Ecuador, Egypt, El Salvador, Estonia, Finland, France, Gabon, Germany, Ghana, Greece, Guatemala, Guinea-Bissau, Honduras, Hungary, India, Indonesia, Iraq, Ireland, Israel, Italy, Japan, Kazakhstan, Kenya, Latvia, Lebanon, Lithuania, Luxembourg, Malaysia, Mali, Malta, Mauritius, Mexico, Republic of Moldova, Myanmar, Namibia, Netherlands, New Zealand, Nicaragua, Nigeria, Norway, Oman, Pakistan, Panama, Papua New Guinea, Peru, Philippines, Poland, Portugal, Qatar, Romania, San Marino, Seychelles, Singapore, Slovakia, South Africa, Spain, Sri Lanka, Suriname, Sweden, Switzerland, Syrian Arab Republic, Thailand, Togo, Tunisia, Turkey, Uganda, Ukraine, United Arab Emirates, United Kingdom, Venezuela, Yemen, Yugoslavia and Zimbabwe.

In accordance with article 12, paragraph 3, of the ILO Constitution and article 39 of the Standing Orders of the Conference, governments were invited to consult the most representative employers' and workers' organizations in finalizing their replies to this questionnaire.

The governments of 12 member States included in their replies the opinions of employers' and workers' organizations: Croatia, Czech Republic, Estonia, Finland, Greece, Hungary, Indonesia, Lithuania, Norway, Oman, Slovakia and Sweden. Other governments forwarded the observations from employers' and/or workers' organizations to the Office. In some cases the Office received replies directly from employers' and workers' organizations. A number of governments did not reply to the question-

¹ ILO: *Learning and training for work in the knowledge society*, Report IV (1), International Labour Conference, 91st Session, Geneva, 2003.

² Replies that arrived too late to be included in the report may be consulted by delegates at the Conference.

naire, but the employers' and/or workers' organizations of these member States did; these replies have been included in the commentaries on each question.

This report has been drawn up on the basis of the replies received, the substance of which, together with brief commentaries, is given in the following pages. The Proposed Conclusions appear at the end of the report.

If the Conference decides to adopt a new international instrument, the Office will draw up a draft to be submitted to governments, for consultation with the most representative employers' and workers' organizations, to be discussed at the 92nd Session of the International Labour Conference in 2004.

REPLIES RECEIVED AND COMMENTARIES

This section contains the substance of the replies to the questionnaire which accompanied the preliminary report. Each question is reproduced and followed by a list indicating the governments that replied to it, grouped in accordance with the nature of the replies (affirmative, negative or other). Where an observation is included qualifying or explaining the reply, the substance is given, in alphabetical order of countries, after the abovementioned list. Where a reply deals with several questions, or refers to an earlier question, the substance of the reply is given under the first of these questions and is only referred to in the other questions. The replies are followed by brief Office commentaries referring to the corresponding point(s) of the Proposed Conclusions at the end of this report.

Some respondents¹ provided information on their national law and practice in their reports. While this is most useful for the work of the Office, this information has not been reproduced unless it is necessary to understand the reply. Affirmative or negative replies from employers' and workers' organizations that are not accompanied by remarks are quoted only when they are contrary to the reply from the government, or when the government has not replied to the question.

General observations

Towards a new Recommendation on human resources development and training

In view of the profound changes that are taking place in the economy, in society and in the world of work, the overwhelming majority of responding governments and employers' and workers' organizations welcomed the development of a new ILO human resources development instrument. Most of these considered that the new instrument should take the form of a Recommendation. The general comments indicated that a more dynamic and applicable instrument should be developed, to be used by member States and the social partners in formulating and implementing human resources development policies which are integrated with other economic and social policies, particularly employment policies. The focus should be on policy targets, frameworks and priority fields of action and less on practical implementation.

¹ For example, the Governments of Australia, Canada, Cuba, Honduras, Hungary, Ireland, Italy, Luxembourg, Netherlands, New Zealand, Poland, Sweden, United Kingdom; and the social partners in Australia (ACTU); Peru (CONFIEP); Portugal (CCP); Portugal (UGT); Switzerland (USS/SGB); and the United States (AFL-CIO). This information may be included in the ILO information base on the revision of the Human Resources Development Recommendation, at <http://www.ilo.org/public/english/employment/skills/recomm/index.htm>

Definitions, context and principles of contemporary human resources development and training

A number of respondents were of the view that certain terms are used in ways that are potentially confusing. Requests were made to clarify these terms, and a few replies suggested definitions, but there was no clear pattern to either the requests or the suggestions.

Some respondents expressed the view that the instrument should focus not only on the technical aspects, but on the changing contemporary economic and social context of human resources development and training. Relevant passages of the *Conclusions concerning human resources training and development*² (hereinafter referred to as “the *Conclusions*”) were cited as describing the shift in human resources development objectives, policies and practice in response to the various manifestations of globalization, the growing debt burden of many developing countries, technological changes, new managerial and business practices and the need to tackle the deteriorating labour market and social situation of many disadvantaged groups in society. The preamble of the new Recommendation should reflect these developments.

Some respondents expressed the view that the preamble should refer to the shift towards lifelong learning, individual responsibility and social dialogue as guiding principles of contemporary human resource development and training policies. The majority of respondents felt that these dimensions would be captured by referring to the Human Resources Development Convention, 1975; the abovementioned *Conclusions*; the Tripartite Declaration of Principles concerning Multinational Enterprises and Social Policy; and the ILO Declaration on Fundamental Principles and Rights at Work. A number of other instruments were suggested for inclusion in the preamble, but no clear pattern emerged in the types of instruments mentioned.

Objectives and scope of human resources development and training

Many respondents considered that the new instrument should draw on the relevant paragraphs of the *Conclusions*, to encourage governments to adopt appropriate economic and social policies aimed at full employment, social inclusion and improved competitiveness in order to enable human resources development and training to contribute fully to these objectives.

Some respondents expressed the view that a broad definition of the term “employability” should be used, and referred to economic and social policies that promote full employment; partnership between governments, employers, trade unions and individual workers; and equity. Many considered that systems of education and training must reflect objectives that go beyond a narrow economic interpretation of the term “employability”. First and foremost, education and training must create free, responsible and critically thinking individuals who can more readily integrate into society, particularly into labour markets that demand increasingly higher levels of skills and flexibility.

Social dialogue in human resources development and training

Many respondents considered that the questionnaire was formulated in a way that suggested central government control, with national government as the architect of all training and learning policy development and implementation. Respondents overwhelmingly endorsed social dialogue as a major guiding principle for education and training policy and programme development and implementation. Considerable room must be made for actors other than government to be involved in education and training, particularly in the area of lifelong learning and training. The role and responsibility of the social partners for human resource development and training should be emphasized to a greater extent, in order to create a balance between their role and that of the government.

² ILO: *Conclusions concerning human resources training and development*, International Labour Conference, 88th Session, Geneva, 2000 (reproduced as Appendix I to ILO: *Learning and training ...*, op. cit.).

I. Form of the international instrument

Do you consider that the International Labour Conference should adopt a new international instrument concerning human resources development and training? **Qu. 1**

Total number of replies: 95.

Affirmative: 93. Algeria, Argentina, Austria, Bahrain, Barbados, Belgium, Benin, Bolivia, Botswana, Brazil, Burundi, Canada, Central African Republic, Chile, China, Costa Rica, Croatia, Cuba, Cyprus, Czech Republic, Denmark, Ecuador, Egypt, El Salvador, Estonia, Finland, France, Gabon, Germany, Ghana, Greece, Guatemala, Guinea-Bissau, Honduras, Hungary, India, Indonesia, Iraq, Ireland, Israel, Italy, Japan, Kazakhstan, Kenya, Latvia, Lebanon, Lithuania, Malaysia, Mali, Malta, Mauritius, Mexico, Republic of Moldova, Myanmar, Namibia, Netherlands, New Zealand, Nicaragua, Nigeria, Norway, Oman, Pakistan, Panama, Papua New Guinea, Peru, Philippines, Poland, Portugal, Qatar, Romania, San Marino, Seychelles, Singapore, Slovakia, South Africa, Spain, Sri Lanka, Suriname, Sweden, Switzerland, Syrian Arab Republic, Thailand, Togo, Tunisia, Turkey, Uganda, Ukraine, United Arab Emirates, United Kingdom, Venezuela, Yemen, Yugoslavia, Zimbabwe.

Negative: 1. Australia.

Other: 1. Luxembourg.

Australia. At the 2000 session of the International Labour Conference (ILC), Australia argued that a decision on the need for a new Recommendation should await the ILO's development of a systematic approach to standard-setting reform. However, in recognition that a majority of member States will support a new instrument in light of the *Conclusions* adopted at that session of the ILC, the Government provides responses to the ILO questionnaire.

Australian Council of Trade Unions (ACTU): The importance of human resources development and training (HRDT) in economic, enterprise and individual development is becoming increasingly clear. Nations, enterprises and individuals that do not have access to broad-based education and training opportunities will become increasingly uncompetitive.

Austria. Yes. The Recommendation should be as specific as possible.

Luxembourg. Not opposed to the adoption of a new international instrument if the majority of member States are in favour.

Morocco. Federation of Chambers of Commerce, Industry and Services (FCCIS): Yes.

Portugal. Yes. There is a new approach to education and training for quality, which is not sufficiently reflected in previous instruments. Fundamental labour rights are also embodied in the concept of decent work, which should accompany human resources development.

Russian Federation. Federation of Independent Trade Unions (FNPR): Yes.

Slovenia. Association of Employers of Slovenia (ZDS) and Association of Employers of Craft Activities of Slovenia (ZDODS): Yes.

United States. United States Council for International Business (USCIB): It is not altogether clear that an international instrument is called for. Human resources development (HRD) is an issue that calls for a menu of “best practices” that depends on the circumstances of the country concerned. HRD is a subjective subject that impacts an individual’s standard of living, national productivity and competitiveness. The scope of this questionnaire is huge, covering both basic education and sophisticated systems and processes used by large enterprises to develop the skills of their employees. If an instrument is needed, it may be preferable to focus on the need for basic education for all, access to basic education for disadvantaged groups, emphasis on vocational education, and building partnerships with enterprises where jobs are available and to ensure that the skills being developed are relevant.

American Federation of Labor and Congress of Industrial Organizations (AFL-CIO): Yes. Workforce investment plays an increasingly important role in the ability of nations to meet the challenges of a global economy and to produce good jobs: a living wage; health benefits; pension coverage; a variety of tasks within a manageable workload; a healthy and safe working environment; the ability to control the pace and organization of work; social interaction among workers; access to continuous learning; adequate information to make decisions; career ladder opportunities; opportunity for input into job redesign; knowledge of the business; and independent voice through a collective bargaining agreement. A revised instrument on HRDT would be particularly useful in helping governments around the world, regardless of their pace or stage of development, to create workforce investment systems that allow workers to compete on the basis of innovation, quality and skill, and not on the basis of low wages and limited benefits. Such an instrument would also provide invaluable guidance to employers and workers’ representatives as they work together with government to advance the skills and training of the labour force and the strength of the national economy.

The overwhelming majority of governments and all employers’ and workers’ organizations replying to this question considered that the Conference should adopt a new international instrument concerning human resources development and training.

Qu. 2 *If so, do you consider that the instrument should take the form of a Recommendation?*

Total number of replies: 93.

Affirmative: 88. Algeria, Argentina, Australia, Austria, Bahrain, Belgium, Benin, Bolivia, Botswana, Brazil, Burundi, Canada, Central African Republic, Chile, China, Croatia, Cuba, Cyprus, Czech Republic, Denmark, Ecuador, Egypt, El Salvador, Estonia, Finland, France, Gabon, Germany, Greece, Guatemala, Guinea-Bissau, Honduras, Hungary, India, Indonesia, Iraq, Ireland, Israel, Italy, Japan, Kazakhstan, Kenya, Latvia, Lebanon, Lithuania, Malaysia, Mali, Malta, Mauritius, Mexico, Republic of Moldova, Myanmar, Namibia, Netherlands, New Zealand, Norway, Oman, Pakistan, Panama, Papua New Guinea, Philippines, Poland, Portugal, Qatar, Romania, San Marino, Seychelles, Singapore, Slovakia, South Africa, Spain, Sri Lanka, Suriname, Sweden, Switzerland, Syrian Arab Republic, Thailand, Togo, Tunisia, Turkey, Uganda, Ukraine, United Arab Emirates, United Kingdom, Venezuela, Yemen, Yugoslavia, Zimbabwe.

Negative: 3. Barbados, Ghana, Peru.

Other: 2. Costa Rica, Nigeria.

Australia. ACTU: Yes.

Barbados. No, the instrument should take the form of a Convention, since countries would be obliged to facilitate implementation of its provisions once ratified, requiring all member States of the ILO to report regularly on implementation, allowing for monitoring and provision of technical assistance.

Barbados Employers' Confederation (BEC): Yes.

Congress of Trade Unions and Staff Associations of Barbados (CTUSAB): Yes.

Costa Rica. The development of knowledge societies has made it necessary to adopt legal or technical instruments, either in the form of a Convention or a Recommendation, which offer effective mechanisms benefiting both male and female workers.

Cyprus. Cyprus Workers' Confederation (SEK): The instrument can take the form of a Recommendation, allowing latitude for national legislation to consider the particularities and needs of individual countries.

France. It should serve as an instrument of reference for constituents when they develop HRD policies. It should also be a practical instrument for the implementation of these policies.

Ghana. No, the instrument should take the form of both a Convention and a Recommendation, so that if a member State cannot ratify the Convention it may follow the provisions of the Recommendation.

Ghana Employers' Association (GEA): No, it should take the form of both a Convention and a Recommendation.

Trades Union Congress of Ghana (TUC): Yes. The Human Resources Development Convention, 1975 (No. 142), remains, to a large extent, up to date.

India. Indian Merchants' Chamber (IMC): No.

Lebanon. The instrument (Recommendation) should mention whether it accompanies Convention No. 142, and supplements its provisions or takes the form of an independent Recommendation.

Association of Lebanese Industrialists (ALI): It should take the form of a Convention.

Mauritius. The Recommendation should contain guidelines for both HRDT policy formulation and implementation.

Morocco. FCCIS: Yes.

Nigeria. It should take the form of both a Convention and a Recommendation.

Peru. It should take the form of a Convention.

Lima Chamber of Commerce (CCL): Yes.

Russian Federation. FNPR: Yes.

Slovakia. Confederation of Trade Unions of the Slovak Republic (KOZ SR): It should take the form of a Convention.

Slovenia. ZDS and ZDODS: Yes.

South Africa. The proposed Recommendation could have a slightly modified structure: I. *Preamble*; II. *Vision* (impact to be achieved); III. *Values* (social dialogue with roles and functions clarified, social justice, innovation, inclusion, etc.); IV. *Context for effective education and training strategies* (complementarity between HRD, macroeconomics, trade and industry, labour market and social development policies for rising employment, lower poverty, etc.); V. *Beneficiaries*: employed workers; employers; unemployed workers; and informal sector workers (with subsections dealing with each); VI. *Policies and objectives* (a generic section of overall frameworks including research, planning, monitoring and evaluation and then subsections dealing with the different beneficiaries); VII. *Implementation of policies and objectives* (providers, quality promotion and recognition of skills informally acquired); and VIII. *Responsibilities and resource commitments of government, business, labour, communities and individuals*. The proposed reorganization is not a condition for acceptance of the new proposed instrument.

Congress of South African Trade Unions (COSATU): A final section should be added setting out follow-up action along the lines of the Job Creation in Small and Medium-Sized Enterprises Recommendation, 1998 (No. 189).

Switzerland. Swiss Federation of Trade Unions (USS/SGB): The instrument should take the form of a Convention.

Ukraine. Federation of Trade Unions of Ukraine (FPU): No, it should take the form of a Convention supplemented by a Recommendation.

United Kingdom. Yes. It would be difficult to formulate a new Convention which could improve on Convention No. 142, since that instrument is sufficiently flexible to continue to apply in present-day conditions. While many elements of the Human Resources Development Recommendation, 1975 (No. 150), are still relevant and applicable, it is through a further Recommendation that new issues can be addressed. A Recommendation would also offer greater scope to achieve a wide consensus.

United States. USCIB: If an instrument is necessary, it should be no more than a Recommendation. Human resources development is not an issue that can be regulated. It is an issue that requires alternative actions that governments can take in conjunction with the private sector to improve the education, training and continuous learning for a nation's workforce.

The majority of the respondents to this question felt that the new instrument should take the form of a Recommendation.

II. Preamble

Qu. 3 *Should the instrument include a preamble referring to:*

- (a) *the Human Resources Development Convention, 1975?*
- (b) *the Conclusions concerning human resources training and development, adopted at the 88th Session of the International Labour Conference?*
- (c) *the Tripartite Declaration of Principles concerning Multinational Enterprises and Social Policy?*

(d) *the ILO Declaration on Fundamental Principles and Rights at Work?*

(e) *other instruments? (Please specify.)*

Total number of replies: 94.

(a) *Total number of replies: 86. Affirmative: 80. Negative: 3. Other: 3.*

(b) *Total number of replies: 89. Affirmative: 86. Negative: 0. Other: 3.*

(c) *Total number of replies: 76. Affirmative: 71. Negative: 2. Other: 3.*

(d) *Total number of replies: 82. Affirmative: 76. Negative: 2. Other: 4.*

(e) *Total number of replies: 36.*

Affirmative: Algeria ((b) to (d)), Argentina ((b) and (d)), Australia ((a) and (b)), Austria, Bahrain, Barbados ((b) and (d)), Benin ((b) to (d)), Bolivia ((a)), Botswana ((a)), Brazil, Burundi ((a), (b) and (d)), Canada, Central African Republic ((a) to (c)), Chile, China ((a) to (d)), Costa Rica, Croatia ((a) and (b)), Cuba, Cyprus ((a) to (d)), Czech Republic ((b) to (d)), Denmark, Ecuador ((a) and (b)), Egypt ((a), (b) and (d)), El Salvador, Estonia, Finland, Gabon, Germany ((a) to (d)), Ghana, Greece, Guatemala ((a), (b) and (d)), Guinea-Bissau, Honduras, India ((a) and (b)), Indonesia, Iraq, Ireland, Israel ((b) to (d)), Italy, Japan, Kazakhstan ((b)), Kenya ((a) to (d)), Latvia, Lebanon ((a) to (c)), Lithuania, Mali ((a) to (d)), Malta, Mauritius ((a) to (d)), Mexico ((a) to (d)), Republic of Moldova ((a) to (d)), Myanmar, Namibia, New Zealand, Nicaragua, Nigeria ((a)), Norway, Oman ((b) to (d)), Pakistan, Panama ((a) to (d)), Papua New Guinea, Peru ((a) and (b)), Philippines ((a) to (d)), Poland, Portugal ((a) to (d)), Qatar, Romania ((a), (b) and (d)), San Marino, Seychelles ((a) to (d)), Singapore ((a) and (b)), Slovakia ((a) to (d)), South Africa ((a) to (d)), Spain, Sri Lanka ((a) to (d)), Suriname, Sweden ((a) to (d)), Switzerland ((a) to (d)), Syrian Arab Republic ((a) to (d)), Thailand, Togo, Tunisia, Turkey ((a) and (b)), Uganda ((a) to (d)), Ukraine, United Arab Emirates ((a) to (d)), United Kingdom ((a) to (d)), Venezuela, Yemen ((b) and (d)), Yugoslavia ((a) to (d)), Zimbabwe.

Negative: Australia ((c)), Benin ((a) and (e)), Germany ((e)), Israel ((a)), Lebanon ((d)), Mauritius ((e)), Oman ((a)), Seychelles ((e)), Switzerland ((e)), Turkey ((c) and (d)), Uganda ((e)), Yugoslavia ((e)).

Other: Australia ((d)), Bulgaria ((e)), China ((e)), Cyprus ((e)), Egypt ((e)), France, Hungary ((e)), Israel ((e)), Kenya ((e)), Lebanon ((e)), Malaysia, Mali ((e)), Mexico ((e)), Republic of Moldova ((e)), Netherlands, Oman ((e)), Panama ((e)), Philippines ((e)), Portugal ((e)), Romania ((e)), Slovakia ((e)), South Africa ((e)), Sri Lanka ((e)), Sweden ((e)), Syrian Arab Republic ((e)), United Arab Emirates ((e)), United Kingdom ((e)).

Australia. (d) While this instrument is important, it has no direct relevance to this topic.

ACTU. (c) Yes, if agreed by the parties. However, the issue under consideration goes far beyond multinational enterprises (MNEs). Besides, MNEs are already in the forefront of recog-

nizing the importance of education and training. (d) Yes, if agreed by the parties. It should not be considered an essential part of a new Recommendation.

Austria. (a) to (d) It should refer to all the relevant previous international instruments.

Brazil. National Confederation of Industry (CNI): (d) No.

Bulgaria. (e) The European Commission Memorandum on Lifelong Learning (2000).

China. (e) Include employment services (Employment Service Convention, 1948 (No. 88)).

Croatia. Croatian Association of Employers (HUP): (e) The preamble should refer to the Cologne Charter: Aims and Ambitions for Lifelong Learning (1999) reproduced in Appendix II and Education and training: A joint statement by BIAC and TUAC (1991) reproduced in Appendix III of Report IV (1).

Union of Autonomous Trade Unions of Croatia (SSSH): (c) and (d) Yes.

Cyprus. (e) The Vocational Rehabilitation and Employment (Disabled Persons) Convention, 1983 (No. 159).

Czech Republic. Czech-Moravian Confederation of Trade Unions (ČMKOS): (e) The European Commission Memorandum on Lifelong Learning (2000).

Denmark. Salaried Employees' and Civil Servants' Confederation (FTF): (e) The Paid Educational Leave Convention, 1974 (No. 140).

Egypt. (e) The preamble should focus on the issue of mitigating the negative labour and production implications of globalization, especially in developing countries, with direct support and unambiguous commitment of developed countries and international organizations to achieve: (i) the development of exports of developing countries and the reduction of trade barriers in developed countries; (ii) increased direct investment by industrialized countries in developing countries; (iii) material, technical and scientific support; (iv) freedom of movement of capital and labour in the framework of international conventions; and (v) supporting technological advancement in developing countries.

Federation of Egyptian Industries (FEI): (c) If this is included in the preamble it would be an implicit recognition of the content of this Declaration, a question which has yet to be determined by many member States.

France. The new instrument should refer to a limited number of international texts which deal, in particular, with HRD.

Ghana. GEA: (e) The Vocational Rehabilitation and Employment (Disabled Persons) Convention, 1983 (No. 159), and Recommendation (No. 168).

Hungary. (e) The Hamburg Declaration on Adult Learning (UNESCO, 1997), the European Commission Memorandum on Lifelong Learning (2000) and the European Union directives on employment policy.

India. Federation of Karnataka Chambers of Commerce and Industry (FKCCI): (e) Any instrument that makes HRD more acceptable is improving managerial practices, such as email and electronic media.

Employers' Association of Rajasthan (EAR): (a), (b) and (d) Yes. (c) Cannot comment as this Declaration is not known.

IMC: (a) to (d) Yes. (e) The Employment Promotion and Protection against Unemployment Convention, 1988 (No. 168).

Indonesia. (d) Yes, since the recognition and protection of workers' rights are important for raising workers' motivation for work.

Japan. Japanese Trade Union Confederation (JTUC-RENGO): (e) The Employment Policy Convention, 1964 (No. 122).

Kenya. (e) Convention No. 122.

Lebanon. (d) No, as the fundamental Conventions addressed by the Declaration do not directly concern training and human resources development. (e) The Discrimination (Employment and Occupation) Convention, 1958 (No. 111), No. 122 and No. 159.

ALI: (a) Since the proposed instrument should be a new Convention covering all aspects of human resources development, there is no need to refer to the existing Convention.

Malaysia. Documents referred to in this question are not available for comment.

Mali. (e) Convention No. 111, Convention No. 140, the Equal Remuneration Convention, 1951 (No. 100), and Convention No. 159.

Mexico. (e) The Fee-Charging Employment Agencies Convention (Revised), 1949 (No. 96).

Republic of Moldova. (e) Convention No. 159 and Recommendation No. 168.

Morocco. FCCIS: Yes.

Netherlands. (e) If possible, give examples of national best practice.

Confederation of Netherlands' Industry and Employers (VNO-NCW): (e) Reference should be made to the Cologne Charter: Aims and Ambitions for Lifelong Learning (1999). It would be appropriate to refer not only to other instruments, but to include in the preamble a description of the context and to highlight the new HRD perspective in comparison to that which existed in 1975. The relationship between education and training and the labour market, and the balance between supply and demand, cannot be found in the planning paradigms of the 1970s. Nowadays, the key to a good fit is not in the hands of the State, but of workers and employers. Education, if this was ever the case, no longer prepares one for stable lifetime jobs, but enables young people to acquire a broad range of competencies as a basis for lifelong learning, including learning to learn; career skills; and the capacity to respond to changes in the labour market. It is important to note that education and training alone are not enough to ensure sustainable economic and social development.

Oman. (e) The Minimum Age Convention, 1973 (No. 138); Convention No. 142.

Pakistan. Employers' Federation of Pakistan (EFP): (b) A direct reference to the *Conclusions* will not be of much use. (c) No, as it applies to multinational enterprises only, which are in a better position to develop their human resources.

Panama. (e) Investment in training as a commitment of the public and private sectors, and individuals, under conditions of equal opportunity.

Peru. CCL: (b) Yes.

Philippines. (e) The Universal Declaration of Human Rights.

Portugal. (e) Convention No. 122.

Confederation of Trade and Services of Portugal (CCP): (b) Yes. The preamble should highlight: (i) economic globalization and its effects on the labour market; (ii) the need for States to ensure greater linkage between policies such as economic and employment policies; (iii) the notion of employability, closely linked to basic skills such as information and communication technology (ICT), skills, problem-solving, teamwork, knowledge of foreign languages, ability to communicate, etc.; and (iv) a shared responsibility approach between the State, firms and individuals. (d) Yes, to promote an integrated approach to human resources development, as set

out in the Declaration, particularly as it refers to the need to maintain the mutually reinforcing link between social progress and economic development.

Confederation of Portuguese Industry (CIP): (c) and (d) No.

General Confederation of Portuguese Workers (CGTP-IN): (d) No.

General Union of Workers (UGT): (e) Recommend to countries that changes introduced in education and training will only be effective if they are accompanied by other policies and measures such as employment policy, macroeconomic policy and investment in science and technology. The fundamental role of the social partners should be highlighted.

Romania. (e) European Commission Memorandum on Lifelong Learning (2000) and the Council Resolution of 3 December 1992 on transparency of qualifications.

Russian Federation. FNPR: (a) to (d) Yes. (e) The Vocational Training Recommendation, 1962 (No. 117), and the Employment Policy (Supplementary Provisions) Recommendation, 1984 (No. 169).

Slovakia. (e) Convention No. 140.

Slovenia. ZDS and ZDODS: (b) Yes.

South Africa. (e) A limited number of key instruments of the Bretton Woods institutions and UNESCO could be included in order to explicitly articulate alignment. This would be consistent with the spirit of the Global Employment Forum, which sought to improve coordination of policies and activities across institutions.

COSATU: (e) The Employment Policy Convention, 1964 (No. 122), and Recommendation No. 122 and relevant United Nations documents, including the conclusions of the World Summit for Social Development and the Universal Declaration of Human Rights. The preamble should also refer to the *Conclusions* adopted at the 88th Session of the ILC (June 2000). It should make explicit reference to those aspects of the general discussion that will not be covered in the substantive paragraphs of the revised instrument. For example, it should refer to the following issues raised in the *Conclusions*: the importance of increasing overseas development assistance and providing international debt relief; and encouraging multinational corporations to engage in fair technology transfer agreements, to develop local high-level skills in developing countries and to help create the infrastructure for the new knowledge economy.

Sri Lanka. (e) Convention No. 122 and Convention No. 159.

Sweden. (e) The Workers with Family Responsibilities Convention, 1981 (No. 156).

Switzerland. (a) to (d) Yes, but in the order (d), (b), (a) and (c). (e) No, although perhaps the OECD Guidelines for Multinational Enterprises (June 2000) could be included.

Confederation of Swiss Employers (UPS): (e) The Cologne Charter: Aims and Ambitions for Lifelong Learning (1999).

Syrian Arab Republic. (e) Some of the issues discussed at the International Conference on Education (Geneva, 1994) concerning complementarity between education and training systems for workforce development.

United Arab Emirates. (e) Examples of good practice of member States.

United Kingdom. (c) Yes. The Declaration reinforces the importance of workforce development and makes clear the benefits to business as well as workers. It also highlights the contributions that multinational enterprises can make to learning and training “as part of a contribution to national development”, which fits well with current thinking on corporate social responsibility. (d) Yes, the Declaration is at the heart of the ILO’s work and specifically mentions vocational training in its preamble. (e) The key instruments are covered above. If, how-

ever, there were a general consensus to include further instruments, Conventions Nos. 122 and 140 should be included.

United States. USCIB: (a) Yes. (b) No. (c) No. The Tripartite Declaration contains no content that is relevant. (d) No. The Declaration contains no content that is relevant to this subject. (e) None.

The majority of respondents indicated that the instrument should include a preamble referring to:

- (a) the Human Resources Development Convention, 1975;
- (b) the Conclusions concerning human resources training and development, adopted at the 88th Session of the International Labour Conference;
- (c) the Tripartite Declaration of Principles concerning Multinational Enterprises and Social Policy; and
- (d) the ILO Declaration on Fundamental Principles and Rights at Work.

Respondents referred to the Cologne Charter: Aims and Ambitions for Lifelong Learning and Education, and Training: A joint statement by BIAC and TUAC, both of which appear as appendices to Report IV (1). A number of respondents mentioned the Employment Policy Convention, 1964 (No. 122), and the Vocational Rehabilitation and Employment (Disabled Persons) Convention, 1983 (No. 159), and Recommendation (No. 168). A few respondents indicated that the preamble should refer to the European Commission Memorandum on Lifelong Learning.

III. Objective, scope and definition

Should the instrument recommend that governments formulate, apply and monitor national human resources development and training policies, which are coherent with other economic and social policies, based on social dialogue, and reflect the different roles of government and the social partners?

Qu. 4

Total number of replies: 93.

Affirmative: 91. Algeria, Argentina, Australia, Austria, Bahrain, Barbados, Belgium, Benin, Bolivia, Botswana, Brazil, Burundi, Canada, Central African Republic, Chile, China, Costa Rica, Croatia, Cuba, Cyprus, Czech Republic, Denmark, Ecuador, Egypt, El Salvador, Estonia, Finland, France, Gabon, Germany, Ghana, Greece, Guatemala, Guinea-Bissau, Honduras, Hungary, India, Indonesia, Iraq, Ireland, Israel, Italy, Japan, Kazakhstan, Kenya, Latvia, Lebanon, Lithuania, Malaysia, Mali, Malta, Mauritius, Mexico, Republic of Moldova, Myanmar, Namibia, Netherlands, New Zealand, Nicaragua, Nigeria, Norway, Oman, Pakistan, Panama, Papua New Guinea, Peru, Philippines, Poland, Qatar, Romania, San Marino, Seychelles, Singapore, Slovakia, South Africa, Spain, Sri Lanka, Suriname, Sweden, Switzerland, Syrian Arab Republic, Thailand, Togo, Tunisia, Turkey, Uganda, Ukraine, United Arab Emirates, Yemen, Yugoslavia, Zimbabwe.

Negative: None.

Other: 2. Portugal, United Kingdom.

Belgium. Walloon Government: Yes, on condition that the State assume an exclusive role with regard to basic education and a decisive role in training, an area in which it alone determines policies. Also on condition that cultural circumstances and objectives are taken into account in HRD policy formulation, as provided in Article 1(2)(c) of the Human Resources Development Convention, 1975 (No. 142).

Czech Republic. Confederation of Industry and Transport (SPD ČR): Add “recommend that governments define the competence of authorities on human resources development and training, and to clearly state forms of social dialogue”.

Denmark. Coherent policies for HRD and training policies should be based on social dialogue, reflecting the different roles and *responsibilities* of the players.

France. By integrating economic policies with employment and social policies, it will be possible to avoid situations where employment and training policies are often used as instruments of adjustment or adaptation in the short term. This approach is also likely to bring about a shift in the perceptions of economic decision-makers, who may consider the financing of training to be a cost and even a risk. Economic and labour market polarization can be avoided, since all actors who are responsible for investing in human resources and competencies also have a stake in the level of this investment and in ensuring equality of access. As the approach is likely to improve social cohesion, it also contributes to better overall performance and, ultimately, higher growth.

Germany. Confederation of German Employers’ Associations (BDA): Yes, in principle, but the setting of specific objectives should be left to States, particularly with regard to national policies and their oversight.

Japan. Japan Business Federation (Nippon Keidanren): Although it is appropriate for governments to formulate and apply national HRD policies, there are reservations about “monitoring” them.

Mauritius. The instrument should also specify the mechanisms for policy formulation and social dialogue.

Morocco. FCCIS: Yes.

Netherlands. Trade Union Federation for Middle and Senior Staff (Unie mhp): Perhaps not formulate policies, but facilitate and monitor them.

Portugal. The instrument should aim to assign distinct functions to governments and the social partners, but should be sufficiently flexible to encompass various forms of participation.

Russian Federation. FNPR: Yes.

Slovenia. ZDS and ZDODS: Regarding Questions 4 to 6: both employers’ organizations agree with all the objectives, scope, and definitions suggested in the questionnaire. Above all, governments should facilitate lifelong learning and employability, and stress the importance of innovation, competitiveness and growth of the economy. They should expand public and private investment in the infrastructure needed for the use of ICT, in education and training hardware and software, and in the training of teachers and trainers, making use of local, national and international collaborative networks.

South Africa. Yes, but replace “coherent” with “complementary”. It is important to convey the notion that HRD is central to the achievement of growth and development objectives and is indeed often the forerunner.

COSATU: The instrument should also recommend that governments adopt other appropriate economic and social policies that are directed at full employment and social inclusion, enabling training and human resource development to realize and contribute to economic growth and full employment.

Switzerland. Yes, specifying the different and complementary roles of the State, the social partners and other actors.

United Kingdom. Certainly governments should formulate, apply and monitor policies, but this should not be based solely on social dialogue. Clearly the social partners should be closely involved in the development and implementation of policy. The instrument should make reference to the involvement of other important stakeholders, such as education and human resource development experts and training providers. It should also attempt to incorporate the contribution that can be made by those who are not fully represented by the social partners, such as unemployed people, women, ethnic minorities, disabled people and older workers, as well as those engaged in non-traditional work.

United States. USCIB: Yes, in a broad sense, but in specifics, no. Government-driven HRDT policies are largely ineffective because they are insufficiently connected to the workplace and jobs, and become programmes of “training for training’s sake”.

AFL-CIO: All stakeholders within the community must participate in developing a strategic plan for identifying long-term goals and prioritizing objectives. Working together, stakeholders assess their resources, strengths, weaknesses, opportunities, allies, opponents and targets, and specific action steps are identified. Assessments should look at both the supply (skills and needs of the workforce) and the demand (industry needs) issues in the area. For example, the ILO instrument should recommend, formulate and monitor HRDT policies that are heavily based on social dialogue and reflect the different roles of government and the social partners.

Most respondents stated that the instrument should recommend that governments formulate, apply and monitor national human resources development and training policies, which are coherent with other economic and social policies, based on social dialogue and reflect the different roles of government and the social partners.

Should the instrument encourage governments to identify human resources development and training policies which:

Qu. 5

- (a) *facilitate lifelong learning and employability?*
- (b) *give equal consideration to economic and social objectives in the context of the global economy, and knowledge- and skills-based society, with emphasis on balanced economic and social development, decent work, social inclusion and poverty reduction?*
- (c) *stress the importance of innovation, competitiveness and growth of the economy, and the employability of workers?*

- (d) address the challenge of transforming activities in the informal economy into decent work fully integrated into mainstream economic life?
- (e) expand public and private investment in the infrastructure needed for the use of information and communication technology (ICT), in education and training hardware and software and in the training of teachers and trainers, making use of local, national and international collaborative networks?

Total number of replies: 94.

(a) Total number of replies: 91. Affirmative: 89. Negative: 0. Other: 2.

(b) Total number of replies: 88. Affirmative: 86. Negative: 0. Other: 2.

(c) Total number of replies: 88. Affirmative: 86. Negative: 0. Other: 2.

(d) Total number of replies: 87. Affirmative: 81. Negative: 3. Other: 3.

(e) Total number of replies: 90. Affirmative: 85. Negative: 0. Other: 5.

Affirmative: Algeria, Argentina, Australia, Austria, Bahrain, Barbados, Belgium, Benin, Bolivia ((b)), Botswana ((a) to (c) and (e)), Brazil, Burundi, Canada, Central African Republic, Chile, China, Costa Rica, Croatia, Cuba, Cyprus, Czech Republic ((a), (c) to (e)), Denmark ((a) to (d)), Ecuador, Egypt, El Salvador, Estonia, Finland, France, Gabon, Germany ((a) to (d)), Ghana, Greece, Guatemala ((a), (b), (d) and (e)), Honduras, Hungary, India ((a), (b) and (d)), Indonesia, Iraq, Ireland, Israel ((a), (c) to (e)), Italy, Japan, Kazakhstan ((a)), Kenya ((a) to (c) and (e)), Latvia, Lebanon, Lithuania, Malaysia, Mali, Malta, Mauritius, Mexico ((b), (c) and (e)), Republic of Moldova, Myanmar, Namibia, Netherlands ((a) to (c) and (e)), New Zealand ((a), (c) and (e)), Nicaragua, Nigeria, Norway, Oman ((a), (c) and (e)), Pakistan, Panama, Papua New Guinea, Peru, Philippines, Poland ((a) to (d)), Portugal ((a) to (d)), Qatar, Romania ((a) to (c) and (e)), San Marino, Seychelles, Singapore, Slovakia, South Africa ((b) and (d)), Spain, Sri Lanka, Suriname, Sweden, Switzerland ((a) to (c) and (e)), Syrian Arab Republic, Thailand, Togo, Tunisia, Turkey ((a) and (e)), Uganda, Ukraine, United Arab Emirates, United Kingdom, Venezuela, Yemen ((e)), Yugoslavia, Zimbabwe.

Negative: Botswana ((d)), Kenya ((d)), Switzerland ((d)).

Other: Bulgaria ((c) and (e)), Denmark ((e)), Mexico ((a) and (d)), New Zealand ((b) and (d)), Oman ((b) and (d)), Poland ((e)), Portugal ((e)), South Africa ((a), (c) and (e)).

Australia. Queensland: (e) Lifelong learning and employability are a key focus of vocational education, learning and training strategies and contribute to community cohesion. The notion of government and other agencies providing a collaborative, holistic response to human resource issues is gaining prominence. Developing a culture of innovation across the vocational

education and training system is a priority. ICT training has an important role to play in bridging the gap between the “information and technology-rich” and the “information and technology-poor”.

Victoria. (c) It should read: “stress the importance of innovation, competitiveness and growth of the economy, job satisfaction of workers, and the regular upskilling of the workforce to ensure its continuing employability”.

ACTU. (e) Yes. However, given the limitations of many countries in terms of affordability of technology, availability of expertise and the lack of reliable energy supplies, there should not be too much reliance on a high-level information technology (IT) solution to delivery of education and training.

Austria. (a) to (e) Yes, with the addition of the following: “human resources development and training policies should also promote personal development”.

Austrian Confederation of Trade Unions (ÖGB). (a) to (e) Yes, with the addition of the following: “human resources development and training policies should also promote personal development and democratic political capacity”.

Barbados. CTUSAB: (a) to (e) Yes, as it demonstrates: (i) a commitment to the concept that learning is a continuous process; (ii) a need to encourage individuals to embrace the notion of keeping themselves employable through lifelong learning and retraining; (iii) an understanding of contemporary economic and social conditions/challenges which are, to a great extent, met through education and training; and (iv) recognition of the fact that all the social partners must “pull their weight” in ensuring that the infrastructure for this new approach to education and training is in place.

Belgium. Walloon Government: (a) Yes, with regard to lifelong learning only. No, with regard to employability, as this concept is incompatible with Convention No. 142. (b) Yes, provided that cultural circumstances and objectives are taken into account when formulating HRD policies. (c) No, as these objectives are based on enterprise interests only; the interests of workers are equally important, according to Convention No. 142 (Article 1, paragraphs 4 and 5). (e) Yes, but with the following reservations: (i) new ICT is not accessible to all concerned, whereas basic education and vocational training should be provided to everyone on an equal and non-discriminatory basis; (ii) other more conventional technologies are still useful, as ICT is not necessarily used effectively and is not necessarily better or more appropriate; (iii) the use of new ICT requires that the individuals concerned have developed a capacity for critical analysis through basic education.

Brazil. CNI: (a) to (e) It is important that any formulation be preceded by consultation with the most representative employers’ and workers’ organizations.

Bulgaria. (c) This should be rephrased as follows: “stress the importance of innovation, competitiveness and growth of the economy, and the employability, adaptability and mobility of the labour force”. (e) Investment in methodology should also be included.

Canada. (c) Productivity could be added to these elements.

Central African Republic. (d) Yes, HRD through workers’ knowledge acquisition and training, combined with policy incentives, can transform informal economy activities.

Croatia. SSSH: (c) Yes, but it is necessary to complement economic development with the protection and preservation of the environment.

Cyprus. Pan-Cyprian Federation of Labour (PEO): (a) No. The concept of employability shifts responsibility for unemployment to the workers, and reference to it should be avoided in the Recommendation. (c) No.

Czech Republic. SPD ČR: Above all, the instrument should help to create proper conditions for developing lifelong learning and corresponding employment opportunities.

Denmark. (e) Instead of “expand ... investment” it should read “promote ... investment” in relation to structures which support ICT.

FTF: The instrument should focus on lifelong learning, the objective of which is to strengthen individuals’ employment opportunities as well as social development. It should define education/training as a right. Compulsory basic education and vocational training should be every individual’s right.

Egypt. (a) to (e) Yes, combined with the support of the industrialized countries and the international organizations concerned.

Finland. (c) Yes, in accordance with national policies. (d) Yes, although the concept of the informal economy, as well as its integration into the mainstream economy, is a complex matter. (e) Yes. Infrastructure development is a prerequisite, but much more is required for successful implementation policies on HRD.

Germany. BDA: (e) Yes, but policies that strictly regulate or determine private investment should not be identified, since an interventionist approach is not desirable.

India. EAR and IMC: (a) to (e) Yes.

Indonesia. (a) Yes, provided it reflects the demands of the labour market.

Ireland. (a) Governments can facilitate lifelong learning, for example, by: ensuring universal attainment of literacy and numeracy skills, and completion of primary education; eliminating unqualified early school leaving; promoting a high level of participation in post-secondary education and ongoing education and training; supporting a strategic framework for lifelong learning; and encouraging a lifelong learning culture in the workplace. (b) This can be done by pursuing a variety of policies to maintain a competitive business environment and create more and better jobs. Such policies may include: creating a climate supportive of new business start-ups; repositioning indigenous manufacturing enterprises from low-tech, low-productivity to higher-value activities offering higher-quality jobs; and upgrading national research and development (R&D) and technological and innovation capability.

Italy. (a) The right to lifelong learning and the related investment should not be left to the individual or to the ethical conscience of the employer, but should be set out in laws applicable to all, and agreed to by the social partners.

Japan. JTUC-RENGO: (b) In determining the definition of “employability”, the *Conclusions* adopted at the 88th Session of the International Labour Conference should be fully incorporated. (d) Given the expansion of the informal economy, this issue should be explicitly reflected in the new instrument.

Kenya. (d) No, change is continuous in this sector.

Lebanon. (a) to (e) The formulation “Should the instrument encourage governments” might be replaced by “Should the instrument recommend that governments”. (a) It is important that job opportunities be available so that training and human resource development policies are not in vain. (b) These policies must consider the realistic requirements of society, which may differ between States. A start has to be made by providing basic education for disadvantaged groups in order to establish the basis for further skills acquisition. (d) Adequate training must be provided in the informal economy in order to generate self-employment opportunities. It is important to have a clear conception and definition of the informal economy. The question is, to what extent can this sector be organized, and does its organization mean its abolition or transformation into the formal sector?

Confederation of Chambers of Commerce, Industry and Agriculture (CCCIA): (a) to (e) Yes, although a new paragraph should be included on retraining the workforce to meet contemporary needs.

Mexico. (a) It is essential that education and training policies be designed according to a holistic and multidisciplinary approach, linking school and employment. (d) The content of ILO policy statements on the informal sector should be incorporated in order to propose and implement specific policies. Decency connotes honesty and legality, and a job in the informal sector can be as decent as any job in the formal economy. Therefore, the term “decent” should be deleted, which would not alter the meaning of the phrase.

Morocco. FCCIS: Yes.

New Zealand. (b) This might be rephrased to read: “give balanced consideration to both economic and social ...”. (d) Note should be made of the general discussion on the informal economy at the 90th Session of the International Labour Conference.

Business New Zealand (Business NZ): (d) Real consideration needs to be given to the extent to which the recent growth in the informal economy is related to a lack of training and educational opportunities and not, as it might seem, a reflection of increasingly stringent employment protection, which discourages formal sector employers from employing people. If, for many countries, the latter holds, then human resources development and training are unlikely to make much headway in transforming informal economy activities.

New Zealand Council of Trade Unions (NZCTU): (b) Yes.

Nigeria. Technical assistance for developing countries should be emphasized.

Oman. (b) Replace the phrase “equal consideration” with “reasonable consideration”. (d) A Convention on workers in the informal economy should be adopted before this instrument considers it.

Pakistan. (a) to (d) These aspects should be considered in view of the changing labour market conditions emerging from globalization and technological progress.

EFP: (b) Yes, but the concept of “decent work” is not universal. (d) No, unless there is a significant change in the registration of employers in the informal sector.

Poland. (b) The social function of basic education and training should be a priority. (e) Public and private investment in any infrastructure may be better expanded by economic policies other than HRD policies. For the latter, the necessity of developing ICT should be stressed.

Portugal. (c) Education and training systems should give higher priority to lifelong learning; encourage agreements between the social partners on innovation and lifelong training; explore the complementarity between lifelong learning and adaptability; promote flexible management of working time and job rotation; and highlight the social responsibility of enterprises for promoting best practices in lifelong learning, organization of work, equality of opportunity, social inclusion and sustainable development. (d) The social partners are crucial in addressing this challenge. (e) Public and private investment should be set within a framework which maximizes the return on resources.

CCP: (b) Social objectives are only achievable through economic means, since it is economic growth and development that generate the wealth necessary to bear the cost of social policies. In this regard, the question should not be stated in the present form. Rather than using the term “equal consideration”, the instrument should provide for a balanced and realistic approach.

CIP: (b) Replace the phrase “equal consideration” with “greater consideration”.

Romania. (a) Policies and strategies should ensure equality of opportunity in access to training and lifelong learning. (c) These factors make it necessary to have high standards of education and qualifications in all economic sectors to ensure quality training and continuous development of skills as jobs change.

Russian Federation. FNPR: (a) to (e) Yes.

South Africa. (a) In the context of the preamble, it would probably be best to speak of the purpose of such interventions (outcome/impact), namely “human resources development policies” which contribute to enhanced employment rates, increased productivity, expanded internal and external career paths, reduced poverty and social inclusion, as well as re-entry into the labour market for those displaced by restructuring or with childcare responsibilities that interrupt their working lives. “Lifelong learning and employability” are the inputs needed to achieve these outcomes. (b) Yes, but in line with the restructuring suggestion, this would go to a section dealing with vision and preconditions and contextual considerations for successful implementation of training policies. (c) Add to this the notion of reducing inequality and discrimination in the labour market. (d) Yes. Add a reference to the need for HRD policies and strategies to be integrated with other interventions (e.g. microcredit and market access) to achieve this outcome. (e) There should be two separate statements: one dealing with the need to expand public and private investment in general, linked to improved returns on that investment, and the other referring to the need to invest in ICT to achieve the vision and objectives of the Recommendation.

COSATU. (a) The instrument should encourage governments to identify HRD and training policies that facilitate lifelong learning and employment security. The concept of employability should be defined in its broadest dimensions. In this regard, the idea that workers are to blame when they are unemployed because they are not “employable” should be avoided. There are distinct elements to this concept: (i) employability is only meaningful in the context of macro-economic policies which promote employment (one cannot be truly employable when there are no jobs); (ii) employability is a joint partnership between trade unions, employers, governments and individual workers (workers cannot be expected to carry the primary or exclusive responsibility in this regard, particularly on the issue of financing); (iii) employability is achievable in an environment where global economic activity is undertaken on an equitable basis (workers in the developing world will be condemned to unemployment if issues of investment, trade, international debt, development assistance, technology transfers, etc. are not addressed); (iv) the HRD contribution to “employability” is not confined to technical and vocational training, but should include all elements of the national education system; and (v) “employability” is a crucial, but not the only, goal and outcome of education and training (other goals and outcomes include the full development of the human being, realizing the responsibility of citizenship, critical thinking and culture). Training can be one mechanism to address the challenge of the informal sector and to help transform marginal activities into decent work, which is fully integrated into the mainstream economy. This point should be fully reflected in the new instrument. (e) Yes.

Sri Lanka. Employers’ Federation of Ceylon (EFC): (b) In developing countries, the inability to achieve social objectives is clearly attributable to the inability to achieve economic goals. While the latter take precedence, countries need to be mindful of social issues and strike a reasonable balance. (d) The instrument needs to note the important contribution of the informal sector to national economies. Transformation of the informal sector should not be at the cost of destroying it. Enterprises in the sector should be given opportunities to integrate into mainstream economic life, but, at the same time, the informal sector will continue to absorb new entrepreneurs.

Sweden. (a) Yes. One important stage in the achievement of sustainable competence development is the establishment of strategies and measures whereby manpower, working condi-

tions and work organization develop with ongoing social changes. Education is important both for the liberty and security of the individual and for the growth and prosperity of society, and it must be continuous. Recurrent training initiatives are needed to reduce the risk of exclusion during the active phase of the life cycle. The instrument should identify targets which emphasize the importance of innovation, competitiveness and growth in the economy. (b) Yes. As regards policy initiatives, governments can help to enhance competence development through financial incentives for the economically active, in the form of entitlements to tax deductions for expenditures related to education and training or other work skills development. This would enable them to save gross earnings to offset loss of earnings related to personal skills development.

Switzerland. (c) Yes, although the questionnaire, in general, seems to focus on the needs of the economy, for example concerning the question of employability. A primary objective of education and training should be to develop free and responsible citizens. (d) No. This aspect should be covered by a reference to the general discussion on the informal economy at the 90th Session of the ILC.

UPS: (b) and (d) The concept of decent work should be clarified. (e) The issue is not one of increasing public investment. The role of the public authorities is to put in place structures, such as judicial and security services, and basic infrastructure that will permit free enterprise growth.

USS/SGB: (a) The term “employability” in the instrument should always be accompanied by a reference to “capacity for social integration”. (e) This objective must be complemented by investment in libraries and the development of stimulating training materials. While the value of ICT is not questioned, care must be taken that it is not used by employers as a way to economize on basic training, which is needed by the most disadvantaged workers. This comment also applies to Questions 9(d), 15 and 19(b).

United Kingdom. (d) Yes. The general discussion on the informal economy at the 90th Session of the ILC concluded that “investing in people ... in their education, skills training, lifelong learning [and] health and safety” was vital to helping people move from the informal into the formal economy. The ILO’s work should be “aimed at creating decent jobs and education, skill-building and training opportunities”. (e) Yes, but the wording is very prescriptive; it should perhaps say “explore and implement ways to expand ...”. The instrument should also emphasize sustainable investment in this area, and the links with other national infrastructure development projects such as electricity and telecommunications, without which much of the investment in ICT is wasted.

United States. USCIB: (a) Yes. In competitive global markets, job security cannot be guaranteed. Employment security requires lifetime learning and cannot be assured by the employer, employment policies or international labour standards. Employability requires the individual to take responsibility. Work in the twenty-first century requires both employers and workers to learn, adapt and acquire new skills, constantly, to keep pace with emerging new technologies, new methods of operation, and new forms of workplace organization. (b) Yes, broadly speaking. Clearly, a social/political environment that is built on a commitment to social inclusion is one that would be supportive of these aims. (c) Yes. Competition and innovation have made economies more efficient and created hundred of millions of jobs. Globalization generates an upward spiral of jobs and prosperity for countries that embrace the process, although the advantages will not reach everybody at the same time. Workers’ investment in their own employability guarantees that they are prepared to take advantage of the new job opportunities created through innovation, competitiveness and the growth of the economy. (d) Yes, but it should be recognized that HRD policies in this context are different from those in the formal sector. (e) Yes.

AFL-CIO: (d) Partnerships to develop high-level, quality and innovative skills must address the challenges posed by the growing informal sector (temporary and contingent workers, for example) and try to create opportunities for stable job growth within these sectors.

The overwhelming majority of member States felt that the instrument should encourage Members to identify human resources development and training policies which facilitate lifelong learning and employability; give equal consideration to economic and social objectives in the context of the global economy, and knowledge- and skills-based society, with emphasis on balanced economic and social development, decent work, social inclusion and poverty reduction; stress the importance of innovation, competitiveness and growth of the economy, and the employability of workers; address the challenge of transforming activities in the informal economy into decent work fully integrated into mainstream economic life; expand public and private investment in the infrastructure needed for the use of ICT, in education and training hardware and software and in the training of teachers and trainers, making use of local, national and international collaborative networks. A few respondents raised concerns about the complexity of the informal economy and the extent to which it can be organized. Others raised the challenge of defining decent work across economies and sectors.

Qu. 6 *Should the instrument encourage governments to:*

- (a) recognize that education and training are a right for all and, in cooperation with the social partners, ensure universal access?*
- (b) define a national strategy and establish an institutional framework for the development and implementation of training policies at different levels (national, regional, local, sectoral, enterprise) that involves the social partners, promotes social dialogue and specifies the roles of the various parties?*
- (c) align human resources and training policies with policies aimed at creating employment opportunities (for example, through regional or industrial development)?*
- (d) establish a national qualifications framework to facilitate lifelong learning, help enterprises and employment agencies to match skill demand with supply, guide individuals in their choice of training and career and facilitate the recognition of prior learning?*
- (e) develop a national training delivery system appropriate to national conditions and practices?*
- (f) assume the primary responsibility for investing in basic education and initial training?*
- (g) invest in other forms of training?*
- (h) create a general economic environment and incentives conducive to encouraging individuals and enterprises to invest individually or jointly in education and training?*
- (i) strengthen social dialogue on training at different levels (national, regional, local, sectoral, enterprise)?*

(j) undertake other activities? (Please specify.)

Total number of replies: 95.

(a) Total number of replies: 92. Affirmative: 87. Negative: 0. Other: 5.

(b) Total number of replies: 89. Affirmative: 86. Negative: 0. Other: 3.

(c) Total number of replies: 90. Affirmative: 89. Negative: 0. Other: 1.

(d) Total number of replies: 91. Affirmative: 90. Negative: 0. Other: 1.

(e) Total number of replies: 89. Affirmative: 87. Negative: 1. Other: 1.

(f) Total number of replies: 89. Affirmative: 84. Negative: 1. Other: 4.

(g) Total number of replies: 90. Affirmative: 87. Negative: 0. Other: 3.

(h) Total number of replies: 89. Affirmative: 87. Negative: 0. Other: 2.

(i) Total number of replies: 88. Affirmative: 87. Negative: 0. Other: 1.

(j) Total number of replies: 32.

Affirmative: Algeria, Argentina, Australia, Austria, Bahrain, Barbados ((a) to (e), (g) to (i)), Belgium, Benin, Bolivia ((c)), Botswana ((a) to (i)), Brazil, Burundi ((a), (b), (e) to (g)), Canada ((b) to (i)), Central African Republic ((a) to (i)), Chile, China ((a) to (f), (h) and (i)), Costa Rica, Croatia, Cuba, Cyprus ((a), (c) to (i)), Czech Republic ((a), (c), (d), (f) to (i)), Denmark, Ecuador, Egypt, El Salvador, Estonia, Finland, France ((a), (d) to (h)), Gabon, Germany ((b) to (f), (h) and (i)), Ghana, Greece, Guatemala, Guinea-Bissau, Honduras, Hungary, India ((d) and (e)), Indonesia, Iraq ((a) to (i)), Ireland ((a) to (h)), Israel ((a) to (d), (f), (g) and (i)), Italy, Japan, Kazakhstan ((a)), Kenya ((b) to (e), (g) to (i)), Latvia, Lebanon ((a) to (e), (g) and (i)), Lithuania, Malaysia, Mali, Malta, Mauritius ((a) to (i)), Mexico ((a) to (i)), Republic of Moldova ((a) to (i)), Myanmar, Namibia, Netherlands ((a) to (d), (f), (h) and (i)), New Zealand, Nicaragua, Nigeria ((a) to (h)), Norway, Oman ((a) to (i)), Pakistan, Panama ((a) to (i)), Papua New Guinea, Peru ((a) to (e), (g) to (i)), Philippines ((a) to (i)), Poland ((a) to (f), (h) and (i)), Portugal ((a) to (d), (f) to (i)), Qatar, Romania ((a) to (i)), San Marino, Seychelles, Singapore, Slovakia, South Africa ((b), (c), (e), (g) to (i)), Spain, Sri Lanka ((a) to (i)), Suriname, Sweden, Switzerland ((a) to (e), (g) to (i)), Syrian Arab Republic, Thailand, Togo, Tunisia, Turkey, Uganda ((a) to (i)), Ukraine, United Arab Emirates ((a) to (i)), United Kingdom ((c) to (i)), Venezuela, Yemen ((a), (d), (g) and (i)), Yugoslavia, Zimbabwe.

Negative: Barbados ((f)), Germany ((j)), Israel ((e)), Kenya ((j)), Mauritius ((j)).

Other: Botswana ((j)), Bulgaria ((g), (h) and (j)), Burundi ((j)), Canada ((a)), China ((g) and (j)), Cyprus ((b)), France ((b) and (c)), Germany ((a) and (g)), Iraq ((j)), Ireland ((j)), Israel ((j)), Kenya ((a) and (f)), Lebanon ((f), (h) and (j)), Mexico ((j)), Republic of Moldova ((j)), Nigeria ((i)), Oman ((j)), Panama ((j)), Philippines ((j)), Poland ((j)), Portugal ((e)), Romania ((j)), South Africa ((a), (d), (f) and (j)), Sri Lanka

((j)), Switzerland ((f)), Uganda ((j)), United Arab Emirates ((j)), United Kingdom ((a), (b) and (j)).

Australia. (a) The right to education and training could be defined more clearly by distinguishing between education/training that equips everybody for economic, social and intellectual participation, and further education/training of well-educated/highly trained people. The latter is not necessarily a right, and need not be universally accessible. (f) Governments should be encouraged to assume primary responsibility for investing in basic education. “Initial training” should be defined; this will help determine whether primary investment responsibility should lie with governments or with others, such as private providers or employers.

Queensland: (f) The government should provide an education and training safety net and foundation and strategically use government funds to foster complementary private investment. Governments could also be encouraged to differentiate between their responsibility for investing in basic education, and individuals’ responsibility for their own training and development beyond basic education. (g) Training that ensures all segments of the community access and equitable provision, skilling to meet the needs of emerging industries, provision to fill skill gaps due to market failure, and development of pathways and infrastructure that support lifelong learning.

Western Australia: (a) The instrument should recognize the fundamental right of every child to access to quality education.

Austria. (d) Yes, although matching supply and demand should occur not only in the sphere of further training but also, where appropriate, in initial training. (e) Such a system should also take into account increasing internationalization. (g) Mention certain types of training, e.g. labour market programmes and remedial courses for completing secondary education. The financing of training and further training, especially in adult education, should be coordinated at the national level in order to meet the challenges of lifelong learning. (h) The State should provide training advisory services for enterprises and training for qualifications for employees.

Federal Chamber of Labour (BAK) and ÖGB: (a) Yes, although the term “universal access” should be replaced with “open access”. (d) Yes, although this should apply to initial training when appropriate. (f) Yes, provided the phrase “... assume greater responsibility for financing lifelong learning” is added to (j). (g) Other forms of training should be mentioned; at least, some examples should be given. (j) The instrument should encourage governments to recognize education as the responsibility of the State, as a matter of principle.

BAK: (e) A national training system should also be internationally compatible.

Barbados. (i) Yes, only at the national level.

BEC: (d) Governments should establish a national framework to help enterprises and employment agencies match skill demand and supply. However, a more decentralized approach, which allows decisions to be taken at the company level and through collective agreements, should also be encouraged.

CTUSAB: (f) Yes.

Belgium. Walloon Government: (a) Yes, with regard to the right to education and initial and continuous training for all. No, regarding cooperation between the social partners to ensure universal access, as this is the responsibility of the State. (b) No, in Belgium this is the responsibility of the French Community; yes, only with regard to vocational training. (c) No. HRD should also meet social and cultural (objectives in accordance with Article 1(2)(c) of Convention No. 142). (d) Yes, at least at the regional level. (g) This depends on the type of training.

Botswana. (j) Provide loans and incentives to workers to encourage them to enrol in training.

Brazil. CNI: (j) When formulating and implementing education and training plans and policies, better links between education, training, labour, employment, science, technology and economic and social development should be promoted. Training geared to entrepreneurship should be promoted, and micro- and small enterprises that generate employment and income should be fostered.

Bulgaria. (g) This should be rephrased as follows: “invest in other forms of training, with a view to priorities”. (h) This should be reworded to read “support the creation of a general economic environment and incentives ...”. (j) Popularize HRD activities, programmes, methods, etc.; support HRD institutional development; develop clear conceptions for HRD and the participation of the main actors.

Burundi. (j) Activities that favour an integrated approach to employment creation.

Canada. (c) Macroeconomic priorities should also be taken into account. (g) A definition of “other” forms of training is needed.

Central African Republic. (c) Yes, in order to match skill demand and supply and facilitate retraining of laid-off workers. (h) Yes, the State, in its public procurement, could favour enterprises that truly invest in education and training.

China. (g) Should be rephrased to read: “encourage investment in other forms of training”. (j) Promote linkages between employment services and training; provide special measures for disadvantaged groups.

Croatia. HUP: (a) to (i) Yes. (j) Invest in training for self-employment and entrepreneurship and promote distance learning programmes.

SSSH: (a) to (i) Yes. (j) Establish partnerships to address labour market issues at the local, regional, national and interregional levels, and launch activities that will develop good industrial relations and hence improve the profitability of enterprises.

Cuba. (b) Yes, although the strategies, institutional framework and duties of the parties must be defined in accordance with the specific conditions of the country.

Cyprus. (b) Substitute “appropriate infrastructure” for “institutional framework”.

PEO: (h) Investment in training cannot be the responsibility of workers.

SEK: (a) Yes, it is essential to clarify individuals’ right to access to learning and training, irrespective of their status, knowledge, qualifications and age. Access to lifelong learning means the promotion of equal opportunity, greater social inclusion and economic development. (b) Yes. (d) The definition of such a framework should be made after serious consideration of the objective data of every occupation and with the participation of the social partners. (h) Individuals should not carry the main burden for financing their learning and training; the State and employers should provide most of the financing. Collective funds established through tripartite and bipartite agreements could be created to finance learning and training projects.

Czech Republic. SPD ČR: (j) Support the implementation of training policies at all possible levels of economic life.

Denmark. (b) and (d) Yes, but should be softened in order to focus on the development of coherent strategies and systems of qualifications.

Egypt. (a) to (i) Yes, provided that governments of industrialized countries earmark a percentage of their national revenues to assist developing countries in implementing their programmes.

Finland. (g) Yes. Secondary and tertiary education should be mentioned as well. (h) Yes, in accordance with national economic, educational and labour market policies.

France. (a) Yes, it is essential that coordinated policies be implemented by the State, representative employers' and workers' organizations and organizations representing self-employed workers, but also by territorial authorities, associations, professional and family organizations, public and private education institutions and enterprises. (b) The Recommendation should not specify the roles of the various parties because, as yet, there is no universally applicable model for assigning responsibilities and tasks. (c) Actual policy development and implementation should take place at national and/or regional level (institutional framework, system of training providers). Regional/local authorities may be called upon to assume particular responsibilities in this area. (d) Yes. However, given that the links between demand and supply are complex, the wording "achieving a closer match between" skill demand and supply would be more appropriate than "matching". (e) Yes, but nothing prevents different countries from agreeing on common objectives and promoting cooperation in a particular area on a voluntary basis. In any case, the exchange of good practices and establishment of international collaborative networks should be encouraged. (g) Yes, governments also have responsibilities in the areas of continuous education and training, since these contribute to employment promotion and the fight against exclusion. (h) Yes, HRDT policies should be an integral component of policies that create jobs, maintain workers' employability, fight poverty and promote decent and quality work. However, these policies must also pursue other objectives: social cohesion, personal development, democracy and citizenship. This multitude of objectives is the principal reason why governments should assume a central role in HRDT and in overseeing the creation of an environment conducive to the development of a lifelong learning culture.

Germany. (a) The phrase "education and training are a right for all" should be replaced by "everyone has unimpeded access to education, including training". A phrase along the lines of "access to education and training should be ensured for disadvantaged youth" should also be added. (f) Yes, but only as concerns initial education in school. The responsibility of business for initial training should be mentioned. (g) The wording should be: "support innovation in training and further training".

BDA: (a) Yes, but individuals' responsibility for their own training should be mentioned. (d) Yes, but employers must be allowed the freedom to identify demand-driven and flexible solutions in the provision of further training for their employees. (g) More emphasis should be placed on individual responsibility and a practical, demand-driven approach.

India. EAR: (g) No.

Employers' Federation of India (EFI): (a) to (i) Yes.

FKCCI: (j) Multiskills training, learn-while-you-earn and self-development will enhance the life of employees and lead to higher productivity in enterprises.

IMC: (b) No. (e) No. (g) No.

Iraq. (j) Encourage continuous education and training by creating opportunities and encouraging individuals to seize these opportunities.

Ireland. (j) Stress the importance of education and training in addressing the impact of globalization.

Israel. (b) Yes, including dissemination of knowledge and experience. (j) Establish job classification and upgrading scales.

Italy. (h) For example, by promulgating laws that provide for individuals' entitlement to training leave and tax incentives for enterprises to engage in training. Low-skilled and older workers should be given economic incentives for retraining.

Japan. (f) The term "primary responsibility" of governments should be clarified.

Kenya. (a) Only basic education and initial training should be recognized as a right. (f) Government should assume a major, not primary, responsibility.

Lebanon. (a) to (e) The phrase “encourage governments to” should be replaced by “recommend that governments” in this Question and all the others. (a) The phrase “ensure universal access” should be qualified by the phrase “endeavour to ...”. Mention the concept of distance learning and other learning technology applications, and the benefit that can be derived from these. (b) It is proposed that a public organization for training be established in which all the social partners participate. (d) Vocational guidance should start with the school curriculum. The national qualifications framework should incorporate job classifications and descriptions. Specialized committees should undertake the recognition of prior learning, according to specific standards. (e) Yes, with the participation of the social partners. (f) It might be difficult for some States to assume alone the primary responsibility for investing in basic education and initial training, given their economic and financial situation, but their responsibility in this regard could be defined with reference to the most disadvantaged and poorest groups. In many countries specialized institutions play an important role in basic education and initial training. (g) The social partners also have a role. (h) Yes, but subject to the conditions in individual States. It is important to assess the outcomes of such investment. (j) The State should establish and periodically review unified public curricula for training at all levels, and all concerned parties should abide by this. It should also establish a supervisory body to follow up on changing training needs and conduct labour market surveys in order to match training with labour market needs.

Mauritius. Federation of Public Service Trade Unions (FSCC): (j) Eradication of poverty through training and basic education.

Mexico. (j) Enterprises and private employment agencies can contribute to designing and developing HRDT programmes.

Republic of Moldova. (j) Ensure access and equality of opportunity for all citizens in respect of education and training.

Morocco. FCCIS: Yes.

Netherlands. (e) It is unclear what is meant by “national training delivery system”.

VNO-NCW: (a) The right to education and training for all could be a general principle, but top-down central legislation, particularly regarding recurrent education, should be avoided. Proposals should not be based on a narrow legislative interpretation, in the direction of centrally determined individual rights, to be forced on companies. (b) and (e) This sounds as if the national government is the architect of all training and learning. A decentralized approach is preferred, in which decisions are made at the company level and through collective agreements which governments support by creating incentives and conditions. (d) Yes. However, the labour market has become very dynamic and even the concept of profession is eroding. People are hired for their competencies. These competencies are developed continuously during working life, and, on average, employees will change jobs at least seven times. In addition, even within a job profile, considerable change may take place owing to technological and organizational developments. These factors call for a framework based on broad (competency-based) descriptions of qualifications which are transparent but leave room for more precise definition by schools and companies at the local level. It would enhance employability and mobility if countries from the same region would cooperate to make national frameworks compatible.

Unie mhp: (e) Not necessarily, as this depends on national strategy. Governments should be responsible for initial training, but training for lifelong learning for working people is more the responsibility of the social partners. (g) Yes, especially tax relief for investment in training. (j) Provide good public information about training facilities and responsibilities.

New Zealand. (g) Yes, but all parties, not just government, should be urged to consider investing in forms of training that contribute to the achievement of their social and economic objectives.

Business NZ: (c) The wording suggests that it is central or local government that will create job opportunities. However, most productive job opportunities are generated in and by the private sector. The subparagraph should therefore be rephrased as follows: “align human resources and training policies aimed at generating private sector employment”.

Nigeria. (f) The government should assume primary responsibility for investing in basic education, but employers should take responsibility for initial and subsequent training. (g) The instrument should encourage both governments and employers to invest in other forms of training. (i) Create an enabling environment that will strengthen social dialogue on training at different levels.

Norway. Confederation of Norwegian Business and Industry (NHO) and Confederation of Trade Unions in Norway (LO): (a) to (i) Yes. The instrument should encourage governments to promote social dialogue concerning the issues in all subparagraphs, not only those in (i). (f) Emphasis should be placed on basic education, as it is an essential element of lifelong learning. Basic education of girls, in particular, has a powerful effect on their future employability as well as their economic and social emancipation. Basic education should also be viewed in relation to child labour, particularly in the light of the Minimum Age Convention, 1973 (No. 138), and the Worst Forms of Child Labour Convention, 1999 (No. 182).

Oman. (b) Yes, but this should not be too specific. (j) Ensure basic education and training for all until they receive the minimum wage.

Pakistan. EFP: (b) Yes, but taking socio-economic conditions into consideration. (d) Yes, focusing on private-public partnerships and training that meets the needs of employers.

Panama. (j) The instrument should encourage governments to consider the issue of vocational training in its social agenda, with greater budgetary resources aimed at dealing with the growing demand for training in those sectors of society most in need of national development.

Philippines. (j) Develop and promote equivalency of educational programmes between institutions and between countries.

Poland. (j) Governments should encourage the building of institutions that support the development of education and training systems. Such institutions include teacher-training organizations, and those involved in education and training standard setting, curricular development and research in the field of HRD.

Portugal. (d) Emphasize the need to promote social dialogue and partnerships at different levels, a more structured training system adapted to the needs of individuals and organizations, involving the social partners and civil society, and an enabling framework for innovation and entrepreneurial initiative. (e) Dialogue and collaboration with the social partners are important in this area.

CCP: (a) Yes, with respect to the right to education, which must be provided by governments/public authorities. Training should not be regarded as a right for all, if that implies responsibilities of the social partners, especially concerning financing, to ensure the full exercise of the right. (d) Yes, although given the diversity of education and training systems throughout the world it is questionable whether a specific recommendation in this area would have any impact. (h) The question of incentives is especially important both for firms and for individuals, particularly tax incentives. Such incentives promote the idea that education and training should not be seen as a cost but as an investment, and encourage the sharing of responsibilities between the company and the individual.

CIP: (a) It is unrealistic to expect the instrument to encourage governments to recognize that education and training are a right for all, since many countries cannot fulfil the obligations arising from this right.

CGTP-IN: (d) Recognition of knowledge should include both that acquired formally and that acquired informally. (j) The instrument should encourage governments to organize education and training systems that complement each other, to take steps that ensure that vocational training has an educational component, allows for the transfer of knowledge between the two systems and introduces systems of certification of training to guarantee its quality.

UGT: (a) The role of governments should be clearly stated – i.e. ensuring that all citizens have the right to education and continuous training – as well as the sharing of some responsibilities with enterprises and workers/citizens.

Romania. (d) Yes, in partnership between training providers and employers. (f) Yes, provided the social partners also assume responsibility. (j) Governments should encourage the social partners, in particular employers, to anticipate new skill needs.

Russian Federation. FNPR: (a) to (i) Yes.

Slovakia. KOZ SR: (j) Encourage governments to strengthen the cyclical form of education/training for the social partners.

South Africa. (a) This should be formulated to take account of the reality that universal access to training will only be achieved over time, whilst access to basic education is a more immediate right. (b) Yes. Governments should also be encouraged to take due account of the voices of those outside the formal economy and the unemployed when such strategies and institutional frameworks are designed and implemented. (c) Yes. But add “strategies” after the word “policies”. (d) A national qualifications framework (NQF) is only one part of an overall learning system and, on its own, it cannot achieve the outcomes listed. It may be better to encourage governments to establish responsive training systems consisting of: partnerships between labour market actors and those that design and deliver training programmes; a national qualifications framework that facilitates the translation of labour market and social development needs into statements of learning outcomes, makes the labour market currency of skill more transparent, enhances access to learning, facilitates mobility across different sites of learning and gives quality assurance to all labour market actors; national delivery systems based on high-quality education and training provision that is responsive to the needs of the labour market and social development; and employment agencies that make labour market information more readily available to labour market actors. (e) Yes, but it is suggested that this be subsumed under a more generic statement – see under (d) above. There is a need to create linkages to the policy debates under way in UNESCO on technical and vocational education and training. The value that the ILO adds is its emphasis on the role of the social partners and the importance of participation in securing responsiveness. There should also be a link to higher education. The ultimate outcome might even be the joint adoption of a Recommendation. (f) It may be better to give “primary responsibility for investing in basic education and adult basic education” to government, but require governments to create incentives and provide resources and support for expanding access to initial training, whilst at the same time encouraging investments of time and resources by other social partners. Nevertheless, investment in initial training for those unable to secure work experience in the formal sector should be publicly funded, but even here, mechanisms need to be found to secure responsiveness to social needs. (g) Yes, there is a need to put in place special incentives and support measures for those who fall outside the reach of the formal economy, and for those who, for cultural or historical reasons, are traditionally excluded (e.g. women, certain racial groups and people with disabilities). Public investment in training for poor communities within the context of social development initiatives is also important. (h) Yes, see comments under (f) and (g) above. (i) Yes, but add “provider” and “employment services” to complete the picture. (j) The importance of employment services in diffusing information about learning opportunities needs to be underlined. Governments should also be encouraged to provide support to trade unions and community organizations to enable them to participate in the institutions of social dialogue.

COSATU: (d) and (f) Yes. (h) Mention should be made of levy systems, public grants, training funds, tax rebates and sabbatical leave as ways to encourage investments in training. Where levies are used, the governance of funding should be tripartite or, where the social partners agree, bipartite. (j) Provision should be made for governments to provide support to trade unions and community organizations to enable them to participate in and contribute to training. Provision should also be made for supportive social and other policies (e.g. childcare provision) to enable all persons to take up training and development.

Spain. (d) This promotes transparency in the labour market, and enhances the quality of intermediation by the public employment services and their organizations to match labour supply and demand, while at the same time serving as a benchmark for vocational training, improving quality and coherence.

Sri Lanka. (b) A national strategy should be defined by a central authority. (j) Establish labour market information systems that facilitate training planning, guidance and job placement.

EFC: (b) Such a strategy and framework are desirable, but they should not deter the social partners from identifying their respective roles and working towards achievement of their objectives.

Lanka Jathika Estate Workers' Union (LJEWU): (d) This is a crucial aspect, which should be carefully considered with the collaboration of all concerned.

Sweden. (b) Yes. The importance of renewal, competitiveness, growth and employability is pivotal. (c) It is especially important to focus attention on the question of workers' employability. (e) Yes. ICT should be developed as one of the most important "new" means of facilitating and augmenting the quality and quantity of training delivery. (g) Yes, especially by designing and implementing gender training packages at teacher training institutions and in continuing training programmes.

Switzerland. (f) Initial training (apprenticeship) should be designed by governments together with economic actors, who have a better vision of training prospects and needs. (h) Yes, provided that such activities do not lead to impairment of the right to quality lifelong education and supplement those undertaken by public authorities.

UPS: (a) Yes, as a principle and an objective, but this should not lead to a strict legal interpretation, which would justify state intervention. Access to education and training should not necessarily be secured by governments, but can also be provided by the private sector. (d) Yes, although qualifications should be defined by enterprises. (f) Yes, sharing the responsibility with the private sector. (g) Apart from basic training, investments in other forms of training should be determined by the needs of the private sector. (h) Yes, provided that this does not distort or hinder the market.

Uganda. (j) The instrument should encourage governments to strengthen dialogue with the private sector on the funding of training, and conduct specific training for vulnerable groups, small enterprises and the informal economy.

United Arab Emirates. (j) Encourage governments to undertake policies aimed at promoting continuous training in employment, aligned with labour market needs.

United Kingdom. (a) The categorization of (vocational) education and training as an absolute right for all could lead to inflexibility and people being channelled into inappropriate training simply to fulfil an ill-defined obligation. The instrument should be worded in terms of the outcomes sought, and should recognize that people have different educational needs at different times in their lives, i.e. "ensure that all people have access to an agreed minimum level of education and training according to their needs". Cooperation with the social partners should be expanded to include other relevant stakeholders (as discussed under Question 4). (b) As with

Question 4, involvement should be extended to all relevant stakeholders, not just the social partners. While recognizing that promotion of social dialogue is appropriate in some circumstances, the instrument should avoid giving the impression that it is the only aim. Social dialogue can exclude those not in work. A separate subparagraph could spell out the benefits of social dialogue and the desirability of enabling workers, employers and governments to engage in meaningful social dialogue, or the text could be incorporated into (j). Some general, non-prescriptive guidance could be given on the roles of the social partners (see also Question 8). Lastly, this subparagraph should refer to training and lifelong learning policies. (e) Yes, provided that such a system involves all relevant stakeholders. (f) Yes, but make clear what is meant by basic education and initial training. The instrument should avoid implying that governments are responsible for providing “initial training”, as inappropriate provision may result. Reword to say that the responsibility is for “investing in basic education and skills, and ensuring access to appropriate initial training”. (g) Yes, but taking into account national priorities and other forms of training. (i) Yes, provided it is clear that social dialogue is not the only model and should be supported where appropriate. (j) Governments also have a role to play in the dissemination of information and good practice, both nationally and internationally.

United States. USCIB: (a) Yes. (b) No. This question sounds like a regulatory labyrinth that could inhibit HRDT flexibility because it suggests that governments define national strategies for training policies at the enterprise level. (c) No. (d) No, because there are too many elements to the question. Yes, there should be skill standards, but these skill standards will not help enterprises and employment agencies meet skill demand. National skill standards will help guide individuals in their choice of training and career. If prior learning means basic education, national skill standards can help in making the transition from school to work. (e) and (f) Yes. (g) Ideally governments would invest in vocational training and “life skills” training. The ability of governments to do this is clearly going to be significantly different around the world. (h) Yes. (i) This should be encouraged, depending on national circumstances. (j) None.

AFL-CIO: (a), (b) and (i) Yes. (d) Yes, government has an important role to play in developing a national qualifications framework that guides the development of good training programmes and allows workers to have a measure of skills portability as they move within the workforce.

Most respondents replied in the affirmative to all subparagraphs of this question. Under (g) some respondents suggested that other forms of training be listed, such as: remedial courses for completing secondary education; labour market programmes; apprenticeships; and secondary and tertiary education. A few respondents emphasized that social dialogue was important in all aspects of training and should be addressed in all subparagraphs of this question, not just under (i). Other initiatives mentioned in the replies under (j) include: recognizing the responsibility of the State for education; providing loans and incentives to workers who take the initiative in their training; undertaking activities that favour an integrated approach to employment creation; investing in training for self-employment and entrepreneurship; launching activities that will develop good industrial relations, thereby improving the profitability of enterprises; providing good public information on training facilities and responsibilities; developing and promoting equivalency of educational programmes between institutions and countries; encouraging the social partners, particularly employers, to anticipate new skill needs; and establishing labour market information systems that facilitate training, planning, guidance and job placement. Although a number of activities were mentioned, no clear pattern emerged in the types of activities specified.

IV. Implementation of training policies

Qu. 7 *Should the instrument encourage the development, organization and maintenance of comprehensive, coordinated and flexible lifelong learning and training systems, taking into account the primary responsibility of government for basic education and training, and the role of the social partners in further training, and including: compulsory basic education, incorporating basic knowledge, literacy and numeracy skills; pre-employment learning and training; and further education and training?*

Total number of replies: 95.

Affirmative: 88. Algeria, Argentina, Australia, Austria, Bahrain, Barbados, Belgium, Benin, Bolivia, Botswana, Brazil, Burundi, Canada, Central African Republic, Chile, China, Costa Rica, Croatia, Cuba, Cyprus, Czech Republic, Ecuador, Egypt, El Salvador, Estonia, Finland, Gabon, Germany, Ghana, Greece, Guatemala, Guinea-Bissau, Honduras, Hungary, India, Indonesia, Iraq, Ireland, Israel, Italy, Japan, Kazakhstan, Kenya, Latvia, Lithuania, Malaysia, Mali, Malta, Mauritius, Mexico, Republic of Moldova, Myanmar, Namibia, Netherlands, New Zealand, Nicaragua, Norway, Oman, Pakistan, Panama, Papua New Guinea, Peru, Philippines, Poland, Qatar, Romania, San Marino, Seychelles, Singapore, Slovakia, Spain, Sri Lanka, Suriname, Sweden, Switzerland, Syrian Arab Republic, Thailand, Togo, Tunisia, Turkey, Uganda, Ukraine, United Arab Emirates, United Kingdom, Venezuela, Yemen, Yugoslavia, Zimbabwe.

Negative: None.

Other: 7. Denmark, France, Lebanon, Luxembourg, Nigeria, Portugal, South Africa.

Australia. See reply to Question 6(f).

Queensland: Education and training must be an integrated part of a comprehensive set of policies and programmes for economic and social development. An approach to flexible lifelong learning, which is coordinated collaboratively between learning sectors and social partners, is required to support transitions through basic education to further education and training. The instrument should also encourage governments to focus on education, training and development acquired in environments other than the world of work, as some governments may emphasize the pre-work and work elements of learning, at the expense of post-work or whole-of-life learning.

Western Australia: Literacy and numeracy skills should receive a high priority, as they ensure students' continuous progress in their education and enable them to participate effectively in society. Professional development of early childhood teachers will ensure the best possible teaching practice for literacy and numeracy development in children.

Austria. Yes. In the age of lifelong learning, basic skills should also include information technology skills, social skills and foreign languages.

BAK and ÖGB: The right to vocational training should be included. Basic skills should be expanded to include information technology skills, social skills and foreign languages. All ac-

tors are responsible for further training, particularly the public authorities, not just the social partners.

Denmark. The question is unclear as regards the distribution of roles between governments and the social partners. Furthermore, the role of and responsibility for implementing policies should be planned in accordance with national practice.

France. Implementing these provisions will depend on an adequate supply of training opportunities at all levels that are accessible to all people who need training. In order to meet the challenge there must also be effective partnerships between governments, social partners, enterprises, training institutions, families and individuals. However, the instrument should not give the impression of promoting an approach that favours a global and abstract concept of training systems. This would be unrealistic. Training systems are constructed in stages. In any case, building up quality basic education and initial training should be the priority of all governments.

Germany. Yes, provided that the reference to the primary responsibility of the State in training is reformulated (see reply to Question 6(f)). The concept of basic education is misleading. It should be made clear that reference is being made to school education.

BDA: Yes, with due regard for national differences in the responsibilities of the State, the social partners, enterprises and individuals.

Italy. Include the acquisition of certain minimum skills (linguistic, mathematical and foreign language) that are prerequisites for access to technical and vocational skills.

Lebanon. The instrument should spell out clearly which party, State or other, should be encouraged to carry out the provisions of the instrument. Making government responsible for providing basic education depends on national legislation. Public or private institutions can provide further education and training.

CCCIA: Yes, with the participation of all educational and academic institutions, as well as research centres, both public and private.

Luxembourg. Young people should achieve a high level of basic knowledge and technological competence during initial training to establish a lasting career. Workers' adaptability to changes in the labour market depends not only on their specialized knowledge but also on the quality of their basic education and training. It is thus important to concentrate on the quality rather than quantity of initial training. Where possible, specialization should not take place too early.

Mauritius. FSCC: Yes, and each government should provide a budget dedicated to education and training.

Morocco. FCCIS: Yes.

Netherlands. Yes. The government's role is to create a policy framework and introduce fiscal measures. The social partners should engage in concrete collective agreements.

VNO-NCW: For Questions 7 and 8, yes, providing that lifelong learning is based on the recognition of the different responsibilities of the different actors, and that the primary responsibility for training of the employed lies with the employers and employees (and their organizations). Section IV could be renamed "Implementation of lifelong learning: The role of government and the social partners" in order to avoid any misunderstanding about the role of government in training policies at the sector, branch or company level.

Unie mhp: Further training is not solely the responsibility of the social partners. Governments should facilitate training of the unemployed.

Nigeria. Take into account the primary responsibility of government for basic education and the role of the social partners in training.

Portugal. It is important that all individuals complete their basic education, including mastery of a foreign language, skills in ICT, and acquisition of a technical culture, an entrepreneurial spirit and social skills, thus creating the conditions that facilitate lifelong learning.

CCP: Basic education should target the least developed countries, in particular. Linking basic education with initial training is particularly important for entry into the labour market and for exercising an occupation. The social partners have a fundamental role in initial training and in the provision, as far as possible, of training that combines theoretical instruction with on-the-job training.

Russian Federation. FNPR: Yes.

Slovenia. ZDS and ZDODS: Yes to Questions 7 to 13 and 15 to 21.

South Africa. This section should emphasize the implementation processes: research; planning and prioritization (refer to roles of government and social dialogue, issues of national steering and local/workplace planning, broad national and specific local/workplace priority setting, etc.); target setting; addressing supply-side constraints, e.g. quality and responsiveness; monitoring – tools, networking and technical cooperation; evaluation.

COSATU: The recommendation contained in the *Conclusions* adopted by the ILC in 2000 that “education and training are a right for all. Governments, in cooperation with the social partners, should ensure that this right is universally accessible” should be reflected in the new instrument. The new instrument should call for greater coherence between schooling, vocational and higher education systems; and greater integration and sharing among the components of a dynamic human resource development system. Appropriate references to benchmarks and target setting should be introduced.

Sri Lanka. LJEWU: All have a right to education and training. The government, in cooperation with the social partners, should ensure that this right is universal. Education and training should go hand in hand with economic, employment and other policies, in an equitable manner.

Sweden. Lifelong learning is conducive to active citizenship, an important aspect of democracy. Formal education and training can be regarded as the beginning of the development of work skills. This being so, the most important task for government is to formulate the objectives of the education system and to evaluate achievements. The achievement of quality and relevance in education and training also hinges on close interaction between enterprise and schools/higher education, especially at the local and regional levels. Cooperation is also important as a means of encouraging the flow of ideas between schools/higher education and enterprises.

Switzerland. Yes, providing the instrument only encourages governments to do so.

UPS: Yes, but it should be made clear that the State is responsible for basic education, while enterprises are responsible for further training.

United Kingdom. Yes, but it should be made clearer in the text that government does not have primary responsibility for all training; stakeholders other than the social partners must be involved.

United States. USCIB: Yes, up to “and including ...”.

AFL-CIO: Yes.

Not one member State responded in the negative to this question. A few respondents felt that basic skills should also include ICT skills, social skills and foreign languages.

Should the instrument promote social dialogue in training as a basic principle for systems development, programme relevance, quality and cost-effectiveness and the promotion of equality of opportunity?

Qu. 8

Total number of replies: 95.

Affirmative: 87. Algeria, Argentina, Austria, Bahrain, Barbados, Belgium, Benin, Bolivia, Botswana, Brazil, Burundi, Canada, Central African Republic, Chile, China, Costa Rica, Croatia, Cuba, Cyprus, Czech Republic, Denmark, Ecuador, Egypt, El Salvador, Estonia, Finland, France, Gabon, Germany, Ghana, Greece, Guatemala, Guinea-Bissau, Honduras, Hungary, India, Indonesia, Iraq, Ireland, Italy, Japan, Kazakhstan, Kenya, Latvia, Lebanon, Lithuania, Malaysia, Mali, Mauritius, Mexico, Republic of Moldova, Myanmar, Namibia, Netherlands, New Zealand, Nicaragua, Nigeria, Norway, Oman, Pakistan, Panama, Papua New Guinea, Peru, Philippines, Poland, Qatar, Romania, San Marino, Seychelles, Singapore, Slovakia, Spain, Sri Lanka, Suriname, Sweden, Switzerland, Syrian Arab Republic, Thailand, Togo, Tunisia, Turkey, Uganda, Ukraine, United Arab Emirates, Venezuela, Yemen, Yugoslavia.

Negative: 1. Israel.

Other: 7. Australia, Bulgaria, Luxembourg, Portugal, South Africa, United Kingdom, Zimbabwe.

Australia. Australia has no preference at this time.

ACTU: Yes. The involvement of the social partners in developing a training system which reflects the needs of individuals, industries and enterprises is critical.

Barbados. CTUSAB: Yes, this would be a sustainable approach to manpower planning.

Belgium. Walloon Government: Yes, but only with regard to continuous training.

Bulgaria. Promotion of lifelong learning should be mentioned.

Chile. Confederation of Production and Trade (CPC): No.

Cuba. Yes, in accordance with national conditions.

Denmark. FTF: The instrument should recommend to governments that the design and implementation of education/training policies should interact with other policies, in particular labour market and social policies. The social partners should be given an important role in designing and implementing these policies.

Ecuador. Pichincha Chamber of Small Industry (CAPEIPI): No.

Finland. Yes; the same issue has been dealt with in Question 6(i).

Italy. In order to guarantee the right of every citizen to acquire basic skills, and prevent social exclusion, there are certain preconditions, such as freedom from want, universal access to the Internet and the creation of incentives for the most marginalized population groups to acquire skills for access to the labour market.

Japan. Yes, although an explanation of “social dialogue in training” is needed.

Luxembourg. The implementation of training policies should involve the responsibility of the various participants in the system, where all actors contribute to the success of those being trained.

Morocco. FCCIS: Yes.

Netherlands. Yes, provided that the social partners, government and educational institutions are involved.

VNO-NCW: Yes; see reply to Question 7.

New Zealand. Yes, but it is also important to undertake consultation with a wider range of stakeholders, such as indigenous peoples, students and education and training providers.

Business NZ: The instrument should confine itself to discussion related to the social partners. It is inappropriate for additional “stakeholders” to be included.

Norway. In regard to both Questions 7 and 8, globalization, structural change and rapid technological development have far-reaching consequences for learning and training. It is important to take into account the primary responsibility of government for basic education and training, and the role of the social partners in further training, to address these issues. Social dialogue provides a means of anticipating and mitigating difficulties arising from changes in working conditions and employment patterns.

Portugal. Research into the real needs of the country, individuals and enterprises should be encouraged, and social dialogue at various levels is a key instrument for achieving this.

Romania. Yes, and in doing this the skills deficit caused by unemployment, labour market inactivity and social exclusion should be addressed through a lifelong perspective.

Russian Federation. FNPR: Yes.

South Africa. Yes, social dialogue should be an element of the proposed new Section III entitled *Values* (see comment under Question 2).

COSATU: Yes.

Switzerland. In principle, yes, although it is important to note that there are other actors in the field of training.

UPS: This is not necessary as regards basic school education. However, the economy should participate in the definition of training objectives and the State should ensure their implementation.

United Kingdom. Social dialogue is an important, but not the only, principle. The instrument needs to ensure that it gives social dialogue its due weight, but not to the exclusion of other interests at stake.

United States. USCIB: No. Lifelong learning is an individual responsibility.

AFL-CIO: Yes.

Zimbabwe. The instrument should also promote social dialogue in the creation of employment opportunities.

The overwhelming majority of respondents indicated that the instrument should promote social dialogue on training as a basic principle for systems development, programme relevance, quality and cost-effectiveness and the promotion of equality of opportunity.

V. Basic education and pre-employment training

Should the instrument encourage governments to:

Qu. 9

- (a) *provide education and pre-employment training for the world of work?*
- (b) *improve access to basic education and pre-employment training, and equality of opportunity, to combat exclusion?*
- (c) *develop approaches to non-formal basic education and pre-employment training?*
- (d) *harness new ICT in learning and training?*
- (e) *ensure provision of vocational and career information and guidance?*

Total number of replies: 93.

(a) *Total number of replies: 89. Affirmative: 80. Negative: 0. Other: 9.*

(b) *Total number of replies: 91. Affirmative: 87. Negative: 0. Other: 4.*

(c) *Total number of replies: 83. Affirmative: 73. Negative: 3. Other: 7.*

(d) *Total number of replies: 84. Affirmative: 81. Negative: 0. Other: 3.*

(e) *Total number of replies: 85. Affirmative: 81. Negative: 0. Other: 4.*

Affirmative: Algeria ((a), (b), (d) and (e)), Argentina, Australia ((a) to (c), (e)), Austria ((a) and (b)), Bahrain, Barbados, Benin ((a), (b), (d) and (e)), Bolivia ((b)), Botswana, Brazil, Bulgaria ((b) to (e)), Burundi, Canada, Central African Republic, Chile, China, Costa Rica, Croatia, Cuba, Cyprus, Czech Republic ((a), (b) and (e)), Denmark ((b) to (e)), Ecuador, Egypt, El Salvador, Estonia, Finland ((a), (b), (d) and (e)), France, Gabon, Ghana, Greece, Guatemala ((d)), Guinea-Bissau, Honduras, Hungary ((a) to (c), (e)), India ((a)), Indonesia, Iraq, Israel ((a), (b), (d) and (e)), Italy ((b), (d) and (e)), Japan ((a), (b), (d) and (e)), Kazakhstan ((b)), Kenya, Latvia, Lebanon, Lithuania, Malaysia, Malta, Mauritius, Mexico ((b) and (d)), Myanmar, Namibia, Netherlands, New Zealand, Nicaragua, Nigeria ((b), (d) and (e)), Norway, Oman ((a), (b), (d) and (e)), Pakistan ((c) to (e)), Panama, Papua New Guinea, Peru ((a), (b) and (e)), Philippines, Poland, Portugal, Qatar ((a) to (d)), Romania, San Marino, Seychelles, Singapore, Slovakia, South Africa ((b) to (e)), Spain, Sri Lanka, Suriname ((a) to (d)), Sweden, Switzerland, Syrian Arab Republic, Thailand, Togo, Tunisia, Turkey, Uganda, Ukraine, United Arab Emirates, United Kingdom, Venezuela, Yemen ((a) and (b)), Yugoslavia, Zimbabwe.

Negative: Benin ((c)), Israel ((c)), Oman ((c)).

Other: Australia ((d)), Austria ((c)), Bulgaria ((a)), Denmark ((a)), Germany ((a) to (c), (e)), Japan ((c)), Luxembourg, Mexico ((a), (c) and (e)), Republic of Moldova, Nigeria ((a) and (c)), Pakistan ((a) and (b)), South Africa ((a)).

Australia. (d) For developed nations this is a commendable aim, but for nations lacking even basic ICT infrastructure, the harnessing of new technologies may prove unattainable. A major paradigm shift is taking place to ensure that learner-centred education and training strategies use ICT. (e) Integrating educational and career guidance services enables users to match their interests, values and abilities to an occupation and provides information on industries, occupations, education and training and financial support to assist study.

Queensland: (e) Learning sectors need to maximize quality learning and work outcomes by ensuring that students have sufficient support to make informed choices about learning to suit their aspirations.

Victoria: (a) Strongly supports improving access to basic education, in order to break the intergenerational long-term unemployment cycle and its adverse social and economic effects. (e) Strongly supports the case for government action to provide vocational and career information and guidance to all people of working age, young and old.

Western Australia: (e) Vocational education and training in senior colleges and high schools should also be considered as alternative pathways to learning for school students.

ACTU: (d) Yes, but see response to Question 5(e).

Austria. (a) Mention should also be made of vocational training leading to a qualification. (c) It is not “non-formal ... education and pre-employment training” that should be developed, but the recognition of basic education and pre-employment training acquired in a non-formal manner.

Belgium. Walloon Government: (a) No, basic education has nothing to do with the “world of work”. (c) The phrase “approaches to non-formal” is not understood. (d) Yes, but subject to the following reservations: (i) as new technologies are not necessarily used effectively or adapted to all situations, support must also be given to conventional and proven methods; (ii) the cost of using new technologies should not jeopardize the necessary investment in qualified teachers; (iii) efforts should be made to ensure that certain groups are not excluded from access to such technologies.

Bulgaria. (a) This subparagraph should refer to basic education.

Canada. (a) Yes, including life skills and critical thinking skills.

Central African Republic. (d) Yes, provided equality between rural and urban areas, rich and poor, and developed and developing countries is guaranteed.

Croatia. HUP: (a) to (e) Yes, including vocational education and training, as well as higher education.

SSSH: (a) to (e) Yes, but also improve horizontal and vertical mobility in the formal educational system. Career counselling should be made more available to students and access should be universal.

Cyprus. PEO: (c) No.

Czech Republic. SPD ČR: (a) In particular, to ensure conditions for pre-employment education and training and to utilize all sources of information on vocational training.

Denmark. (a) The instrument should encourage governments to focus on offering employment-promoting training.

Egypt. (a) to (e) Yes, in the framework of an international commitment to the promotion of relevant programmes such as improving literacy rates.

France. (a) Governments are responsible for basic education. Every child, including girls, should have access to it, through the provision of assistance to families in need, by means of scholarships, the creation of schools in isolated areas, school transport, and monitoring of

children's health. (e) Although governments have primary responsibility for providing vocational and career information as well as pre-employment training, this responsibility is shared with the social partners and enterprises and, where appropriate, with regional and local authorities. The social partners should be encouraged to develop sandwich courses for young people in order to promote their vocational guidance and entry into the labour market.

Movement of French Enterprises (MEDEF): (a) Schools should provide a common base for all young people at the end of their compulsory education, including mastery of reading, writing and numeracy skills; socio-cultural, scientific and technological skills to enable young persons to understand their environment and find their place in it; and the means for young persons to decide for themselves what they will do after leaving school. (e) Vocational guidance should enable the student, and subsequently the worker, to take charge of his or her own career plan.

Germany. (a) The focus should not be on governments only. (b) Clarify the concept of "basic education". (c) Clarify what is meant by "non-formal basic education". (e) Indicate here that it is not only government that is responsible for ensuring vocational and career information and guidance.

BDA: (a) Yes, since demand-driven training that meets labour market needs is essential. (c) It is not clear what is meant by "non-formal basic education".

Ghana. TUC: (a) to (e) Since the informal sector constitutes a large proportion of the labour force in developing countries, the instrument should include provisions for developing strategies, measures and programmes to promote and implement training for self-employed workers in small and medium-sized enterprises.

Greece. Federation of Greek Industries (SEV): (a) to (c) Should include widespread on-the-job training.

Hungary. (e) School curricula should allow primary-school teachers to provide students with basic information about the world of work. High priority should be given to the creation and development of a system of vocational and career guidance.

India. EAR; (b) to (e) Yes.

IMC: (d) No.

Italy. (e) Vocational guidance services should be permanently accessible to all, with greater availability to individual users and to firms. Guidance should be seen as a supporting arrangement throughout the life of an individual, not only during times of vulnerability. In this regard, an integrated education and training system should provide constant support, with tailor-made solutions for individuals at different stages of their personal and professional life.

Japan. (c) An explanation of "non-formal basic education" is needed.

Lebanon. (a) The type of pre-employment training varies according to the type of work. Therefore public institutions should provide this training. (c) Yes, in cooperation with the national and, if appropriate, international parties concerned. (e) Yes, supported by an institutional framework for such provision.

Luxembourg. (b) Basic vocational training aimed at the socio-occupational integration of young people with academic difficulties is essential to reduce the number of young people leaving school with no qualifications. (e) School and vocational guidance are essential.

Mexico (a) The training of future jobseekers is essential to reducing periods without work and ensuring that new entrants are rapidly and satisfactorily integrated into the labour market. (c) It is important to encourage approaches that are not limited to the official policy framework. (e) Also ensure that the school-age population and jobseekers have access to these services.

Republic of Moldova. The instrument should encourage governments to gradually extend, adapt and harmonize vocational training systems to meet the lifelong learning needs of young people and adults.

Morocco. FCCIS: (a) to (c) and (e) Yes.

Netherlands. VNO-NCW: Reference should be made to vocational education and higher education. Of course, developing countries may have difficulty guaranteeing the supply of these types of education, but it should be made very clear that this is a first responsibility of governments. Business and industry are prepared to cooperate with schools to ensure that education is relevant and practice-oriented.

Nigeria. (a) and (c) Refer to comments under Question 7.

Norway. (b) Equal access to basic education and pre-employment training is especially important for girls and young women. (c) This should be viewed in the context of the Worst Forms of Child Labour Convention, 1999 (No. 182).

Pakistan. (a) The word “provide” should be replaced by “facilitate”. (b) The word “improve” should be replaced by “facilitate”.

EFP: (a) Yes. (c) Yes, but for specific groups, such as illiterate employed persons.

Poland. (a) and (b) Yes, especially for those workers who do not have or have lost their professional qualifications and are threatened with social exclusion. (c) Recognition of basic education and pre-employment training should be a priority. (e) Expanded use of ICT should also be mentioned in terms of increasing access to vocational information and guidance.

Portugal. (c) Yes, specifically by expanding and diversifying initial training of young people within the formal education system, and promoting their skills and employability. (d) Yes; through the use of electronic networks for training purposes, digital libraries and new forms of disseminating cultural heritage, the growing dynamism of the information and knowledge society will promote improvements in the quality of education, culture and training.

CCP: (c) Yes, if the subparagraph means the creation of systems for the recognition and certification of skills. (d) The phrase “to the extent possible” should be added because the full harnessing of ICT is too ambitious, especially for the poorest countries.

UGT: (c) The knowledge-based society and the spread of ICT require changes, especially in the organization of work and the nature of work, which could lead to the polarization of society and workers, creating a gulf between a small group of skilled workers and the mass of low-skilled workers. Thus, it is essential to ensure that governments introduce specific measures and policies to combat exclusion, especially that which results from ICT and globalization.

Romania. (b) Yes, in particular by modernizing apprenticeship and workplace learning, making them more effective.

Russian Federation. FNPR: (a) to (e) Yes.

South Africa. (a) See comment under Question 6(f). (c) Yes, including for adults who were denied these opportunities when young. (e) Yes, but the difference between “vocational” and “career” information is not clear. The more generic term “employment counselling” could be introduced.

COSATU: (a) to (e) Yes. In doing so, the instrument should strongly encourage governments to ensure that free universal access to education is provided. It should also emphasize the importance of encouraging and facilitating the provision by enterprises of ICT facilities or support schemes for workers, schools and other training providers in order to promote the diffusion of ICT.

Sri Lanka. LJEWU: (b) Effective legislation and its implementation would be necessary.

Sweden. (b) Yes. The challenge to close the gender gap in basic education worldwide is particularly important as girls, in particular, face discrimination when they are kept out of school.

Switzerland. (c) The term “non-formal basic education” should be clarified.

UPS: (a) Only with regard to basic schooling (primary and secondary school). (c) This needs to be evaluated by individual countries.

United Kingdom. (a) While it is the responsibility of government to ensure the provision of basic education, the instrument should encourage governments to ensure access to education and pre-employment training, giving them sufficient flexibility with regard to provision. (c) Yes, if this means incorporating and recognizing non-formal basic education and training. (d) Yes, ICT skills are now classified with literacy and numeracy as being fundamental to employability. (e) Yes, but it needs to be clear what is meant by guidance – whether, for example, this implies advice or something more directive.

United States. USCIB: (a) and (b) Yes. (c) No, because the question is unclear. (d) Yes, recognizing that the use of ICT is not a panacea in and of itself; it must be properly harnessed. (e) Yes.

AFL-CIO: (a) and (b) Partnerships to develop high-level skills result in an economic development strategy that includes training and support for stable jobs that pay living wages, and not simply filling the short-term or current needs of employers. The best way to move people out of poverty and toward middle class is good jobs. Indeed, public funds should be used only to create such jobs, and should never be wasted on filling short-term employment gaps that leave workers without a decent income or future.

Support for all aspects of Question 9 was evident in the replies. Many replies put particular emphasis on the role of ICT in learning and training. A few respondents suggested that a reference to vocational training and higher education should be included in this question.

VI. Training of employed workers

Should the instrument encourage governments to:

Qu. 10

- (a) *promote systematic identification of the skills needed by enterprises, individuals and the economy as a whole?*
- (b) *recognize workplace learning, including formal and informal training, and work experience?*
- (c) *support initiatives by the social partners, and the role of training, in bipartite dialogue and collective agreements?*
- (d) *initiate tripartite agreements on training at various levels of government?*
- (e) *assume primary responsibility for stimulating investment in training?*

- (f) *acknowledge the role of the social partners, enterprises and the individual worker in promoting investments in training, in partnership with government?*
- (g) *promote the expansion of workplace-based learning and training, utilizing high-performance work practices and on- and off-the-job training, with public and private providers, and making greater use of ICT?*
- (h) *promote human resources management at enterprise level?*
- (i) *develop equal opportunity strategies, measures and programmes to promote and implement training for workers in small and medium-sized enterprises, the informal economy, the rural sector and self-employment; and, in particular, for women workers?*
- (j) *promote educational and career guidance for employed workers?*
- (k) *carry out other initiatives? (Please specify.)*

Total number of replies: 95.

- (a) *Total number of replies: 88. Affirmative: 80. Negative: 1. Other: 7.*
- (b) *Total number of replies: 90. Affirmative: 81. Negative: 0. Other: 9.*
- (c) *Total number of replies: 89. Affirmative: 83. Negative: 0. Other: 6.*
- (d) *Total number of replies: 90. Affirmative: 81. Negative: 1. Other: 8.*
- (e) *Total number of replies: 89. Affirmative: 75. Negative: 3. Other: 11.*
- (f) *Total number of replies: 91. Affirmative: 87. Negative: 0. Other: 4.*
- (g) *Total number of replies: 91. Affirmative: 85. Negative: 0. Other: 6.*
- (h) *Total number of replies: 89. Affirmative: 77. Negative: 4. Other: 8.*
- (i) *Total number of replies: 90. Affirmative: 84. Negative: 1. Other: 5.*
- (j) *Total number of replies: 90. Affirmative: 82. Negative: 1. Other: 7.*
- (k) *Total number of replies: 38.*

Affirmative: Algeria, Argentina, Australia ((b), (f) to (j)), Austria, Bahrain, Barbados ((a) to (d), (f) to (j)), Belgium, Benin ((a) to (j)), Bolivia ((i)), Botswana, Brazil, Burundi ((a) to (j)), Canada ((a) to (d), (f) to (j)), Central African Republic ((a) to (d), (f) to (j)), Chile, China ((a) to (j)), Costa Rica, Croatia ((a) to (i)), Cuba, Cyprus ((a) to (j)), Czech Republic, Denmark ((a), (c) and (d)), Ecuador, Egypt, El Salvador, Estonia ((a) to (h), (j)), Finland ((a), (b), (d), (f), (g), (i) and (j)), Gabon, Germany ((a) to (c), (f), (g), (i) and (j)), Ghana, Greece, Guatemala ((b) to (j)), Guinea-Bissau ((a) to (j)), Honduras, Hungary, India ((c), (d) and (f)), Indonesia ((a) to (j)), Iraq ((a) to (j)),

Ireland ((a) to (j)), Israel ((g) and (i)), Italy, Japan, Kazakhstan ((d)), Kenya ((a) to (i)), Latvia, Lebanon ((a), (c), (e) to (g), (i) and (j)), Lithuania, Malaysia, Malta, Mauritius ((a) to (j)), Mexico ((c), (d), (f), (h) and (j)), Republic of Moldova ((a) to (j)), Myanmar, Namibia ((a) to (d), (f) to (k)), Netherlands ((a) to (c), (f) to (j)), New Zealand ((a), (b), (f), (g), (i) and (j)), Nicaragua, Nigeria ((a) to (g), (i) and (j)), Norway, Oman ((a) to (c), (e) to (i)), Pakistan, Panama ((a) to (j)), Papua New Guinea, Peru, Philippines ((a) to (i)), Poland, Qatar, Romania ((b) to (j)), San Marino, Seychelles ((a) to (j)), Singapore, Slovakia, South Africa ((a), (c) to (j)), Spain ((a), (c) to (j)), Sri Lanka ((a) to (j)), Suriname, Sweden, Switzerland ((b), (c), (e) to (j)), Syrian Arab Republic, Thailand, Togo, Tunisia, Turkey ((a), (b), (e), (f), (g), (i) and (j)), Uganda ((a) to (f), (i) and (j)), Ukraine ((a) to (g), (i) and (j)), United Arab Emirates ((a) to (j)), United Kingdom ((b) to (h), (j)), Venezuela, Yemen ((d), (f), (g) and (j)), Yugoslavia ((a) to (j)), Zimbabwe ((a) to (j)).

Negative: Barbados ((e)), Benin ((k)), Estonia ((i)), Germany ((e), (h) and (k)), Israel ((h) and (j)), New Zealand ((e) and (h)), Switzerland ((a) and (d)), Ukraine ((h) and (k)), Yugoslavia ((k)).

Other: Australia ((a), (c) to (e), (k)), Barbados ((k)), Bulgaria ((b) and (j)), Burundi ((k)), Canada ((e) and (k)), Central African Republic ((e)), China ((k)), Cyprus ((k)), Denmark ((b), (e) to (h), (j)), Finland ((c), (e), (h) and (k)), France, Guinea-Bissau ((k)), Indonesia ((k)), Iraq ((k)), Ireland ((k)), Israel ((k)), Kenya ((j) and (k)), Lebanon ((b), (d), (h) and (k)), Luxembourg, Mauritius ((k)), Mexico ((a), (b), (e), (g), (i) and (k)), Republic of Moldova ((k)), Namibia ((e)), Netherlands ((d) and (e)), New Zealand ((c) and (d)), Nigeria ((h)), Oman ((d), (j) and (k)), Panama ((k)), Philippines ((k)), Portugal, Romania ((a) and (k)), Seychelles ((k)), South Africa ((b) and (k)), Spain ((b)), Sri Lanka ((k)), Uganda ((g), (h) and (k)), United Arab Emirates ((k)), United Kingdom ((a), (i) and (k)), Zimbabwe ((k)).

Australia. (a) Australia has no preference at this stage. The danger is that “skills needed” change frequently. There is a need to stress the skills that enhance general employability, such as thinking skills, problem solving and learning-to-learn. (b) This is an important measure; the difficulty, particularly in relation to the recognition of informal and non-formal learning or training, needs to be recognized. (c) to (e) and (k) Australia has no preference at this stage. (e) Primary responsibility for investment in continuous training lies with enterprises and individuals; however, governments can stimulate private investment (for example, through tax incentives).

Queensland: (a) Planning and information gathering should allow different stakeholders to participate more fully and to share the costs and benefits more equitably. Industry and community leadership and collaboration are critical to maximizing training, employment and social outcomes. (e) It would not be useful for governments to assume, or be perceived to assume, responsibility for the success, or otherwise, of activities to invest in training. (f) Individuals, community, industry, government and other learning stakeholders would, ideally, assume responsibility for investing in learning until a sustainable learning culture is developed. Until then, the government has a key role in stimulating debate and investment in training. (i) Courses may be ill tuned to the needs of small firms, and motivation through a training culture is more difficult to foster. Expanding “sector-focused” initiatives can enhance efficiency in developing capacity of smaller firms.

ACTU: (a) Yes. However, there are serious limitations involved in predicting future needs. It is more important to have a flexible training system which can respond quickly to emerging needs. (c) to (e) Yes.

Austria. BAK and ÖGB: (k) Add “adopt legislation to afford further training opportunities to all workers, for example in the form of annual time accounts for further training, time off for longer periods of further training and financial incentive models to participate in further training”.

Barbados. (a) Yes, as it will promote effective manpower planning. (d) Yes, but with assistance from non-governmental, faith-based and community-based organizations. (k) The cross-training of workers in at least two areas of the enterprise to improve productivity.

BEC: (k) Any system for training employed workers should be flexible and decentralized as opposed to a fixed national system of qualifications.

CTUSAB: (a) to (j) Yes; this approach will, among other things: recognize the need for effective manpower planning; demonstrate that there is value attached to prior/experiential learning; and recognize the need to involve all of the partners/stakeholders with respect to human resources development.

Belgium. Walloon Government: (d) Yes, but only as regards continuous training. (e) No, responsibility must be shared between the State and the social partners. (g) Yes, but not exclusively for the systematic use of ICT. (i) Yes, but bearing in mind other sectors where equal opportunity does not yet exist and giving priority to certain groups such as low-skilled and older workers. (k) Promote the transfer of skills of experienced workers to younger ones, particularly with regard to enterprise culture and specific skills; support cross-generational activities in enterprises.

Brazil. CNI: (k) Forms and tools for identifying and updating career profiles should be designed and developed through sectoral technical committees made up of employers, workers and training professionals.

Bulgaria. (b) Non-formal training should be included. (j) This could be rephrased as: “promote vocational and career guidance for employed workers”.

Burundi. (k) Take gender issues into account in training and retraining.

Canada. (d) Yes, where applicable. (e) There are many partners and stakeholders who have responsibility for stimulating investment in training, including governments. (j) Yes, as an essential part of lifelong learning. (k) Encourage initiatives that seek to balance work and life.

Central African Republic. (e) Training as well as education is primarily the responsibility of the State. (i) Yes, such strategies could prevent social exclusion and discrimination.

China. (k) Retraining of workers in industries undergoing restructuring.

Croatia. HUP: (a) A decentralized and flexible system is preferred.

SSSH: (a) to (j) Yes. (e) It is important to define investment, including leave from work for training. (k) Encourage employers to invest in human resources (e.g. by means of tax exemptions).

Cyprus. (d) Yes, provided that it is in accordance with national practice. (e) Yes, but the phrase “primary responsibility” should be replaced by “key role”. (k) Support to small and medium-sized enterprises.

PEO: (h) Promoting investments in training cannot be the responsibility of an individual worker.

SEK: (k) Reorganization of working time should be examined in order to create conditions for workplace learning and training. It is important to arrange and share working and training

time through negotiations between the social partners. The minimum hours of work per year allocated to training should be fixed. The right to educational leave should be established.

Cuba. (d), (f) to (i) Yes, adapted to national conditions.

Czech Republic. SPD ČR: (k) Motivate employees for further vocational education.

Denmark. (b) Recognition of workplace learning should be placed under Section VII, *Framework for recognition and certification of skills*, and integrated into subparagraph (c) of Question 11. The terminology does not appear to be entirely in compliance with the EU definitions of formal and informal learning. (e) to (h) and (j) The instrument should encourage governments, the social partners and enterprises to take co-responsibility for stimulating and promoting investments in training.

Ecuador. CAPEIPI: (f) No.

Estonia. (i) No, training should be provided for all workers.

Finland. (e) Thought should be given to the diversification of the financial structure. (h) This is mainly the responsibility of the management of the enterprise. (j) Yes, as well as promoting educational and career guidance for all groups of citizens. (k) The development of adult learning and training according to the principle of lifelong learning.

France. The social partners and enterprises have the primary responsibility for human resources management and training of employed workers. However, these activities must be based on dialogue and co-responsibility between public authorities, the social partners, enterprises and individuals. The State can only contribute to the general architecture of continuous training for employed persons. It should correct spontaneous discriminatory practices in the world of work and ensure the general interest in the medium and long term. When the social partners are weak, it is useful, even indispensable, for the State to take the initiative or legislate with regard to training of employed workers.

Germany. (e) No, the main responsibility for stimulating investment in training of employed workers should lie with the social partners. (h) No, this is the task of enterprises.

BDA: (b) Yes, but an approach based on the individual should still be possible. (d) and (e) Yes. (g) Yes, where on-the-job training is feasible; off-the-job training should be the exception. (h) Yes. (i) Yes, in principle, but instead of specific programmes, the framework should be improved.

Greece. (g) and (h) Add: “on the basis of the principle of equal opportunity and equal treatment”.

Guinea-Bissau. (k) Establishment and operation of an employment observatory.

India. EAR: (a) to (d) and (f) to (j) Yes. (e) No. (k) Periodically publish and circulate available information to all concerned.

EFI: (a) to (j) Yes.

IMC: (b), (c), (g) and (j) No.

Indonesia. (k) The instrument should encourage the government to evaluate education policies in order to create qualified human resources in the global labour market.

Iraq. (k) Develop a schedule for career development and promotion.

Ireland. (k) The continuous updating of knowledge and skills is crucial to both the employability of individuals and the adaptability of firms in an ever-changing business and working environment.

Israel. (k) Develop upgrading tracks.

Italy. (a) Common criteria for the certification of skills and recognition of training should be identified, as well as the encouragement of greater mobility of workers within the EU, shifting the focus from the product to the process and towards the objectives of monitoring and continuous improvement in the “quality” of training. Evaluation and control of training activities and the elaboration of learning, education and training benchmarks should be compulsory and should be assigned to autonomous and independent organizations. (b) The social partners have a key role in solving the problem of recognition and certification of skills acquired in the workplace (non-formal learning). Rigidity in this area of learning, for example exporting rigid systems from “formal” education, should be avoided. To this end, the exchange of different national experiences and good practice would be useful.

Japan. (d) It should be clear that tripartite agreements refer to those made, at any level, between governments, workers and employers. (e) The term “primary responsibility” should be clarified.

Nippon Keidanren: (a) to (e) These issues should encourage HRD based on employees’ individual initiative, followed by enterprise support.

Kenya. (j) Only for its own workers. (k) Promote education and training for all workers irrespective of their physical abilities.

Latvia. (i) Yes, on condition that the phrase “the informal economy” is deleted.

Lebanon. (a) Yes, by means of labour market surveys, job descriptions and classifications, and revisions of educational, knowledge and occupational requirements. (b) A committee should set criteria and assess work experience and skills gained in formal and informal education and training. (d) The phrase “various levels of government” should be defined. (e) Governments do not assume primary responsibility for stimulating investment in training, although they have a basic role to play; the social partners have a role as well. (f) Yes, within the limits of established laws. (g) This implies the establishment, development and periodic revision of training curricula that match training needs, and the provision of continuous and further training for trainers in the public and private sectors. (h) The instrument should identify the means by which governments can promote human resources development in enterprises. (k) Employers are responsible for the development and training of employed workers, including older workers, and should provide them with ICT. Workers’ organizations are responsible for workers’ education and literacy.

CCCIA: (a) This sentence should begin with “endeavour to”. (b) No.

Luxembourg. Continuing vocational training within the framework of a training plan, a training project or collective agreements should be included.

Mauritius. (k) Review of existing legislation pertaining to an employer’s obligation to train its employees for a prescribed period annually.

Mexico. (a) The systematic identification of the content of skills must be the result of consultation and exchange of views among education authorities, enterprises and workers’ organizations. (b) Authorities must recognize knowledge and abilities acquired in the workplace and institutions and through work experience. (e) The public sector has a legal and political obligation to promote investment in training and create conditions conducive to private sector participation. (g) The promotion of workplace-based learning and training must be subject to legal standards protecting the apprentice and preventing the establishment of a hidden employment relationship prejudicial to the worker. Likewise, public and private providers should also be subject to a legal framework that ensures quality and efficiency in the provision of training services both on and off the job. (k) Formulate and implement education and training strategies specifically targeting the most vulnerable groups: low-skilled women wishing to engage in gainful activity, young first-time jobseekers and migrant workers.

Republic of Moldova. (k) Develop and implement a clear and flexible system of training for managers.

Morocco. FCCIS: (a) to (i) Yes. (k) Provide training and vocational guidance for school drop-outs.

Namibia. (e) Not sure.

Netherlands. (d) This issue is too specific and does not suit situations where tripartite agreements, which cover broad themes that include, but go beyond, training, are concluded for target groups. (e) The term “primary responsibility” is too strong and the subparagraph could be combined with (f). (j) Training and career guidance form part of good human resources management policy.

VNO-NCW: (a) See comments under Question 6(b). Statistics on labour market developments can be collected, but that is different from the concept expressed here. A good example of a decentralized and flexible approach, contrary to a fixed national system of qualifications, is the ICT Consortium, consisting of 11 major ICT companies in Europe. (d) Recalling the general discussion on human resources development and training at the 88th Session of the ILC in 2000, the vast majority of employers’ organizations did not favour tripartite agreements on training. The best wording is still the description of responsibilities given in the Cologne Charter: Aims and Ambitions for Lifelong Learning (1999). Governments should not be encouraged to initiate tripartite agreements on training.

Unie mhp: (a) Yes, but only in general terms. (c) and (d) These depend on the needs of the social partners. (i) Yes, but not only for women workers. This should cover people with disabilities, older workers and ethnic minorities. (k) Governments should pay special attention to minorities and people with few chances on the labour market.

New Zealand. (c) Greater recognition of the role of training in bipartite dialogue and collective agreements would help to improve the acquisition of skills. (d) The meaning of this subparagraph is unclear. (e) and (f) The wording of (f) provides a more sensible approach than that outlined in (e). (h) No. In the context of promoting good human resources development it is important to encourage dialogue between employers and employees.

Business NZ: (d) The meaning of this subparagraph should be clarified. The inclusion of stakeholders other than the social partners is inappropriate. The question appears to be framed in such a way as to imply that there should be a requirement for tripartite agreements on training. The type and format of in-house training must be at the sole discretion of the employer. (h) It is not appropriate for government to be involved in human resource management at the enterprise level.

NZCTU: (c) Yes.

Nigeria. (h) The instrument should encourage employers to promote human resources management at the enterprise level.

Norway. NHO: (a) No. (i) There are too many target sectors mentioned. Equal opportunity for women should be mentioned.

LO: (a) No. (b), (f) to (i) The role of the social partners should be linked to all subparagraphs, not only (c) to (e).

Oman. (b) Yes, if it falls within the national framework. (d) If it is required. (j) Educational and career guidance is more important for new entrants in the labour market than for the employed. (k) Develop trade testing facilities.

Pakistan. EFP: (a) and (b) Yes, but include voluntary participation by employers. (d) No, agreements can create a legal obligation for employers to provide training. (k) Recognition of good initiatives in human resource development by employers and training in self-employment and entrepreneurship.

Panama. (k) Guarantee effective and high-quality basic education and initial training with adequate facilities and implement effective systems for the recruitment, remuneration, education, training, retraining and deployment of teaching staff.

Peru. CCL: (a) Yes, but systematic identification of skill needs is not easily accomplished.

Philippines. (k) Promotion of competency-based training.

Portugal. CCP: (a) Yes. The systematic identification implies the existence of partnerships at different levels with the social partners, and an information gathering system based on networks. (b) Yes, but this means the establishment of systems for recognizing, validating and certifying skills, which are costly. They must be compatible with the national qualifications framework referred to in Question 6(d). (c) Yes, with respect to initiatives by the social partners in the area of managing education and training organizations. (e) Yes, for example, by providing fiscal incentives to firms and individuals, encouraging agreements between the social partners and promoting partnerships in the management of training organization, co-financed by public funds. (g) Yes, but the instrument should not propose methods, timetables or sources of financing, since these are matters for national law and practice, and subject to company-level decisions. (h) No. (j) Yes, without overlooking the personal responsibility of each worker for his/her own career. (k) The specific features of small and medium-sized enterprises in terms of workers' training should be highlighted.

CIP: (h) No.

CGTP-IN: (i) There should also be references to people with disabilities and migrants.

Romania. (a) Envisage the creation of conditions conducive to improving skills and knowledge. (b) Yes, but it is important to separate assessment and training processes. (k) Promote training of older workers.

Russian Federation. FNPR: (a) to (e) Yes.

Seychelles. (k) Recognition of experience.

Slovakia. KOZ SR: (k) Create optimum conditions for self-education and provide time off from work for this purpose.

South Africa. (a) Yes. Add skills needed by communities for social development. (b) Recognition is not an end in itself but should be for access to further learning, improved career prospects, fair rewards and enhanced capacity to be mobile in the labour market. It can also help to undercut discrimination at work. (c) Yes, provided it reads something like "support initiatives by the social partners to elevate the role of training in bipartite dialogue and collective agreements". (g) Yes. Perhaps there needs to be a cross-reference to "promoting the quality assurance of such training in a way which enhances the national qualifications framework". (h) Yes. Perhaps mention should be made of the need for this to be incrementally advanced in smaller firms. (i) Yes. For developing countries this constitutes the majority of workers. Perhaps a dedicated section for the informal economy and the rural and self-employment sectors is required. (j) Yes, but for all workers. (k) Perhaps focus also on the relationship between productivity and skills, and encourage the social partners to exploit these linkages to advance efficiency.

COSATU: (a) to (j) Yes, subject to the comments made under Question 6 concerning appropriate ways to finance training, and to those under Question 9 concerning ICT. Benchmarks are one means of encouraging countries to invest in training, and the new instrument should address this issue. (a) Add skills needed by communities for social development. (c) The new instrument should reflect the points made in the Conclusions of the general discussion in 2000 concerning collective bargaining and social dialogue.

Spain. (a) It is necessary to have systematic identification, but also preliminary identification and subsequent updating of the required skills. (b) The question should be restated as

“recognize the skills that people possess, irrespective of whether they were acquired through formal or non-formal training, as well as through work experience”.

Sri Lanka. EFC: (g) and (h) Yes, but subject to enterprise needs. (j) Yes, at the national level but not at the enterprise level. (k) Extend incentives to employers for training of the employed.

LJEWU: (b) Employers must recognize and accept this reality as a sine qua non for development of the institution or organization. (i) The instrument should provide detailed guidelines on these matters.

Sweden. (b) Yes. It should be emphasized that the greater part of individuals' skills development takes place after they have left school and entered working life. Even though part of the continuing development of work skills can be achieved through training, the most important development occurs at the workplace itself. The most valuable and effective guidance takes place at the workplace in the course of everyday work, on a worker-to-worker basis. (f) A distinction should be made between activity-related skills development and personally chosen development initiatives. Business undertakings are responsible for ensuring that the competence needed is available and can be developed. Work skills development, going beyond the needs and demands of the undertaking, forms part of the individual's career ambitions and is the individual's own responsibility. The greater the responsibility imposed on the individual for his or her own development, the greater the support needed in connection with educational choice and career planning. (g) Yes. It is probably expected that a growing proportion of a person's work skills development will be through workplace-based training. This is partly because basic skills acquired during schooling and post-secondary education will age rapidly and will have to be replaced by the new skills that are needed. (i) It should be noted that women generally receive less in-house training than men; fixed-term employees less than employees with permanent tenure; and employees of SMEs have less opportunity for in-house training and work skills development than employees of larger enterprises. At the same time, it is the educationally disadvantaged who bear the brunt of recessions.

Switzerland. (a) No, not systematically, and this is not only the responsibility of governments. (d) No, the initiation of such agreements should rest with the social partners. (i) See comment on Question 5(d).

UPS: (a) No, this is not the role of the government. (b) Yes, although recognition of such qualifications should be carefully evaluated as to their usefulness on the labour market. (c) Yes, although this should not be a pretext for state interference in the relations between the social partners, whether in training, bipartite dialogue or collective bargaining. (d) Only with regard to basic training. (e) No, the training of the employed is primarily the responsibility of the economy. (f) The State must recognize the role of enterprises. It should not interfere in workplace training, either financially or in any other way. (g) and (h) Such action on the part of government should not occur if it distorts competition to the detriment of market actors. The main responsibility in this field rests with economic actors. (j) No.

USS/SGB: (k) Countries should ratify the Paid Educational Leave Convention, 1974 (No. 140).

Uganda. (g) and (h) In collaboration with the social partners/private sector. (k) Promote training in new technologies, and facilitate the participation of the social partners and other agencies in implementing training activities.

Ukraine. FPU: (k) Encourage enterprises to broaden vocational training at work.

United Arab Emirates. (k) Encourage and provide incentives for individual initiatives in the field of performance development and productivity enhancement through on-the-job training.

United Kingdom. (a) Systematic skills planning across the economy presents problems. While certain universal basic skills can be identified and addressed (literacy, numeracy and ICT), attempting to do so for more specialized skills can lead to inappropriate training. The identification of skills needs at different levels and times is more appropriate. A flexible network of training providers can then respond to local, or even regional, needs and ensure appropriate training provision. (b) Yes, but in a way that does not imply a bureaucratic process of recording and certifying such experience. In the workplace, a person's work record or curriculum vitae often provides the information needed to support recognition; experience may be used to demonstrate proficiency in certain skills or competencies. (d) There are other models in place that work. (e) Yes, in terms of stimulating investment while making it clear that "primary" does not exclude others. (g) Yes, provided that expansion is manageable and training is efficient and effective. It would be useful to include the word "responsive" in relation to workplace-based learning to emphasize the link between provision and need. (i) These strategies should be developed, but this text would need to be re-formulated. Strategies for equal opportunities need to be set out separately from the strategies needed in SMEs, the informal economy, etc. Equal opportunities should apply to all work; specific actions need to be directed at particular identified sectors and types of employment. (j) Such guidance is needed by all workers, whether employed or not. (k) The instrument could promote the provision of specific help for employed workers with low skills, providing basic skills to ensure and maintain employability. This could be tied to (i).

United States. USCIB: (a) Yes, but this is a huge, complicated task that requires the involvement of enterprises. (b) Yes. (c) Yes, where there are union recognition and collective agreements. (d) No. This is a prescription for training inflexibility. (e) Yes. (f) No, the question has no meaning. (g) Yes, but this will only be applicable in developed country circumstances in most instances. (h) No, the question has no clear meaning. (i) and (j) Yes. (k) Yes, as necessary.

AFL-CIO: (c) Yes. (i) See reply to Question 5(d).

Zimbabwe. (k) Where necessary, advocate multiskilling and retraining for those employed in preparation for self-reliance in the event of retrenchments.

Each subparagraph of Question 10 received affirmative responses from almost all of the member States. Subparagraph (f), which asks whether the instrument should encourage governments to acknowledge the role of the social partners, enterprises and individual workers in promoting investments in training, in partnership with government, received the greatest support. Other initiatives mentioned in the replies include: the training of workers in multiple areas of the enterprise in order to increase productivity; encouraging employers to invest in human resources; support for training in SMEs; creating conditions for workplace learning and training; motivating employees to undertake further vocational training; promoting education and training for all workers, irrespective of disabilities; reviewing existing legislation regarding employers' obligations to train their employees; focusing special attention on school drop-outs, older workers, the unemployed, minorities and/or those with fewer opportunities in the labour market; retraining of workers in industries undergoing restructuring; promoting competency-based training; and the recognition of experience. Although a number of initiatives were mentioned, no clear pattern emerged in the types of initiatives specified.

VII. Framework for recognition and certification of skills

Should the instrument encourage governments to consider:

Qu. 11

- (a) *Skills recognition and certification, including the principle that an individual's skills be recognized and certified irrespective of where such skills were obtained?*
- (b) *The legal and institutional framework, the role of social partners, sharing of responsibilities and financing of the recognition and certification of skills?*
- (c) *The recognition of prior learning?*
- (d) *Other issues? (Please specify.)*

Total number of replies: 95.

(a) *Total number of replies: 93. Affirmative: 77. Negative: 3. Other: 13.*

(b) *Total number of replies: 90. Affirmative: 82. Negative: 0. Other: 8.*

(c) *Total number of replies: 83. Affirmative: 75. Negative: 1. Other: 7.*

(d) *Total number of replies: 30.*

Affirmative: Algeria, Argentina, Australia, Austria, Bahrain ((b)), Barbados ((b) and (c)), Benin ((a) to (c)), Bolivia ((a)), Botswana ((b) and (c)), Brazil, Burundi, Canada ((b) and (c)), Central African Republic, Chile, China ((a) to (c)), Costa Rica, Croatia, Cuba, Cyprus, Czech Republic, Denmark, Ecuador ((a) to (c)), Egypt, El Salvador, Estonia ((a) and (b)), Finland, France, Gabon ((b) and (c)), Germany ((a)), Ghana ((a) to (c)), Greece, Guatemala, Guinea-Bissau, Honduras, Hungary, India ((a)), Indonesia, Iraq ((a) to (c)), Ireland ((a) to (c)), Israel ((b)), Kazakhstan ((b)), Kenya, Latvia, Lithuania, Malaysia, Malta, Mauritius ((a) to (c)), Mexico ((a) and (c)), Myanmar, Namibia, Netherlands, New Zealand, Nicaragua, Nigeria, Norway, Oman ((a) to (c)), Pakistan ((b) and (c)), Panama ((a) to (c)), Papua New Guinea ((a) to (c)), Peru, Philippines, Poland, Qatar ((a) to (c)), Romania ((a) and (b)), San Marino, Seychelles, Singapore ((a) and (b)), Slovakia, Spain, Sri Lanka ((a) to (c)), Suriname, Sweden, Switzerland, Syrian Arab Republic ((a) to (c)), Thailand, Togo, Tunisia, Turkey ((a) and (b)), Uganda ((a) to (c)), Ukraine ((a) to (c)), United Arab Emirates ((a) to (c)), United Kingdom ((b) and (c)), Venezuela, Yemen ((a) and (b)), Yugoslavia ((a) to (c)), Zimbabwe.

Negative: Barbados ((a)), Benin ((d)), Estonia ((c)), Gabon ((a)), Germany ((d)), Ghana ((d)), Israel ((a)), Uganda ((d)), Yugoslavia ((d)).

Other: Bahrain ((a) and (c)), Barbados ((d)), Belgium ((a)), Botswana ((a)), Bulgaria ((d)), Canada ((a)), China ((d)), Ecuador ((d)), Iraq ((d)), Ireland ((d)), Israel ((d)), Italy, Japan ((a), (b) and (d)), Lebanon, Luxembourg, Mauritius ((d)), Mexico ((b) and (d)), Republic of Moldova, Oman ((d)), Pakistan ((a)), Panama ((d)), Papua

New Guinea ((d)), Portugal, Qatar ((d)), Romania ((d)), South Africa, Sri Lanka ((d)), Syrian Arab Republic ((d)), Ukraine ((d)), United Arab Emirates ((d)), United Kingdom ((a)).

Australia. (c) The recognition of prior learning is an important issue. Systematic and extensive recognition of prior learning processes offers significant savings to both government and the individual.

Bahrain. (a) and (c) This seems unrealistic in that many education and training institutions do not adhere to international standards and criteria in their certification.

Barbados. (d) For recognition of prior training, the individual should take responsibility for ensuring that the place of study is accredited before commencing the course of study.

BEC: (a) Collective agreements and/or tax incentives may help promote this kind of certification system.

Belgium. (a) The entire range of skills of citizens should be recognized and certified. The instrument should promote the right to access, assessment, recognition and certification of skills for all workers, whether employed or not, whether the skills are acquired formally or informally.

Walloon Government: (d) The system of certification should be entirely managed by the public authorities.

Botswana. (a) Delete “irrespective of where such skills were obtained”.

Bulgaria. (d) Add “validation of skills”.

Canada. (a) This is a complex issue to which the ILO can make a significant contribution through the dissemination of information on best practices.

China. (d) The instrument should encourage governments to consider the development of the training market.

Croatia. HUP: (a) to (c) Yes. (d) Services such as assessment of prior learning are market services that have to be financed by private resources. The division of costs between employer and employee is subject to dialogue at the company level.

SSSH: (a) to (c) Yes. (c) Knowledge and skills acquired in an informal manner should be validated and registered in a worker’s employment record to increase his or her employability.

Cyprus. (a) Yes, within the national framework for the recognition and certification of skills.

PEO: (b) Recognition and certification of skills should be designed through a tripartite process, but run and financed by the State.

SEK: (a) and (b) Recognition and certification of specific qualifications is a matter to be determined by the authorities of each State with the cooperation of the social partners.

Czech Republic. SPD ČR: (d) Ensure mutual recognition of qualifications, based mainly on professional standards.

Denmark. Integrate (a) and (b) with (c).

FTF: (a) to (d) Governments play a central role in laying down a regulatory framework, which fixes goals and financing. The social partners play a central role in filling out and implementing the framework – a role that is endorsed by collective agreements. The instrument should address the particular challenges emerging as a consequence of new work organization, which lead to new qualification requirements, for example in the use of ICT.

Ecuador. (d) The instrument should encourage governments to validate migrant workers' skills so that they can gain access to the rights conferred by certification.

CAPEIPI: (b) No.

Finland. (c) Yes, although this question should be more specific on the topic concerned.

France. (b) Governments should give full legal guarantees for recognition and certification of workers' skills, as these are crucial for their access to, retention of, and return to employment. Skills recognition and certification may motivate workers to develop their skills during working life.

MEDEF: (b) Recognition and validation of work experience constitute a shared responsibility of the enterprise and the worker. It is up to the enterprise to target the development of those skills that ensure a competitive advantage. It is up to the social partners to define the necessary branch-level qualifications, anticipate their evolution, determine the mechanisms for certification and access, and agree on the means to develop them.

Germany. BDA: (a) and (c) No, there should be no automatic recognition and certification; this should be left to member States. This depends on whether skills are comparable in terms of content.

Ghana. GEA: (d) The instrument should encourage governments to consider designing a training framework to make training and regulatory arrangements simple and more flexible, allowing easier credit transfer and movement between courses, programmes and institutions.

India. EAR: (a) to (c) Yes. (d) Lists of people certified in skills relevant to particular industries should be made available to those industries.

EFI: (a) to (c) Yes.

IMC: (b) Only the legal and institutional framework. (a) and (c) No.

Iraq. (d) Develop an integrated testing system to determine the level of individuals' qualifications.

Ireland. (d) In many countries, current delivery systems are not optimally adapted to life-long learning. The predominant model remains that of full-time attendance during "office hours". The development of more flexible delivery systems in regard to opening hours, modular courses and open and distance learning needs to be considered.

Israel. (d) Accreditation.

Italy. Acknowledgement of the key role of the social partners in solving the problem of certification and recognition of skills acquired in the workplace (non-formal learning).

Japan. (a) An explanation of the concept of skills recognition and certification is needed. (b) The role of the social partners should be clarified in relation to (a). (d) Identification of governments' responsibility for skills recognition and certification.

JTUC-RENGO: (a) to (d) Yes.

Lebanon. (a) to (d) The expression "encourage governments to consider" raises the question of the nature of such encouragement. (a) Recognition entails evaluation according to specific criteria. Consideration should also be given to the extent to which States recognize skills acquired in other countries. (b) There should be specific criteria for recognition of skills defined by the competent authority, which also defines the framework for recognition. What is meant by "financing of the recognition and certification of skills"? Certification of skills should be determined by each State in the light of its legal and institutional framework. (d) Recognition of skills should be linked to the evaluation process.

CCCIA: (a) No.

Luxembourg. (a) The introduction of a “training booklet” listing all the training undertaken by individuals so that their skills can be better evaluated will help enterprises, employment agencies and jobseekers. (b) A “training charter”, stating the rights and obligations of jobseekers wishing to undertake publicly financed training, could be useful.

Mauritius. (d) Establish regional databases on skills and training supply.

Mexico. (a) A modern HRDT policy must include recognition of skills irrespective of whether they were obtained in an institutional education system, private institutions or at work. (b) Co-financing between the public sector and employers is a prerequisite for establishing a national system of vocational qualification certification. (d) The instrument should encourage governments to lay the groundwork for a national training policy based on recognition and certification of skills and knowledge acquired at work and in daily life.

Republic of Moldova. (a) to (c) Standards of competency should meet the requirements of industry and educational and training institutions.

Morocco. FCCIS: Yes.

Netherlands. VNO-NCW: (a) to (c) It is acceptable for governments to invest in the development of assessment methods and enable the social partners and educational institutions to use them. Quality control of institutions responsible for assessment and recognition can also be a role of government, possibly shared by the social partners. But this question may suggest that an individual has the right to be assessed at any time and for any purpose. It should be made very clear that services such as the assessment of prior learning are market services that, in principle, have to be financed by private resources. The division of costs between employer and employee is subject to dialogue at the company level. Sectoral agreements or fiscal incentives may support assessment and recognition activities. (b) This subparagraph should define more precisely the responsibilities of the government and the social partners.

Unie mhp: (d) Governments should recognize education obtained in other countries.

New Zealand. (b) Yes; however, this should take into consideration entry into the labour market from the school system and the transition from inactivity to the labour market.

Nigeria. (a) Yes, if the skills meet national standards.

Oman. (c) Yes, in accordance with the national certification framework. (d) The role of the ILO in assisting countries in developing a framework for recognition and certification of skills.

Pakistan. (a) The phrase “irrespective of where such skills were obtained” should be qualified by the need for a legal certification framework to permit formal skills recognition, as per Question 16(a).

EFP: (a) Yes. (c) Yes, including non-formal training.

Panama. (d) Establishment of a national framework for evaluating and certifying skills that are transferable and recognized in various sectors, industries, enterprises and educational establishments, whether public or private. Development of horizontal management structures that enable some management responsibilities to be transferred to the workers and lead to the recognition of new skills and improved remuneration systems.

Papua New Guinea. (d) Include testing and certifying the skills of managers at different managerial levels.

Portugal. (b) Lifelong learning should be financed from a variety of sources, in particular the State, families, firms and civil society. The duality of the right/duty to learn should also be borne in mind. The State has primary responsibility for compulsory education, but individuals and other partners must also be responsible for lifelong learning.

CCP: (a) Yes, subject to the difficulties mentioned in response to Question 10(b). (b) Yes, subject to the difficulties in terms of costs of implementation and operation of the system. Any system must ensure recognition and validation of all qualifications acquired through formal, informal and non-formal means.

CIP: (b) There should not be a reference to the social partners, since these are matters that are directly dependent on specific national conditions.

Qatar. (d) The instrument should encourage governments to establish a system for skills recognition.

Romania. (d) Skills, especially those gained informally and non-formally, should be recognized not only nationally but also internationally.

Russian Federation. FNPR: (a) to (c) Yes.

Slovakia. KOZ SR: (d) Introduce international recognition of certification of skills.

South Africa. See comments under Question 6(d) and Question 10(b). These are not ends in themselves, they are means towards other objectives and these should be given explicit emphasis.

COSATU: The *Conclusions* adopted at the 88th Session of the ILC state that “every person should have the opportunity to have his or her experiences and skills gained through work, through society or through formal and non-formal training assessed, recognized and certified”. This should be fully reflected in the new instrument.

Spain. (a) Yes, provided the concepts used are well established and defined. Recognition and, where appropriate, certification of skills will depend on whether these skills are included in the national inventory of vocational qualifications. The phrase “irrespective of where such skills were obtained” is unclear. If it refers to skills obtained in a given country, the recognition and certification of skills obtained in other countries will depend on existing agreements between countries or those at the regional or subregional level. In relation to skills obtained in the workplace, what matters is that a worker is able to demonstrate that he or she possesses a standard skill at a certain level, in relation to a qualification that is included in the national inventory of vocational qualifications of the country concerned. (b) It should be made clear who, among the social actors, bears the total or partial cost of the process.

Sri Lanka. (d) Promote articulation arrangements between different training modes and programmes.

Sweden. (a) Yes. A more open-minded attitude to prior learning and combinations of different kinds of learning and education, in the context of both eligibility and skills recognition, has an important bearing on the promotion of lifelong learning. It is highly important for all knowledge and experience to be recognized and harnessed, regardless of whether they are based on formal education/training or on everyday workplace-based learning. Accordingly, there may be good reason in higher education to develop what might be termed the “practitioner nexus”. (b) Yes. Methods for evaluating experience-based learning are essential to the development of lifelong learning. It is important to accelerate the advanced development of validation instruments, for vocational development above all. The social partners have an important role to play in this respect.

Switzerland. (a) Yes, for example, the system for skills recognition in the European Union. However, it is important to fix minimum standards for the international recognition of qualifications. (b) It is important for all actors to be involved, not only the social partners.

UPS: (a) This is not only the responsibility of the State. (b) This is possible but can also be organized by the private sector. (c) Government can encourage this process but financing should remain private.

Syrian Arab Republic. (d) Give priority to skilled people in some areas.

Ukraine. (d) Recognition of training obtained through independent study, or at establishments not licensed by the State.

United Arab Emirates. (d) The instrument should encourage governments to encourage workers' initiatives.

United Kingdom. (a) This is linked to Question 10(a). There is scope for a framework of skills recognition and certification, but it must be easy to understand and widely accepted to be credible. People certainly acquire new skills in a variety of ways, making skills difficult to certify and verify. The need to recognize skills must be balanced with the ease with which they can be recorded and recognized. (b) Yes, but the roles of others should also be considered. (c) Yes, subject to comments under (a).

United States. USCIB: (a) No, but governments should be encouraged to develop a strategy aimed at greater recognition of skills acquired elsewhere. (b) No. (c) Yes, depending on when, where, and how it was acquired and its relevance to current circumstances.

Most of the member States replied affirmatively to all the subparagraphs of this question. Some respondents emphasized that certification of skills should be determined by individual States, in accordance with the legal and institutional framework. Others emphasized the role of the social partners in the certification and recognition of skills; establishing regional databases on skills and training supply; recognition of skills obtained in other countries; and the promotion of articulation between different training modes and programmes. Although a number of issues were mentioned, no clear pattern emerged in the types of issues specified.

VIII. Training for decent work and social inclusion

Qu. 12 *Should the instrument recognize:*

- (a) *the primary role of governments for the training of people with special needs in order to develop and enhance their employability?*
- (b) *the role of the social partners in reintegrating such people in the workforce?*
- (c) *the involvement of the social partners, local authorities, local communities and associations in implementing programmes for such people?*

Total number of replies: 93.

(a) *Total number of replies: 90. Affirmative: 87. Negative: 0. Other: 3.*

(b) *Total number of replies: 89. Affirmative: 85. Negative: 0. Other: 4.*

(c) *Total number of replies: 90. Affirmative: 86. Negative: 0. Other: 4.*

Affirmative: Algeria, Argentina, Australia ((b) and (c)), Austria, Bahrain, Barbados, Belgium ((b) and (c)), Benin, Bolivia ((a)), Botswana, Brazil, Burundi, Canada, Central African Republic, Chile, China, Costa Rica, Croatia, Cuba, Cyprus, Czech Republic ((a) and (c)), Denmark, Ecuador, Egypt, El Salvador, Estonia, Finland ((a)), France, Gabon, Germany, Ghana, Greece, Guatemala, Guinea-Bissau, Honduras, Hungary, India ((c)), Indonesia, Iraq, Ireland, Israel ((b) and (c)), Italy, Japan, Kazakhstan ((a)), Kenya, Latvia, Lebanon, Lithuania, Malaysia, Malta ((a) and (b)), Mauritius, Mexico ((a) and (c)), Republic of Moldova ((a)), Myanmar, Namibia, Netherlands, New Zealand, Nicaragua, Nigeria, Norway, Oman, Pakistan, Panama, Papua New Guinea, Peru, Philippines, Poland, Portugal ((a)), Qatar, Romania ((b) and (c)), San Marino, Seychelles, Singapore, Slovakia, South Africa, Spain, Sri Lanka, Suriname, Sweden ((b) and (c)), Switzerland, Syrian Arab Republic, Thailand, Togo, Tunisia, Turkey, Uganda, Ukraine, United Arab Emirates, United Kingdom ((a) and (b)), Venezuela, Yemen, Yugoslavia, Zimbabwe.

Negative: None.

Other: Australia ((a)), Finland ((b) and (c)), Mexico ((b)), Republic of Moldova ((b) and (c)), Portugal ((b) and (c)), Romania ((a)), Sweden ((a)), United Kingdom ((c)).

Australia. (a) Australia has no preference at this stage. “Special needs” groups include women, rural workers, people with disabilities, older workers, the long-term unemployed, young people, migrant workers and low-skilled workers. The regular educational and training system should endeavour to meet the needs of these groups. Where a need for extra targeting exists, the role of government should not be prescribed too narrowly.

ACTU: (a) Yes.

Austria. (a) The training of people with special needs should also further their personal development. (b) The social partners should also have a role in the provision of initial training and initial integration of such groups.

Barbados. BEC: (b) The role of the social partners should be voluntary.

Croatia. HUP: (c) The social partners, local authorities, local communities and associations should be encouraged to become involved.

Czech Republic. SPD ČR: Create conditions for the training of all people including those with special needs.

Denmark. (b) In relation to vulnerable groups, enterprises should also be included.

France. The State should finance training for these people so that they can attain and maintain some level of employability. The social partners should also be called upon to contribute to financing their training, as these persons should as far as possible be able to secure a job. Such programmes could be implemented by private, e.g. non-profit, organizations and organizations managed in collaboration with the social partners.

Germany. BDA: (b) Yes, but conditions should be created to make it possible to integrate people with special needs into the regular labour market. It would be desirable to provide training in special trades and courses for young people displaying practical aptitude.

Hungary. (a) to (c) Yes, as the provision is aimed at positive discrimination in favour of groups with special needs.

India. EAR, EFI and IMC: (a) to (c) Yes.

Iraq. (a) to (c) Yes, provided the term “social exclusion” is clarified.

Ireland. Measures to address the training and labour market needs of people with disabilities should focus on integrating services for people with disabilities with general, mainstream services, including placement services.

Japan. (b) A brief explanation of the phrase “reintegrating such people in the workforce” is needed.

JTUC-RENGO: (a) to (c) The definition of employability should be broad enough to provide education and training opportunities so that workers can prepare themselves for a range of employment opportunities throughout their lives.

Lebanon. CCCIA: (a) At the end of the sentence, add the phrase “and encourage active enterprises to absorb them”.

Mexico. (b) The role of civil associations and non-governmental organizations is essential.

Republic of Moldova. Governments should also take measures to provide effective vocational guidance for such people.

Morocco. FCCIS: Yes.

Netherlands. Unie mhp: (b) Yes, but the social partners should not have primary responsibility.

Oman. (c) Yes, but within the framework of national HRD policies.

Pakistan. (a) The question should be reformulated by adding “facilitating” before “the training”.

EFP: (a) Yes. (b) No, it will add another burden that will jeopardize the liquidity of many enterprises.

Portugal. (b) and (c) Measures to facilitate the social and professional integration of such people must take into account differing situations and needs. The measures should cover actions aimed at personal and professional development (information, evaluation, vocational guidance and development of interpersonal and technical skills) and integration into the labour market (support for the creation of self-employment or recruitment by established firms). There is a need for additional measures, aimed at employers and the general public, such as information and advocacy concerning groups with special needs.

CCP: (b) Yes, the social partners do have a role, provided it is closely linked to the public employment services. (c) Participation of the social partners should be on a voluntary basis.

CIP: (a) The instrument should not recognize the primary role of governments because this formulation might imply that firms also have responsibilities in this area. (b) The instrument should not recognize the role of the social partners in integrating people with special needs. Some of these manage to enter the labour market without assistance, while others need special conditions for integration into active life, for which governments should be responsible.

CGTP-IN: (a) to (c) The role of firms in reintegrating people with special needs should be highlighted because it is firms that create jobs.

Romania. (a) Governments should promote measures to reduce marginalization, exclusion and poverty of the long-term unemployed and people with special needs.

Russian Federation. FNPR: (a) to (c) Yes.

South Africa. (a) to (c) Yes. See beneficiaries listed in the reply to Question 2.

COSATU: (a) The instrument should provide specific guidance to governments on how they should implement training for people with special needs. (b) and (c) Yes, the instrument should set out training for social development (basic social services, infrastructure, worker rights, land rights, consumer and environmental protection, access to credit, etc.) as a crucial objective of HRD.

Sweden. (a) To promote the inclusion of certain groups, there is a need to find an optimum pedagogy based on different levels of skills, technical capabilities, etc.

Switzerland. (b) Yes, but the social partners do not have exclusive responsibility in this area.

UPS: (b) Yes, with regard to training.

USS/SGB: (a) to (c) Measures directed towards youth, women and migrant workers should be particularly emphasized.

United Kingdom. (b) and (c) For consistency, these subparagraphs should recognize the role of the social partners and relevant civil society partners in the integration of people with special needs and the implementation of programmes for such people.

United States. USCIB: (a) Yes, but it needs to be connected to available jobs. (b) and (c) Yes.

AFL-CIO: (a) HRD must take account of persons with special needs and ensure equal access to opportunities in training. (b) Yes.

The overwhelming majority of respondents answered affirmatively to all aspects of this question. Comments reflected the need for governments to take primary responsibility in the training of those with special needs, complemented by the social partners in integrating these people into the labour market. Requests were made for information and advocacy measures concerning groups with special needs, aimed at both employers and the general public.

Should the instrument promote improved access to lifelong learning and training for all in order to prevent and combat social exclusion and to assist people with special needs in securing decent work? **Qu. 13**

Total number of replies: 89.

Affirmative: 84. Algeria, Argentina, Australia, Austria, Bahrain, Barbados, Benin, Bolivia, Botswana, Brazil, Burundi, Canada, Central African Republic, Chile, China, Croatia, Cuba, Cyprus, Czech Republic, Ecuador, Egypt, El Salvador, Estonia, Finland, France, Gabon, Germany, Ghana, Greece, Guatemala, Guinea-Bissau, Honduras, Hungary, India, Indonesia, Iraq, Ireland, Israel, Kazakhstan, Kenya, Latvia, Lebanon, Lithuania, Malaysia, Malta, Mauritius, Republic of Moldova, Myanmar, Namibia, Netherlands, New Zealand, Nicaragua, Nigeria, Norway, Oman, Pakistan, Panama, Papua New Guinea, Philippines, Poland, Portugal, Qatar, Romania, San Marino, Seychelles, Singapore, Slovakia, Spain, Sri Lanka, Suriname, Sweden, Switzerland, Syrian Arab Republic, Togo, Tunisia, Turkey, Uganda, Ukraine, United Arab Emirates, United Kingdom, Venezuela, Yemen, Yugoslavia, Zimbabwe.

Negative: None.

Other: 5. Costa Rica, Denmark, Italy, Mexico, South Africa.

Costa Rica. The instrument should promote the right to education, as education is a source of economic and social well-being.

Croatia. SSSH: Yes. The instrument should define access to lifelong learning as a universal right.

Denmark. See replies to Questions 4, 5 and 6.

Ireland. See reply to Question 12.

Italy. A considerable change in existing national education and training systems is needed to achieve flexibility, which will allow everyone access to opportunities to learn throughout their life.

Japan. JTUC-RENGO: Yes. Other factors, such as provision of childcare facilities in training, should not be overlooked.

Lebanon. This requires paying special attention to the long-term unemployed.

Mexico. As in Question 5, the term “decent work” should not be used because it is a concept that does not exist in law and is likely to lead to confusion.

Morocco. FCCIS: Yes.

Netherlands. Yes, particularly as regards ICT.

Russian Federation. FNPR: Yes.

South Africa. Given that a large proportion of the population in developing countries falls within this category, we recommend that a special section be included on training for social development as an explicit and complementary component of any HRD strategy. There is an emerging international discourse on how to deliver productive assets to the poor so that they can enhance not only their current but also their future incomes. HRD is a critical “productive asset” and needs to be highlighted as such. The World Bank has done a fair amount of work in this area.

COSATU: The role of training in combating social exclusion and promoting decent work is extremely important and should be emphasized throughout the new instrument. However, the provision of training alone will not necessarily achieve social inclusion. The provision of childcare facilities to enable parents to engage in training, for example, is critical. The *Conclusions* adopted at the 88th Session of the ILC state that “potential hidden discrimination should be actively guarded against. For example, the shift to the service sector, with an overall stronger female component, often relies on greater communication and problem-solving skills, which are not always explicitly recognized”. The instrument should effectively address this issue.

United Kingdom. Yes, but this text should be included under III. *Objective, scope and definition*, and should end with “and to assist all people, including those with special needs, to secure decent work”.

United States. USCIB: Yes.

All respondents agreed that the instrument should promote improved access to lifelong learning and training for all in order to prevent and combat social exclusion and to assist people with special needs to secure decent work.

Should the instrument specify groups with special needs, or should this be left to national law and practice? **Qu. 14**

Total number of replies: 91.

The instrument should specify groups with special needs

Affirmative: 36. Argentina, Austria, Barbados, Bolivia, Botswana, Burundi, Central African Republic, China, Croatia, El Salvador, Gabon, Ghana, Greece, Guatemala, Guinea-Bissau, Indonesia, Kazakhstan, Latvia, Mauritius, Mexico, Republic of Moldova, Myanmar, Namibia, Panama, Papua New Guinea, Philippines, San Marino, Seychelles, Singapore, Slovakia, Sri Lanka, Sweden, Togo, Uganda, Venezuela, Yugoslavia.

The definition should be left to national law and practice

Affirmative: 49. Algeria, Australia, Benin, Brazil, Canada, Chile, Costa Rica, Cuba, Cyprus, Czech Republic, Ecuador, Egypt, Estonia, Finland, France, Germany, Honduras, India, Iraq, Israel, Italy, Japan, Kenya, Lebanon, Lithuania, Malaysia, Malta, Netherlands, New Zealand, Nicaragua, Nigeria, Norway, Oman, Pakistan, Peru, Poland, Portugal, Qatar, Romania, Spain, Suriname, Switzerland, Syrian Arab Republic, Turkey, Ukraine, United Arab Emirates, United Kingdom, Yemen, Zimbabwe.

Other comment: 6. Bahrain, Denmark, Hungary, Ireland, South Africa, Tunisia.

Australia. It may be useful to give examples of groups with special needs, but it should be clear that each member country needs to make its own list on the basis of individual circumstances.

Austria. BAK and ÖGB: The groups should be indicated in full and allowance made for regional and labour market policy conditions.

Bahrain. The law and practice of individual countries needs to be considered in developing a general policy at the international level, but the instrument can specify groups with special needs as a reference to be consulted.

Barbados. CTUSAB: This might be better determined through national law and practice.

Belgium. Walloon Government: This should be left to national law and practice.

Central African Republic. The instrument should identify groups with special needs but allow national law and practice to supplement the list.

Croatia. HUP: No, the list of groups should be provided at the national level.

SSSH: The instrument should define groups with special needs and allow a more comprehensive list to be defined by national legislation.

Cyprus. PEO: The instrument may refer to special groups, but national law and practice can be more specific.

Czech Republic. SPD ČR: The instrument should specify groups with special needs.

Denmark. The instrument should not specify groups with special needs.

FTF: The instrument should specify groups with special needs.

Danish Confederation of Trade Unions (LO): The instrument should specify groups with special needs.

Ecuador. This should be left to national law, but it would be useful if the list of special groups appeared in the Recommendation to be used as a reference.

France. The precise identification of population groups that should be targeted can be left to each country. The instrument can, however, mention the main categories of groups potentially concerned: persons with disabilities, single women with family responsibilities, young people in difficulties, ethnic minorities, groups living in certain territories or undertaking certain activities.

Gabon. Confederation of Gabonese Employers (CPG): It should be left to national law and practice.

Ghana. GEA: It should be left to national law and practice.

Greece. National Confederation of Hellenic Commerce (ESEE), SEV and General Confederation of Greek Workers (GSEE): It should be left to national law and practice.

Hungary. It is necessary to specify disadvantaged groups (such as the partially disabled, the long-term unemployed, the under-educated and those living in less developed regions). However, it is the specialists in the countries concerned who are best placed to identify the appropriate target groups for action programmes.

Ireland. Governments should develop a comprehensive legal framework for addressing inequality and combating discrimination in the workplace. Such legislation should be supported by an authority that enforces the legislation effectively.

Japan. JTUC-RENGO: The instrument should identify groups with special needs but the list of groups should be flexible.

Mauritius. FSCC: This should be left to national law and practice.

Mexico. The instrument should specify groups with special needs and requirements, and should be supplemented by the provisions of national legislation and practice.

Morocco. FCCIS: Yes.

Netherlands. Some specific examples can be mentioned but it should be left to national law and practice.

VNO-NCW: The list of possible groups is endless, so the instrument should mention just some examples and leave the specifics to national practice.

New Zealand. This should be left to national practice. However, the instrument may include guidelines that enable members to identify groups with special needs, for example, groups lacking basic literacy and numeracy skills, and groups experiencing persistent unemployment.

Pakistan. EFP. This should be left to national law and practice.

Peru. CCL: The instrument should specify the groups with special needs.

Poland. Although this should be left to national law and practice, general categories of persons with special needs may be mentioned as an illustration of specific problems that governments are encouraged to solve.

Portugal. CGTP-IN: The instrument should identify groups with special needs.

Russian Federation. FNPR: The instrument should specify groups with special needs.

Slovenia. ZDODS: The instrument should specify groups with special needs.

ZDS: Specification of groups with special needs should be left to national law and practice.

South Africa. Governments should be encouraged to address these needs.

COSATU: The instrument should specify the groups with special needs as identified in the *Conclusions* adopted by the 88th Session of the ILC.

Sri Lanka. EFC. No. The instrument should allow the groups to be determined by national law and practice.

LJEWU: No, this should be left to national law and practice.

Sweden. Refer to comments on Question 10(i).

Tunisia. The instrument should specify the groups with special needs, or this could be left to national law and practice.

Uganda. The instrument should specify groups with special needs, such as women, people with disabilities, elderly people, children and youth. However, national law and practice should be free to expand on the list.

Ukraine. FPU: The groups should be listed in the instrument, but national law and practice should be taken into account.

United Kingdom. The instrument may offer some guidance, but the definition of special needs should be left to individual governments where practicable.

United States. USCIB: It should be left to national law and practice.

It was clear from all the responses that it is important to identify groups with special needs for training for decent work and social inclusion. However, there was no consensus on whether the instrument should specify these groups or whether this should be left to national law and practice. The majority of member States replied that it should be left to national law and practice. Some felt that the list could be endless and members would be better placed to identify groups specific to their countries. Some respondents suggested that the instrument should broadly outline the range of groups with special needs, but that a more comprehensive list should be defined through national law and practice. The paragraph below from the *Conclusions concerning human resources training and development* adopted at the 88th Session of the International Labour Conference provides some additional guidance on this matter.

Education and training of high quality are major instruments to improve overall socio-economic conditions and to prevent and combat social exclusion and discrimination, particularly in employment. In order to be effective they must cover everyone, including disadvantaged groups. Therefore, they must be carefully targeted at women and persons with special needs, including rural workers; people with disabilities; older workers; the long-term unemployed, including low-skilled workers; young people; migrant workers; and workers laid off as a result of economic reform programmes, or industrial and enterprise restructuring. In addressing the needs of these groups, particularly of young people, access to a combination of formal, off-the-job and workplace learning should be systematically offered and developed as it provides for effective learning outcomes and increases the chance of entering the labour market.³

³ ILO: *Conclusions concerning human resources training and development*, International Labour Conference, 88th Session, Geneva, 2000 (reproduced as Appendix I to ILO: *Learning and training for work in the knowledge society*, Report IV (1), International Labour Conference, 91st Session, Geneva, 2003, para. 6.

IX. Training providers

Qu. 15 *Should the instrument encourage governments to promote the diversity of training provision and develop flexible regulatory frameworks appropriate to national conditions, covering formal and informal delivery, workplace learning and training, including apprenticeship, and the expanded use of ICT for learning and training?*

Total number of replies: 91.

Affirmative: 85. Algeria, Argentina, Australia, Austria, Bahrain, Barbados, Benin, Bolivia, Botswana, Brazil, Burundi, Canada, Central African Republic, Chile, China, Costa Rica, Croatia, Cyprus, Czech Republic, Denmark, Ecuador, Egypt, El Salvador, Estonia, Finland, Gabon, Ghana, Greece, Guatemala, Guinea-Bissau, Honduras, India, Indonesia, Iraq, Ireland, Israel, Japan, Kazakhstan, Kenya, Latvia, Lebanon, Lithuania, Malaysia, Malta, Mauritius, Mexico, Republic of Moldova, Myanmar, Namibia, Netherlands, New Zealand, Nicaragua, Nigeria, Norway, Oman, Pakistan, Panama, Papua New Guinea, Peru, Philippines, Poland, Qatar, Romania, San Marino, Seychelles, Singapore, Slovakia, South Africa, Spain, Sri Lanka, Suriname, Sweden, Syrian Arab Republic, Thailand, Togo, Tunisia, Turkey, Uganda, Ukraine, United Arab Emirates, United Kingdom, Venezuela, Yemen, Yugoslavia, Zimbabwe.

Negative: 1. Cuba.

Other: 5. France, Italy, Luxembourg, Portugal, Switzerland.

Austria. These provisions should be extended to cover providers of further training.

Barbados. BEC: Governments should not have a monopoly in training; there should be a choice of training providers and a level playing field has to be established for private providers. These issues should be developed in close consultation with the social partners.

Belgium. Walloon Government: No, diversity does not guarantee that training needs are met in terms of quality. It is up to the national authorities to ascertain whether, in quantitative terms, provision meets, exceeds or falls short of needs.

China. Include public and private delivery of training provision.

Croatia. HUP: The free market determines the quality of further training of the employed.

Cuba. No. The instrument should promote consistency in training systems so as to encourage equal opportunity and treatment in access to employment and training. Diversity would go against seeking official certification and recognition of skills, given the impossibility of reviewing and supervising the large number of programmes. Training must not be commercialized.

Denmark. See comment on Question 16.

LO: Educational institutions play a central role in national education strategies and therefore need to be incorporated into the instrument.

France. The public authorities should endeavour constantly to ensure a supply of high-quality training that meets the needs of the labour market and individuals. This can be offered

by public or private providers, which should guarantee quality standards. Quality cannot be guaranteed by government decree; it is as much the result of voluntary efforts by all the actors involved as of extensive, yet flexible regulation. Nonetheless, given that education and training are “public goods”, it is important that governments regulate these markets to some degree. This can be done, for example, by imposing minimum standards, such as conditions for the establishment and management of training providers, activity reports, public supervision of the use of certain funds, etc. Self-regulation can also be carried out by the providers themselves, in collaboration with the social partners. The State and the social partners should endeavour to ensure general supervision, while specific measures such as standards, labels and certification should be carried out by training professionals.

Germany. BDA: Yes, but excessive stringent regulation should be avoided.

Ireland. Yes, by providing services such as multimedia learning centres; training delivered through the Internet; and accreditation of prior learning.

Italy. The decentralization of training provision is a core element of the development of lifelong learning. Accessibility of courses and opportunities for lifelong learning should be linked to regional programming policies, and the training needs of the adult population should be assessed in relation to the local context.

Japan. A brief explanation of “formal and informal delivery” is needed.

Lebanon. Yes, provided such action is taken in accordance with national laws and conditions. The instrument should specify the ways in which governments can promote the diversity of training provision.

Luxembourg. There is a need for new training providers alongside the traditional ones. Whether the initiative for this comes from trade unions, social institutions or other actors is of secondary importance.

Morocco. FCCIS: Yes.

Netherlands. VNO-NCW: There is some contradiction in the Questions in Part IX because the issue, more or less, is whether to ask governments to intervene in the training market. Contrary to initial education, which is the primary responsibility of governments, the quality of further training of the employed is a matter for the free market. In several countries, providers organize themselves and establish quality control at branch level, but in principle this is not a responsibility of the government. Include a remark to the effect that private providers should be given access to the initial education market, subject, of course, to the same criteria as public providers.

Norway. NHO: These activities should be undertaken jointly with the social partners.

Panama. Government should be warned against the dangers of creating a “digital divide” in which inequalities are worsened.

Portugal. Increasingly, vocational training and entry systems should be a strategic measure to respond to changes in the nature of jobs and skills resulting from growing competitiveness in the economy and rapid technological and organizational changes.

Russian Federation. FNPR: Yes.

South Africa. Yes, governments should also be encouraged to strengthen partnerships between providers and labour market actors in the design and quality assurance of programmes. Governments could be encouraged to build on the strengths of the traditional apprenticeship system in ways that are appropriate to local conditions.

Switzerland. The market already regulates questions of diversity. Therefore, governments should intervene in this area only in terms of ensuring that the rules of competition apply.

United Kingdom. Yes, see comments on Question 8.

United States. USCIB: Yes, if appropriate to national conditions.

The overwhelming majority of respondents replied in the affirmative to this question. Some felt that these provisions should be extended to include explicitly both public and private providers.

Qu. 16 *Should the instrument encourage governments to:*

- (a) *develop a legal framework for the certification of qualifications of training providers?*
- (b) *identify the roles of government and the social partners in promoting the expansion and diversification of training delivery?*
- (c) *establish guidelines to improve quality control and evaluation of the outcomes of training?*

Total number of replies: 92.

(a) *Total number of replies: 86. Affirmative: 76. Negative: 2. Other: 8.*

(b) *Total number of replies: 88. Affirmative: 80. Negative: 1. Other: 7.*

(c) *Total number of replies: 88. Affirmative: 81. Negative: 0. Other: 7.*

Affirmative: Algeria, Argentina, Australia ((a) and (c)), Austria, Bahrain, Barbados, Benin, Bolivia ((c)), Botswana, Brazil, Burundi, Canada, Central African Republic, Chile, China, Costa Rica, Croatia, Cuba ((a) and (c)), Cyprus, Czech Republic ((a) and (b)), Ecuador, Egypt, El Salvador, Estonia, Finland, Gabon, Ghana, Greece, Guatemala, Guinea-Bissau, Honduras, Hungary ((a) and (c)), India ((b)), Indonesia, Iraq, Ireland, Israel ((a) and (c)), Kazakhstan ((b)), Kenya, Latvia, Lebanon, Lithuania, Malaysia, Malta ((b) and (c)), Mauritius, Mexico ((b)), Republic of Moldova, Myanmar, Namibia, Netherlands ((b) and (c)), New Zealand, Nicaragua, Nigeria, Norway, Oman ((a) and (b)), Pakistan, Panama, Papua New Guinea, Peru, Philippines, Poland, Portugal, Qatar, Romania, San Marino, Seychelles, Singapore ((b) and (c)), Slovakia, Spain ((b) and (c)), Sri Lanka, Suriname, Sweden ((b) and (c)), Switzerland, Syrian Arab Republic, Thailand, Togo, Tunisia, Turkey, Uganda, Ukraine, United Arab Emirates, United Kingdom ((a) and (c)), Venezuela, Yemen ((b) and (c)), Yugoslavia, Zimbabwe.

Negative: Cuba ((b)), Netherlands ((a)), Sweden ((a)).

Other: Australia ((b)), Bulgaria ((a)), Denmark, France, Italy, Luxembourg, Mexico ((a) and (c)), Oman ((c)), South Africa, Spain ((a)), United Kingdom ((b)).

Australia. (b) Australia has no preference at this time.

ACTU: (b) Yes.

Austria. These provisions should be extended to cover providers of further training.

Bulgaria. (a) Include certification of the licensing of training providers. Add a clause on the need to guarantee high-quality training.

Canada. (a) Yes, a legal framework and/or guidelines.

Croatia. HUP: (a) to (c) See comment on Question 15.

Denmark. (a) to (c) The content of these subparagraphs is already included in Question 15, or may be incorporated in it; hence Question 16 should be deleted.

FTF: Educational institutions play a central role in national education strategies, therefore their role and qualification requirements should be incorporated into the instrument.

LO: Yes.

Ecuador. CAPEIPI: (b) No.

France. See comments on Question 15.

India. EAR: (a) to (c) Yes.

IMC: (a), (b) Yes. (c) No.

Italy. (a) The decentralization of training provision is a key element of the development of lifelong learning.

Japan. JTUC-RENGO: Yes.

Germany. BDA: (a) to (b) Yes. (c) Yes, with regard to initial vocational training. Regulation of further training is not desirable.

Lebanon. (a) Yes, but it is important that such a framework be based on established criteria. (c) Evaluation and control should be carried out by competent bodies recognized by the State.

CCCIA: (b) No.

Lithuania. Confederation of Lithuanian Industrialists (LPK): Also ensure mandatory certification for training institutions.

Luxembourg. (c) The idea of lifelong learning implies a system of continuous assessment, as opposed to one-off examinations. Such assessment is based on determining whether the person being trained is able to carry out a task at an adequate level of competence.

Mexico. (a) Each country should have a system of certification of qualifications issued by public institutions, private organizations and enterprises. (c) It is the responsibility of public authorities to establish guidelines and criteria to improve quality control and evaluation of training outcomes.

Morocco. FCCIS: Yes.

Netherlands. (a) No. It is not clear whether this question refers to the certification of specific qualifications or to the accreditation of educational institutions.

Unie mhp: (a) Yes, on condition that this makes international recognition easier.

Norway. NHO: (a) to (c) No.

Oman. (c) This issue is very important, but should be recognized nationally.

Pakistan. EFP: (c) Yes, in consultation with stakeholders.

Poland. (a) and (c) It is important that these issues not be regulated solely by the market.

Portugal. CCP: (c) Yes. The quality of service must be ensured by the establishment, implementation and continuous evaluation of systems of accreditation of training institutions. Encourage methods for evaluating the impact of training on direct beneficiaries and employers and companies' return on investment.

Russian Federation. FNPR: (a) to (c) Yes.

South Africa. Yes, but mention the purposes for which these interventions are intended.

Spain. (a) A legal framework should also be established for the certification of staff, instructors and teachers.

Sri Lanka. EFC: (a) Yes, subject to Question 11(a). (b) and (c) Yes, in consultation with the social partners.

Sweden. (a) Quality assurance, evaluation of training outcomes and certification of training providers are also important, but there should not be statutory certification of all training providers.

Switzerland. (b) Yes, but the roles of other actors should be defined as well. (c) Yes. International standards could be useful for cross-border provision of training.

UPS: (a) to (c) Yes, and the role of the private sector should be encouraged.

United Kingdom. (b) The instrument can offer guidance on the form that these roles can take, but should bear in mind differing circumstances and needs and avoid being too prescriptive. The role of the private sector is also important for cost-effective and sustainable training delivery and should be addressed in the instrument.

United States. USCIB: (a) No. This is a market judgement, to be made by the individual and the enterprise. It does not require legal regulation except where health and safety is involved. (b) No. This is a prescription for inflexibility and "one-size-fits-all" solutions. (c) No. The government is not in a good position to make these judgements at the enterprise level. It is too far removed from the needs of the labour market.

AFL-CIO: (b) Yes.

Most respondents replied in the affirmative to all subparagraphs of this question.

X. Human resources development, lifelong learning and training support services

Qu. 17 *Should the instrument provide that governments:*

- (a) *when organizing regular surveys of the population, collect information on educational levels, qualifications, training activities, and employment and incomes?*
- (b) *establish databases and quantitative and qualitative indicators on the national training system, including at the enterprise level?*
- (c) *collect information on skills from a variety of sources, including longitudinal studies, not confined to traditional occupational classifications?*

Total number of replies: 93.

(a) Total number of replies: 92. Affirmative: 82. Negative: 5. Other: 5.

(b) Total number of replies: 86. Affirmative: 78. Negative: 3. Other: 5.

(c) Total number of replies: 87. Affirmative: 76. Negative: 4. Other: 7.

Affirmative: Algeria, Argentina, Australia ((a) and (c)), Austria, Bahrain, Barbados, Belgium, Benin, Bolivia ((a) and (b)), Botswana, Brazil, Burundi, Canada, Central African Republic, Chile, China, Costa Rica, Croatia, Cuba ((a) and (b)), Cyprus, Czech Republic, Ecuador, Egypt, El Salvador, Finland, France, Gabon, Ghana, Greece, Guatemala, Guinea-Bissau, Honduras, Hungary, India ((a)), Indonesia, Iraq, Ireland, Italy, Kazakhstan ((c)), Kenya, Latvia, Lebanon, Lithuania, Malaysia, Malta ((a)), Mauritius, Mexico, Republic of Moldova, Myanmar, Namibia, Netherlands ((a)), Nicaragua, Nigeria, Oman ((a) and (b)), Pakistan, Panama, Papua New Guinea, Peru ((a) and (c)), Philippines, Poland, Portugal, Qatar, Romania ((b) and (c)), San Marino, Seychelles, Singapore, Slovakia, South Africa, Spain, Sri Lanka, Suriname, Sweden ((b) and (c)), Switzerland ((a) and (c)), Syrian Arab Republic, Thailand, Togo, Tunisia, Turkey ((a) and (b)), Uganda, Ukraine ((a) and (b)), United Arab Emirates, Venezuela, Yemen ((a) and (b)), Yugoslavia, Zimbabwe.

Negative: Estonia ((a)), Germany, Israel ((a)), Japan ((a)), Netherlands ((b) and (c)), Norway, Ukraine ((c)).

Other: Australia ((b)), Cuba ((c)), Denmark, Estonia ((b) and (c)), Japan ((c)), New Zealand, Oman ((c)), Romania ((a)), Sweden ((a)), United Kingdom.

Australia. (b) Australia has no preference at this stage. Data collection and the establishment of databases relating to training are integral parts of improving training delivery and assessing outcomes. However, in relation to private enterprises, it is important to ensure that administrative requirements do not prove excessive.

ACTU: (b) Yes, there is value in determining industry- and national-level trends. Enterprise-level data would be difficult to gather and would provide limited advantage to planners.

Barbados. (b) Yes, but the effort should be collaborative, with trade unions and employers committing resources as well.

CTUSAB: These data will be useful in long-term planning.

Belgium. Walloon Government: (a) Yes, on condition that the data remain anonymous.

Canada. (a) Yes, labour market information contributes to the effectiveness of labour incentives and training, and constitutes an essential investment.

Cuba. (c) The collection of information must be realistic and take into account the possibilities of systems that are in place and the numerous limitations of developing countries.

Cyprus. (b) Yes, but add "to the extent possible".

Denmark. Questions 17 to 19 deal too specifically with the role of governments. The instrument should be worded in more general terms.

Estonia. (a) The information is already collected in labour force surveys. (c) Yes and no; surveys are already based on occupational classifications.

Finland. (a) Yes, recognizing that building indicators is a demanding exercise. Initially one should carefully study and take into account work done in this field by organizations such as the OECD, as well as the Labour Statistics Convention, 1985 (No. 160), and the ILO October Inquiry.

France. Governments should be encouraged to create and finance specialized organizations that have the task of producing the necessary information and disseminating it to public and private providers. However, other organizations should also be encouraged to collect and analyse such information. Generally speaking, collaboration between the State and the social partners should be encouraged.

Germany. BDA: (a) and (c) Yes. (b) Yes, but not at the enterprise level.

Greece. (b) After the phrase “quantitative and qualitative indicators” add “including information on the sexes”.

Hungary. Other international organizations (such as the Organisation for Economic Co-operation and Development (OECD) and the European Union) should also develop such databases and require this as a condition of membership.

India. EAR, EFI and IMC: (a) to (c) Yes.

Japan. (a) This subparagraph should be deleted, because decisions concerning data collection should be left to governments. (c) A brief explanation of why governments should collect information on skills “not confined to traditional occupational classifications” is needed.

JTUC-RENGO: (a) to (c) Yes.

Lebanon. (a) Such information should be collected every three to five years. (b) Yes, and the revision of such databases as required. (c) Yes, but it is also important to update traditional occupational classifications as required.

Republic of Moldova. (a) to (c) Yes, as these activities will help enterprises and employment agencies to achieve a better match between skilled labour demand and supply.

Morocco. FCCIS: Yes.

Netherlands. (b) and (c) No. These items are too far-reaching. Question 20 offers sufficient starting points for data collection.

New Zealand. (a) to (c) A less prescriptive approach to the collection of information is preferred, particularly given that information collection is for national purposes. The wording should focus on the purpose of data collection rather than what should be collected. (b) Collection of such information at the enterprise level may have significant compliance costs for employers and unions. It is unclear why quantitative and qualitative information is only considered in relation to vocational training. A rewording might be considered, for example “encourage governments to develop appropriate and relevant methods of collecting information on the outcomes of education and training”.

Business NZ: (a) to (c) The proposals set out in the questionnaire are a move into prescription that marks too many ILO instruments. The costs of recording information and notifying a central database are huge for an enterprise as well as for government. This is an area where governments should be encouraged to collect data in ways appropriate to the specific country’s needs.

Norway. (a) to (c) No, collecting and analysing such data will be difficult.

Oman. (a) Yes, although this is usually accomplished by labour force surveys. (c) This should be left to national law and practice.

Pakistan. Include information on all aspects of human resources training and institutions.

Poland. (b) Yes, but some doubts exist about the feasibility of collecting information on training activities at the enterprise level.

Portugal. The instrument should be flexible with respect to the recommendations made to governments.

Romania. (a) These are difficult to quantify. Other factors may influence the relationship between skills/qualifications and wages. (c) Yes, because of different needs of different sectors and regions.

Russian Federation. FNPR: (a) to (c) Yes.

South Africa. (a) and (b) Yes, but link this point to the planning and monitoring of the overall system. See comments on Question 7. (c) Yes, see comments on Question 7.

COSATU: (a) to (c) Yes.

Spain. (b) Yes, since it is necessary to justify to the public the results of investments in training in terms of effectiveness and efficiency. It would be very convenient if the system of indicators established permitted reliable comparison between countries.

Sri Lanka. LJEWU: (a) This is an essential requirement for national development planning. (c) Steps must be taken to collect information required to suit modern trends.

Sweden. (a) The collection of information on education levels, etc., is important for comparison with other countries. No to the collection of data at the enterprise level.

Switzerland. UPS: (a) This should be left to the judgement of the State. (b) and (c) No.

United Kingdom. (a) In many developing countries, collecting such data can impose a heavy administrative burden on systems that are rudimentary. It is necessary to ensure that the primary effort is targeted at education and training, with encouragement to collect data within the means and capabilities of individual member States. (b) See comments on (a). In particular, many enterprises are small, and an obligation to collect data would impose a burden which might discourage them from participating fully in training activity. Governments should certainly monitor training systems, but according to capability. (c) Such information would be useful, but the instrument should not imply that it is a necessary requirement. Instead, it should encourage information collection where appropriate.

United States. USCIB: (a) Yes. (b) and (c) Yes, if they have the resources.

The majority of member States replied in the affirmative to all subparagraphs of this question. Many cited the potential benefits of this kind of data for long-term planning, national development and assisting enterprises and employment agencies in matching skilled labour supply with demand.

Should the instrument encourage governments to promote and facilitate the development of the capacity to analyse trends in labour markets and human resources development and training?

Qu. 18

Total number of replies: 90.

Affirmative: 84. Algeria, Argentina, Austria, Bahrain, Barbados, Belgium, Benin, Bolivia, Botswana, Brazil, Burundi, Canada, Chile, China, Costa Rica, Croatia, Cuba,

Cyprus, Czech Republic, Ecuador, Egypt, El Salvador, Estonia, Finland, France, Gabon, Germany, Ghana, Greece, Guatemala, Guinea-Bissau, Honduras, Hungary, India, Indonesia, Iraq, Ireland, Israel, Kazakhstan, Kenya, Lebanon, Lithuania, Malaysia, Mauritius, Mexico, Republic of Moldova, Myanmar, Namibia, Netherlands, Nicaragua, Nigeria, Oman, Pakistan, Panama, Papua New Guinea, Peru, Philippines, Poland, Portugal, Qatar, Romania, San Marino, Seychelles, Singapore, Slovakia, South Africa, Spain, Sri Lanka, Suriname, Sweden, Switzerland, Syrian Arab Republic, Thailand, Togo, Tunisia, Turkey, Uganda, Ukraine, United Arab Emirates, United Kingdom, Venezuela, Yemen, Yugoslavia, Zimbabwe.

Negative: 1. Norway.

Other: 5. Australia, Denmark, Italy, Japan, New Zealand.

Australia. Australia has no preference at this stage. This is a useful and much-utilized process if the analysis confines itself to broad projections of demand for major categories of skills over the short to medium term. Attempts to forecast long-term trends in specific occupations have proved problematic.

ACTU: Yes.

Denmark. See reply to Question 17.

France. See reply to Question 17.

Hungary. See reply to Question 17.

Japan. Information should be provided on the specific capacities envisaged.

JTUC-RENGO: Yes.

Lebanon. Yes, but the instrument should identify the means that promote and facilitate the development of such capacity, and identify whether public or non-governmental institutions should undertake such analysis.

Morocco. FCCIS: Yes.

New Zealand. See reply to Question 17.

Norway. No, collecting and analysing such data will be difficult.

Russian Federation. FNPR: Yes.

South Africa. Yes, see comments on Question 7.

Spain. All training planning should be based on analyses of labour market trends. It is also necessary to observe innovation and good practice in the area of HRDT to promote continuous improvement.

Switzerland. Yes, in collaboration with research institutes and international organizations.
UPS: No.

United Kingdom. If the instrument encourages governments to do so, rather than implying an obligation, it might be useful. That said, the Labour Statistics Convention, 1985 (No. 160), and Recommendation (No. 170), already provide for labour market analysis. In the interests of ensuring that the instrument adds value, it might refer to the earlier instruments, and add encouragement on development of capacity specifically in the area of HRD.

United States. USCIB: Yes, if they have the resources.

The majority of respondents indicated that the instrument should encourage governments to promote and facilitate the development of the capacity to analyse trends in labour markets and human resources development and training.

Should the instrument encourage governments to:

Qu. 19

- (a) *provide vocational and career information and guidance for: employability development; access to education, training and active labour market programmes; jobsearch techniques; and access to skills recognition and certification throughout life?*
- (b) *promote the use of ICT in guidance services?*
- (c) *identify the roles and responsibilities of public and private employment services, the social partners and other parties?*

Total number of replies: 94.

(a) *Total number of replies: 93. Affirmative: 86. Negative: 1. Other: 6.*

(b) *Total number of replies: 88. Affirmative: 84. Negative: 1. Other: 3.*

(c) *Total number of replies: 87. Affirmative: 79. Negative: 1. Other: 7.*

Affirmative: Algeria, Argentina, Australia, Austria, Bahrain, Barbados, Belgium, Benin, Bolivia ((a)), Botswana, Brazil, Burundi, Canada, Central African Republic, Chile, China, Costa Rica, Croatia, Cuba ((a) and (b)), Cyprus, Czech Republic ((a) and (b)), Ecuador, Egypt ((b) and (c)), El Salvador, Finland, France ((a) and (b)), Gabon, Germany ((b) and (c)), Ghana, Greece, Guatemala, Guinea-Bissau, Honduras, Hungary, India ((c)), Indonesia, Iraq, Ireland, Israel ((a) and (b)), Italy ((a) and (b)), Japan ((c)), Kazakhstan ((a)), Kenya, Latvia ((a) and (b)), Lebanon, Lithuania, Malaysia, Malta ((a)), Mauritius, Mexico ((b)), Republic of Moldova, Myanmar, Namibia, Netherlands, New Zealand, Nicaragua, Nigeria, Norway, Oman ((a) and (b)), Pakistan, Panama, Papua New Guinea, Peru, Philippines, Poland ((a) and (c)), Portugal, Qatar, Romania, San Marino, Seychelles, Singapore, Slovakia, South Africa, Spain, Sri Lanka, Suriname, Sweden, Switzerland, Syrian Arab Republic, Thailand, Togo, Tunisia, Turkey, Uganda, Ukraine, United Arab Emirates, United Kingdom ((a) and (b)), Venezuela, Yemen ((a) and (c)), Yugoslavia, Zimbabwe.

Negative: Japan ((a) and (b)), Latvia ((c)).

Other: Bulgaria ((a)), Cuba ((c)), Denmark, Egypt ((a)), France ((c)), Germany ((a)), Luxembourg, Mexico ((a) and (c)), Oman ((c)), Poland ((b)), United Kingdom ((c)).

Austria. BAK and ÖGB: (c) The tasks and responsibilities of the social partners should not be determined by government, but autonomously by the social partners in accordance with the law.

Bulgaria. (a) Replace “access to education” with (employability development) “and improvement”.

Canada. (a) The functions of orientation, referral and counselling are crucial for adults, particularly vulnerable groups, to succeed in the acquisition of skills. These functions do not require important investments, but are often neglected.

Croatia. SSSH: (a) Yes. Offices of employment services should be enabled to provide counselling to both jobseekers and employers.

Cuba. (c) This must be adapted to national circumstances.

Cyprus. PEO: (a) Yes, but replace the phrase “employability development” with “human resource development”. (c) No, employment services should be a state responsibility.

Denmark. See reply to Question 17.

Egypt. (a) Relevant information should be provided only to the extent to which such information serves their national interests.

Finland. (a) Yes, but perhaps the examples are too specific.

France. (a) and (b) Yes. The function of providing vocational and career information and guidance should focus on the needs of the individual in order to guide her/him at various stages of training and transition in working life. The general guidance and counselling function should be exercised at the local level and be free, neutral and of high quality. It should be a public service, which can fulfil one or more functions: the provision of educational guidance in schools, employment services, occupational documentation and information, processing requests for skills assessment and validation of prior learning and qualifications, and acting as resource centres for people with particular difficulties. The social partners should be involved in organizing these services. (c) There can be private initiatives to develop services for information and advice on employment and training, but it is not advisable that governments encourage their creation.

Germany. (a) The role of the government is overemphasized. Independent bodies should also be mentioned here.

Greece. (a) At the end of the phrase add: “on the basis of equal opportunity and without stereotypes”.

Hungary. See reply to Question 17.

India. EAR and EFI: (a) to (c) Yes.

IMC: (a) and (b) Yes. (c) Only public employment services.

Japan. (a) and (b) Guidance services are important but go beyond HRD measures, which is the target of the instrument. Therefore they should not be included. (c) Yes, but this subparagraph should focus on the target of the instrument, HRD measures.

JTUC-RENGO: (a) to (c) Yes.

Lebanon. (c) Yes, to the extent provided for by established laws and regulations.

Luxembourg. (a) Special secondary school courses on “jobsearch strategies” to prepare young people in search of a job. It seems that an overwhelming majority of jobseekers do not know the basic rules on how to succeed in finding a job.

Mexico. (a) Guidance should be based on an integrated approach comprising jobsearch techniques, enhancement of employability, access to education and training programmes and certification of skills, irrespective of where they were acquired. (c) It is the responsibility of governments to ensure convergence between the roles of public and private employment services and measures carried out by different social organizations (associations of small producers; trade unions; business chambers; and education and training institutions).

Morocco. FCCIS: Yes.

Netherlands. (a) Yes, provided “skills recognition and certification throughout life” is interpreted as recognition of previously acquired competencies. (c) Yes, as recent research shows that these roles are not clearly identified.

Unie mhp: Yes, but only in a general way.

Norway. (a) to (c) Yes, these activities should be undertaken to promote equal opportunity.

Oman. (b) Yes, while specifying the role of the ILO in assisting in its implementation. (c) Leave this to national law and practice.

Pakistan. (a) The word “provide” should be replaced by “facilitate”.

EFP: (a) to (c) Yes.

Poland. (b) The issue of ICT could be dealt with in a separate paragraph or section.

Portugal. Rapid scientific and technological change, globalization and economic interdependency, the emergence of new forms of organization of work and the growing demands of competition, accentuate the constant need to update and enhance skills and qualifications. In this context, support systems in the field of educational and vocational information and guidance are particularly relevant as they link the individual and institutional needs with the system of education, training and employment. The State must increasingly play a coordinating role, and define the objectives and general methods for assessing educational, training and guidance measures, and overall financial management.

CIP: The instrument should not address the issue of public and private employment services, or the role of the social partners in such services.

Romania. (a) Yes, but also as a means to modernize work organization and promote structural change in the economy.

Russian Federation. FNPR: (a) to (c) Yes.

South Africa. Yes, see comments on Question 7. This is a key part of any system and should be integrated into Sections III and IV. There may also be a need to cross-reference to relevant ILO instruments on public and private employment agencies.

Sri Lanka. EFC: (c) Yes, in consultation with the social partners.

Sweden. (c) The role of the trade union organizations as advisers with no commercial interests makes them especially suitable for participating in this work, together with other actors. Agreements between the social partners, especially at the industrial level, can help to ensure good results.

Switzerland. UPS: (b) This issue should be clarified. (c) No.

United Kingdom. (a) Yes, but this is already covered in Question 9(e). It would be better to keep these aspects together. (b) Yes, such services should clearly make the best possible use of ICT, but perhaps the instrument should stress the importance of human contact in these and other services. A personal relationship between adviser and individual jobseeker can be extremely successful in helping people find work. While ICT can help, it must be in addition to

traditional communication media, to avoid exclusion of those who find themselves on the wrong side of the digital divide. (c) While governments have a role in ensuring that all parties contribute, rather than encouraging governments to identify roles, perhaps the instrument could encourage all actors to work together to establish their roles through consensus, in accordance with differing circumstances.

United States. USCIB: (a) Yes, although private sector employment agencies may do this as well. (b) Yes, if appropriate to national conditions. (c) No, such guidance will impede HRDT.

The majority of member States replied affirmatively to all subparagraphs of Question 19. A few respondents raised concerns with regard to subparagraph (c) as to whether the government should be solely responsible for identifying the role and responsibilities of the social partners.

XI. Research on human resources development and training issues

Qu. 20 *Should the instrument encourage governments to support and facilitate research on human resources development, learning and training, including:*

- (a) learning and training methodologies, including the use of ICT in training?*
- (b) skills recognition and qualifications frameworks?*
- (c) human resources development and training policies, strategies and frameworks?*
- (d) investment in training, and the effectiveness and impact of training?*
- (e) identifying, measuring and forecasting the demand for skills?*
- (f) other issues? (Please specify.)*

Total number of replies: 93.

(a) Total number of replies: 88. Affirmative: 84. Negative: 1. Other: 3.

(b) Total number of replies: 89. Affirmative: 87. Negative: 0. Other: 2.

(c) Total number of replies: 89. Affirmative: 86. Negative: 0. Other: 3.

(d) Total number of replies: 89. Affirmative: 87. Negative: 0. Other: 2.

(e) Total number of replies: 88. Affirmative: 84. Negative: 1. Other: 3.

(f) Total number of replies: 32.

Affirmative: Algeria, Argentina, Australia ((a) to (d)), Austria ((a) to (e)), Bahrain, Barbados ((a) to (e)), Benin ((a) to (e)), Bolivia ((c) and (e)), Botswana, Brazil, Burundi, Canada ((a) to (e)), Central African Republic, Chile, China ((a) to (e)), Costa Rica, Croatia, Cuba ((a) to (e)), Cyprus ((a) to (e)), Czech Republic ((a) to (d)), Denmark, Ecuador, Egypt, El Salvador, Estonia, Finland ((a) to (e)), France, Gabon, Ghana ((a) to (e)), Greece ((a) to (e)), Guatemala, Guinea-Bissau ((a) to (e)), Honduras, Hungary, India ((b), (d) and (e)), Indonesia, Iraq ((a) to (e)), Ireland ((a) to (e)), Israel, Italy, Japan, Kazakhstan ((c)), Kenya ((a) to (e)), Latvia, Lebanon ((a), (b), (d) and (e)), Lithuania, Malaysia, Malta, Mauritius ((a) to (e)), Mexico ((a) to (e)), Republic of Moldova, Myanmar, Namibia ((a) to (e)), Netherlands, New Zealand ((a) to (e)), Nicaragua, Nigeria, Norway, Oman ((a) to (e)), Pakistan, Panama ((a) to (e)), Papua New Guinea, Peru ((a), (b) and (e)), Philippines ((a) to (e)), Poland, Qatar, Romania ((a) to (e)), San Marino, Seychelles, Singapore, Slovakia, South Africa ((a) to (e)), Spain, Sri Lanka ((a) to (e)), Suriname, Sweden ((b) to (e)), Switzerland ((b) to (d)), Syrian Arab Republic, Thailand, Togo, Tunisia, Turkey ((a), (b) and (d)), Uganda ((a) to (e)), Ukraine, United Arab Emirates ((a) to (e)), United Kingdom, Venezuela, Yemen ((c) and (d)), Yugoslavia, Zimbabwe.

Negative: Australia ((e)), Benin ((f)), Germany ((f)), Ghana ((f)), Mauritius ((f)), Switzerland ((a)).

Other: Austria ((f)), Barbados ((f)), Canada ((f)), China ((f)), Cuba ((f)), Cyprus ((f)), Finland ((f)), Greece ((f)), Guinea-Bissau ((f)), Iraq ((f)), Ireland ((f)), Kenya ((f)), Lebanon ((c) and (f)), Luxembourg, Mexico ((f)), Namibia ((f)), New Zealand ((f)), Oman ((f)), Panama ((f)), Philippines ((f)), Portugal, Romania ((f)), South Africa ((f)), Sri Lanka ((f)), Sweden ((a)), Switzerland ((e)), Uganda ((f)), United Arab Emirates ((f)).

Australia. (e) No, refer to comments on Question 18.

Austria. (f) This provision should be extended to further training providers. HRD research should also give attention to the social aspects of training (with participation in training according to social status).

Barbados. (f) Facilitation should not be the sole responsibility of the government.

BEC: (f) All HRDT policy development must be done in collaboration with the social partners in order to be effective.

Brazil. CNI: (f) Organize and operate observatories on labour, employment, income, education and training. Conduct comparative studies and assessments of training systems.

Canada. (f) Address barriers to training and employment, as well as ways and means of addressing such barriers.

Croatia. HUP: (f) The instrument should also encourage the social partners to improve their capacity in the field of HRD.

Cuba. (f) Carrying out research and recommending measures with regard to the cost of the “brain drain” and its consequences for developing countries.

Cyprus. (f) Research on the need for new skills (new professions) by enterprises, individuals and the economy as a whole.

Denmark. The social partners should also be consulted on this challenge.

FTF: Include in the list of possible research topics: incentives which promote motivation and real access to education, for example recognition of informal competencies, compensation/educational subsidies, individual training plans, etc.

Finland. (f) Research on concrete applications of HRD and training in organizations.

Germany. BDA: (a) to (e) Yes, in principle, but instead of investing in research on learning and training, invest in learning and training themselves, as there has already been a great deal of research on this topic.

Ghana. TUC: (f) The role of the public and private employment agencies in gathering labour market information should be included.

Greece. (f) Making full use of women's potential in the labour force and securing the principle of equality in the development of HRD policies and strategies.

Guinea-Bissau. (f) Distance training and learning.

India. EAR: (a) to (e) Yes. (f) All information must be accessible on the Internet.

EFI: (a) to (e) Yes.

IMC: (c) No.

Iraq. (f) Research concerning systems and methods of apprenticeship and training, and occupational health and safety.

Kenya. (f) Establishing productivity centres.

Lebanon. (a) to (e) The provision should identify the nature of government support and facilitation. (a), (b), (e) Yes, when established by the competent authorities. (c) The instrument should identify the parties responsible for implementing such HRD policies and strategies within the policy framework established by the government, through social dialogue. (f) An education culture.

Luxembourg. Other international institutions have carried out studies, research and surveys in HRDT and duplication of effort should be avoided. Refer to the studies of the European Centre for the Development of Vocational Training, for example.

Mauritius. FSCC: (f) The instrument should encourage governments to ratify the Freedom of Association and Protection of the Right to Organise Convention, 1948 (No. 87), and promote lifelong training, which is fundamental to workers. Ratification of Convention No. 87 would give complete freedom of expression and association conducive to promoting lifelong learning of workers.

Mexico. (f) Reviewing and updating curricula on a regular basis.

Morocco. FCCIS: Yes.

Namibia. (f) Identifying the decline of certain skills in the market.

Netherlands. VNO-NCW: (e) The ambition of "identifying, measuring and forecasting the demand for skills" is not realistic. The only feasible option is to monitor trends.

Unie mhp: (a) to (e) Yes, but only in a general way. (f) There should also be agreements between countries for the international recognition of educational attainments.

New Zealand. (f) Information on the outcomes of both education and training should be collected.

Norway. (a) to (e) Yes, the need for new information systems arises from entirely new patterns of employment.

Oman. (e) Yes, and the role of the ILO should be specified. (f) The role of the ILO in assisting countries in developing all these aspects should be included.

Pakistan. EFP: (a) to (d) Yes, in consultation with the social partners.

Panama. (f) Guaranteeing that training programmes offered by the private sector are of an acceptable standard; promoting lifelong learning.

Philippines. (f) Supporting and facilitating research on the feasibility of distance learning to deliver training services.

Portugal. (a) to (e) The formulation of these questions is not very clear in the sense that they only concern the role of governments. This is an area where the social partners and civil society can have considerable involvement.

CCP: (f) The role of international cooperation and multinational enterprises in developing countries should be highlighted.

CGTP-IN: (d) Yes, including experience of other comparable countries.

Romania. (d) Yes, including fiscal incentives to encourage employers to train their staff. (f) Establishing statistical indicators for monitoring purposes.

Russian Federation. FNPR: (a) to (e) Yes. (f) The instrument should encourage governments to support and facilitate research on the problems of HRDT and gender.

South Africa. (a) to (e) Yes. (f) Add employment services and other aspects of information diffusion and communication on the importance of HRD/skills development. Refer to the issue of migration of skills and the need to manage this in a way that does not lead to the mass exodus of scarce skills from developing to developed countries. For example, the active recruitment of such skills from developing countries by developed countries should be discouraged and developed countries should be encouraged to expand their contribution to bursaries and scholarships within their aid portfolios. This issue can be cross-referenced to the provision on employment services.

Sri Lanka. (f) Barriers to improving access to training for women, poor, disabled and other vulnerable groups; identification of causes for the low esteem and social value accorded to vocational training.

Sweden. (a) Yes. It should be made clear, however, that ICT, although an important means to an end, is not an end in itself. The essential need is to respond to, motivate and support individuals in their own quest for knowledge and their own learning processes. (e) Although there is no great need for information in the broad sense, it is important that lack of quantifiable data should not be permitted to obscure a development like workplace-based learning, which is becoming more and more difficult to quantify.

Switzerland. (a) No, the methodology of skills acquisition rests with trainers and training institutions. (e) Forecasting of needs is difficult to achieve. Promotion of an observatory of training needs would however be an idea to support.

UPS: (a) to (e) These aspects should be evaluated on the basis of the needs of each State and should therefore be left to their consideration.

Uganda. (a) to (e) These should be done in close collaboration with the social partners, NGOs and the private sector. (f) Research into lost traditional skills such as blacksmithing and craftsmanship.

United Arab Emirates. (f) Training responsibilities shared between governments and the social partners, and the basis required for this.

United Kingdom. (a) to (e) Yes, with the usual caveats about capability and emphasis on practical work in the first instance. In addition, it should not be just governments that are encouraged to do this, but all of the social partners and others as well.

United States. USCIB: (a) to (e) Yes.

The responses to all of the subsections of this question were overwhelmingly positive. Some respondents noted that this provision should be extended to include: encouraging the social partners to improve their capacity in the field of HRD; assessing the cost of brain-drain in developing countries; concrete application of human resources development and training in organizations; the role of public and private employment agencies in gathering labour market information; establishment of productivity centres; establishment of statistical indicators for monitoring purposes; and the feasibility of distance learning. Although a number of issues were mentioned, no clear pattern emerged in the types of issues specified.

XII. Technical cooperation

Qu. 21 *Should the instrument provide guidance on technical cooperation in human resources development and training:*

- (a) *to promote greater opportunities for women and men to obtain decent work?*
- (b) *to promote national capacity building to reform and develop training policies and programmes, including developing the capacity for social dialogue and partnership building in training?*
- (c) *to promote technical cooperation between governments, the social partners, the private sector and international organizations?*
- (d) *in other ways? (Please specify.)*

Total number of replies: 93.

(a) *Total number of replies: 87. Affirmative: 80. Negative: 1. Other: 6.*

(b) *Total number of replies: 89. Affirmative: 84. Negative: 1. Other: 4.*

(c) *Total number of replies: 91. Affirmative: 84. Negative: 1. Other: 6.*

(d) *Total number of replies: 27.*

Affirmative: Algeria, Argentina, Australia, Austria, Bahrain, Barbados, Benin ((a) to (c)), Bolivia ((c)), Botswana, Brazil, Burundi, Canada ((a) to (c)), Central African

Republic, Chile, China ((a) to (c)), Costa Rica, Croatia, Cuba ((a) and (b)), Cyprus, Czech Republic, Denmark, Ecuador, Egypt, El Salvador, Estonia, Finland, France, Gabon, Germany, Ghana ((a) to (c)), Greece, Guatemala, Guinea-Bissau ((a) to (c)), Honduras, Hungary, India, Indonesia, Iraq ((a) to (c)), Israel ((c)), Italy, Japan, Kazakhstan ((c)), Kenya, Latvia, Lebanon ((a) to (c)), Lithuania, Malaysia, Malta, Mauritius ((a) to (c)), Mexico ((a) to (c)), Myanmar, Namibia ((a) to (c)), New Zealand, Nicaragua, Nigeria, Oman ((b) and (c)), Pakistan, Panama ((a) to (c)), Papua New Guinea, Peru ((b) and (c)), Philippines, Poland, Portugal, Qatar, Romania ((a) to (c)), San Marino, Seychelles, Singapore, Slovakia, Spain, Sri Lanka ((a) to (c)), Suriname, Sweden ((a) to (c)), Switzerland ((b) and (c)), Syrian Arab Republic ((a) to (c)), Thailand, Togo, Tunisia, Turkey, Uganda ((a) to (c)), Ukraine, United Arab Emirates ((a) to (c)), United Kingdom ((a) and (b)), Venezuela, Yemen ((b)), Yugoslavia ((a) to (c)), Zimbabwe.

Negative: Benin ((d)), Ghana ((d)), Mauritius ((d)), Norway, Yugoslavia ((d)).

Other: Bulgaria ((d)), Canada ((d)), China ((d)), Cuba ((c)), Guinea-Bissau ((d)), Iraq ((d)), Ireland, Lebanon ((d)), Mexico ((d)), Republic of Moldova, Namibia ((d)), Netherlands, Oman ((a) and (d)), Panama ((d)), Romania ((d)), South Africa, Sri Lanka ((d)), Sweden ((d)), Switzerland ((a)), Syrian Arab Republic ((d)), Uganda ((d)), United Arab Emirates ((d)), United Kingdom ((c) and (d)).

Barbados. BEC: (d) Increase cooperation between regional and international training institutions.

Bulgaria. (d) Develop youth programmes beginning in early childhood; combine social and life skills with vocational skills; facilitate access to technical cooperation programmes in general; create worldwide HRD programmes of a multidisciplinary nature.

Canada. (d) There is a need to examine other ways in which the instrument can provide guidance on technical cooperation in HRD and training.

China. (d) In developing countries, the issues of traditional industry, rural workers and rural-to-urban migrants are important, as is the promotion of technical cooperation with developed countries.

Croatia. HUP: (d) Promote technical cooperation between regional and international training institutions.

Cuba. (b) and (c) Adapted to national conditions.

Czech Republic. SPD ČR: (d) Ensure equal access to training and equality in the recognition of qualifications.

Denmark. FTF: With regard to Questions 17 to 21, it is particularly important to increase knowledge on the effect of educational measures and to develop quantitative as well as qualitative indicators. The work done by the OECD should be further developed, focusing on the establishment of useful qualitative indicators.

Germany. (b) Responsible, coordinated involvement of the State, private business and civil society guarantees the highest degree of coordination of the content, procedures and organizational forms of training. In addition, it contributes to ensuring sustainable financing of training.

(c) The economic, political and social context affects the creation and preservation of jobs and incomes, and should accordingly be taken into account in connection with training.

Guinea-Bissau. (d) Promote cooperation between two or more member governments.

Iraq. (d) Organize an annual conference on training to share experience among States and to develop cooperation between them.

Ireland. (d) Build local capacity and test models of community education; develop support structures and provide for accreditation and partnerships between statutory and voluntary agencies; facilitate the progression of marginalized groups and individuals; and disseminate learning and share good practices.

Irish Congress of Trade Unions (ICTU). (d) Promote the capacity of international organizations to diffuse best practice.

Japan. (b) The phrase “developing the capacity for social dialogue and partnership building” should be explained.

Lebanon. (a) to (c) Yes, although it should be left to each State to decide on the need for such cooperation. (c) The ILO plays a major role in technical cooperation through its Decent Work strategy and other programmes. (d) The ILO must provide a database on the terminology of vocational training and, in particular, further training, and on best practice in establishing a framework for vocational qualifications, as well as research and studies on the recognition of prior learning.

Mexico. (d) The instrument should also promote horizontal cooperation among public organizations in the education and work sectors.

Republic of Moldova. (d) The instrument should promote increased technical assistance to the least developed countries and societies.

Morocco. FCCIS: Yes.

Namibia. (d) Promote greater opportunities for disadvantaged youth to obtain decent work.

Netherlands. The term technical cooperation should be defined.

VNO-NCW. (a) to (c) Yes.

Unie mhp. (a) to (c) Yes.

Norway. NHO: (a) to (c) No, Question 21 is too imprecise.

LO. (a) No. Promotion of greater opportunities for women and men to obtain decent work should not be based on technical cooperation. This is the responsibility of governments, in cooperation with the social partners.

Oman. (a) This should be left to national law and practice. (d) The ILO should create a special programme to help countries to benefit from technical assistance.

Panama. (d) To incorporate gender perspectives and the environment into education; regulate public and private education and training systems so that they meet the standards for economic growth and development; use ICT to develop training and education programmes, and extend this to sectors of society most in need of development.

Poland. (a) to (c) To ensure optimum access to training and prevent social exclusion.

Portugal. CCP: (d) It would be useful for the instrument to distinguish between technical cooperation among national actors, and international cooperation.

Romania. (c) Yes, since the diversification of training supply calls for greater participation of labour market actors, and development of national and international partnerships to promote

employment through continuous training. (d) Promote cross-border mobility and exchange of good practice.

Russian Federation. FNPR: (a) to (c) Yes.

Slovakia. KOZ SR: Support for creating an HRD information system for the social partners.

South Africa. This should be expanded to take account of the need for the North to respond to initiatives from the South, such as the New Partnership for Africa's Development (NEPAD), in a variety of ways, e.g. commitment to support capacity development within the context of programmes identified as priorities within NEPAD; identify partner institutions for centres of provider excellence in Africa; provide opportunities for local consultants to acquire experience in large-scale, technologically advanced programmes; and reinstate bursary and scholarship programmes.

COSATU: Yes. The instrument should provide for increased international assistance and aid for education and training. It should draw attention to the significant exodus of skills from developing to developed countries, with many developing countries investing in education and developed countries reaping the benefits. This should be discouraged, or appropriate forms of compensation should be developed. The instrument should also provide for technical cooperation in developing common regional accreditation systems, with full involvement of the tripartite constituents.

Sri Lanka. (d) Promote dissemination of information on research findings, best practices, innovations, etc., on training.

EFC: (d) Through the promotion of technical cooperation.

LJEWU: (c) It is imperative that governments work in close cooperation and partnership with the private sector and national and international organizations. In open economies and national development programmes, the private sector has to play a dominant role.

Sweden. (d) Technical cooperation could also enable small enterprises to obtain ICT support.

Switzerland. (a) This would seem to be a matter for labour market policies.

Syrian Arab Republic. (d) The international community should endeavour to provide debt relief or, if required, cancel debts to help in mobilizing resources for literacy and establish ICT training.

Uganda. (d) Promote community-based training.

United Arab Emirates. (d) Promote greater training opportunities in rural areas to reach a balance in HRD between rural and urban areas.

United Kingdom. (a) Yes, but such guidance should ensure that HRD is fully integrated into all of the ILO's work. Decent work is ultimately the objective of all technical cooperation, and HRD is the means rather than the end in itself. The instrument should set a clear framework of guidance, and allow the Office to supply detailed guidance. (b) Technical cooperation in this area should include exchange of information and experience. (c) This needs clarification. The question suggests that guidance be provided on technical cooperation to promote technical cooperation. If the meaning is to provide guidance on the promotion of technical cooperation, it should be set out in a separate paragraph. Use, as a model, Paragraph 16 of the Worst Forms of Child Labour Recommendation, 1999 (No. 190). (d) Guidance should be given on how to integrate support for HRD with other work on poverty eradication (particularly in Poverty Reduction Strategy Programmes) and national plans and strategies for employment.

United States. USCIB: (a) Yes. (b) Yes, if there is a sound source for such guidance. (c) Yes. (d) None.

AFL-CIO: (c) Yes.

The vast majority of replies indicated that the instrument should promote: greater opportunities for women and men to obtain decent work; national capacity building to reform and develop training policies and programmes, including developing the capacity for social dialogue and partnership building in training; and technical cooperation between governments, the social partners, the private sector and international organizations. Some respondents listed other ways in which the instrument could provide guidance on technical cooperation in human resources development and training, but there was no clear pattern to the types of ways specified.

PROPOSED CONCLUSIONS

The following Proposed Conclusions have been prepared on the basis of the replies received to the questionnaire and summarized and commented upon in this report. They have been drafted in the usual form and are intended to serve as a basis for discussion of the fourth item on the agenda of the 91st Session (2003) of the International Labour Conference.

I. Form of the instrument

1. The International Labour Conference should adopt a new international instrument concerning human resources development and training.
2. The instrument should take the form of a Recommendation.

II. Preamble

3. The instrument should contain a preamble referring to the relevant ILO instruments which might include the following:
 - (a) the Human Resources Development Convention, 1975;
 - (b) the Tripartite Declaration of Principles concerning Multinational Enterprises and Social Policy;
 - (c) the ILO Declaration on Fundamental Principles and Rights at Work;
 - (d) the Conclusions concerning human resources training and development, adopted at the 88th Session of the International Labour Conference.

III. Objective, scope and definition

4. The instrument should recommend that Members formulate, apply and monitor national human resources development and training policies, which are coherent with other economic and social policies, based on social dialogue, and reflect the different roles of government and the social partners.
5. The instrument should encourage Members to identify human resources development and training policies which:
 - (a) facilitate lifelong learning and employability;
 - (b) give equal consideration to economic and social objectives in the context of the global economy, and knowledge- and skills-based society, with emphasis

- on balanced and sustainable economic and social development, decent work, social inclusion and poverty reduction;
- (c) stress the importance of innovation, competitiveness and growth of the economy, and the employability of workers;
 - (d) address the challenge of transforming activities in the informal economy into decent work fully integrated into mainstream economic life;
 - (e) expand public and private investment in the infrastructure needed for the use of information and communication technology (ICT), in education and training hardware and software and in the training of teachers and trainers, making use of local, national and international collaborative networks.
6. The instrument should encourage Members to:
- (a) recognize that education and training are a right for all and, in cooperation with the social partners, ensure universal access;
 - (b) define a national strategy and establish an institutional framework for the development and implementation of training policies at different levels (national, regional, local, sectoral, enterprise) that involve the social partners, promote social dialogue and specify the roles of the various parties;
 - (c) align human resources and training policies with policies aimed at creating employment opportunities (for example, through regional or industrial development);
 - (d) establish a national qualifications framework to facilitate lifelong learning, help enterprises and employment agencies to match skill demand with supply, guide individuals in their choice of training and career and facilitate the recognition of prior learning;
 - (e) develop a national training delivery system appropriate to national conditions and practices;
 - (f) assume the primary responsibility for investing in basic education and initial training;
 - (g) invest in other forms of training;
 - (h) create a general economic environment and incentives conducive to encouraging individuals and enterprises to invest individually or jointly in education and training;
 - (i) strengthen social dialogue on training at different levels (national, regional, local, sectoral, enterprise);
 - (j) undertake other activities?

IV. Implementation of training policies

7. The instrument should encourage the development, organization and maintenance of comprehensive, coordinated and flexible lifelong learning and training systems,

taking into account the primary responsibility of government for basic education and training, and the role of the social partners in further training. The systems should include: compulsory basic education, incorporating basic knowledge, literacy and numeracy skills; pre-employment learning and training; and further education and training.

8. The instrument should promote social dialogue on training as a basic principle for systems development, programme relevance, quality and cost-effectiveness and the promotion of equality of opportunity.

V. Basic education and pre-employment training

9. The instrument should encourage Members to:
 - (a) provide basic education and pre-employment training;
 - (b) improve access to basic education and pre-employment training, and equality of opportunity, to combat exclusion;
 - (c) develop approaches to non-formal basic education and pre-employment training;
 - (d) make full use of new information and communication technology in learning and training;
 - (e) ensure provision of vocational and career information and guidance.

VI. Training of employed workers

10. The instrument should encourage Members to:
 - (a) promote systematic identification of the skills needed by enterprises, individuals and the economy as a whole;
 - (b) recognize workplace learning, including formal and informal learning, and work experience;
 - (c) support initiatives by the social partners, and the role of training, in bipartite dialogue and collective agreements;
 - (d) consider initiating tripartite negotiations on training at various levels of government;
 - (e) assume primary responsibility for stimulating investment in training;
 - (f) acknowledge the role of the social partners, enterprises and the individual worker in investing in training;
 - (g) promote the expansion of workplace-based learning and training, utilizing high-performance work practices and on- and off-the-job training, with public and private providers, and making greater use of information and communication technology;

- (h) promote human resources management at enterprise level;
- (i) develop equal opportunity strategies, measures and programmes to promote and implement training for women workers, as well as for workers in small and medium-sized enterprises, the informal economy, the rural sector and self-employment;
- (j) promote career guidance for employed workers;
- (k) carry out other initiatives?

VII. Framework for recognition and certification of skills

11. The instrument should encourage Members to consider:
- (a) skills recognition and certification, including the principle that an individual's skills be recognized and certified irrespective of where such skills were obtained;
 - (b) the legal and institutional framework, the role of the social partners, sharing of responsibilities and financing of the mechanism for the recognition and certification of skills;
 - (c) the recognition of prior learning;
 - (d) other issues?

VIII. Training for decent work and social inclusion

12. The instrument should encourage Members to consider:
- (a) the primary role of government for the training of people with special needs in order to develop and enhance their employability;
 - (b) the role of the social partners in reintegrating people with special needs in the workforce;
 - (c) the involvement of the social partners, local authorities and communities in implementing programmes for people with special needs;
 - (d) the assistance to people with special needs in securing decent work.
13. The instrument should promote improved access to lifelong learning and training for all in order to prevent and combat social exclusion.
14. The instrument should encourage Members to pay particular attention to groups with special needs.

IX. Training providers

15. The instrument should encourage Members to promote the diversity of training provision and develop flexible regulatory frameworks appropriate to national con-

ditions, covering formal and informal delivery, workplace learning and training, including apprenticeship.

16. The instrument should encourage Members to:

- (a) develop a legal framework for the certification of qualifications of training providers;
- (b) identify the roles of government and the social partners in promoting the expansion and diversification of training delivery;
- (c) establish guidelines to improve quality control and evaluation of the outcomes of training.

X. Human resources development, lifelong learning and training support services

17. The instrument should provide that Members:

- (a) when organizing regular surveys of the population, collect information on educational levels, qualifications, training activities, and employment and incomes;
- (b) establish databases and quantitative and qualitative indicators on the national training system, including training at the enterprise level;
- (c) collect information on skills from a variety of sources, including longitudinal studies, not confined to traditional occupational classifications.

18. The instrument should encourage Members to promote and facilitate the development of the capacity to analyse trends in labour markets and human resources development and training.

19. The instrument should encourage Members to:

- (a) provide vocational and career information and guidance for: employability development; access to education, training and active labour market programmes; jobsearch techniques; and access to skills recognition and certification throughout life;
- (b) promote the use of information and communication technology in guidance services;
- (c) identify the roles and responsibilities of public and private employment services, the social partners and other parties.

XI. Research on human resources development and training issues

20. The instrument should encourage Members to support and facilitate research on human resources development, learning and training, including:

- (a) learning and training methodologies, including the use of information and communication technology in training;
- (b) skills recognition and qualifications frameworks;
- (c) human resources development and training policies, strategies and frameworks;
- (d) investment in training, and the effectiveness and impact of training;
- (e) identifying, measuring and forecasting the demand for skills;
- (f) other issues?

XII. Technical cooperation

21. The instrument should provide guidance on technical cooperation in human resources development and training:
- (a) to promote greater opportunities for women and men to obtain decent work;
 - (b) to promote national capacity building to reform and develop training policies and programmes, including developing the capacity for social dialogue and partnership building in training;
 - (c) to promote technical cooperation between governments, the social partners, the private sector and international organizations;
 - (d) other?