

International Labour Conference  
92nd Session 2004

---

Report IV (2A)

# Human resources development and training

Fourth item on the agenda

---

ISBN 92-2-113037-1

ISSN 0074-6681

---

*First published 2004*

---

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 RECURRING ABBREVIATIONS .....	V
INTRODUCTION .....	1
REPLIES RECEIVED AND COMMENTARIES .....	3

## LIST OF RECURRING ABBREVIATIONS

### **Employers' and workers' organizations**

Australia	ACTU	Australian Council of Trade Unions
Belgium	CNT	National Labour Council
Brazil	CNC	National Confederation of Commerce
	CUT	Single Central Organization of Workers
Canada	CEC	Canadian Employers Council
Czech Republic	KZPS	Confederation of Employers' and Entrepreneurs' Unions
	SPD	Confederation of Industry and Transport
	ČMKOS	Czech-Moravian Confederation of Trade Unions
Denmark	DA	Danish Employers' Confederation
	LO	Danish Confederation of Trade Unions
	FTF	Salaried Employees' and Civil Servants' Confederation
	AC	Danish Confederation of Professional Associations
Finland	KT	Commission for Local Authority Employers
Italy	UGL	General Union of Labour
	CGIL	Italian General Confederation of Labour
	CISL	Italian Confederation of Workers' Unions
	UIL	Italian Labour Union
Japan	JTUC-RENGO	Japanese Trade Union Confederation
New Zealand	NZCTU	New Zealand Council of Trade Unions
Netherlands	VNO-NCW	Confederation of Netherlands' Industry and Employers
Portugal	CCP	Confederation of Trade and Services of Portugal
	UGT	General Union of Workers
	CGTP-IN	General Confederation of Portuguese Workers
	CAP	Confederation of Farmers of Portugal

Spain	CEOE	Spanish Employers' Confederation
	UGT	General Union of Workers
	CCOO	Trade Union Confederation of Workers' Committees
Switzerland	UPS	Confederation of Swiss Employers
	USS/SGB	Swiss Federation of Trade Unions
Thailand	NCTL	National Congress of Thai Labour
Turkey	TÜRK-IS	Confederation of Turkish Trade Unions
United States	USCIB	United States Council for International Business
Uruguay	PIT-CNT	Inter-Trade Union Assembly-Workers' National Convention

**Other abbreviations**

HRD	Human resources development
HRDT	Human resources development and training

## INTRODUCTION

The first discussion of the question concerning human resources development and training took place at the 91st Session (2003) of the International Labour Conference. On the basis of that discussion, and in accordance with article 39 of the Standing Orders of the Conference, the International Labour Office prepared and communicated to the governments of member States the text of a proposed Recommendation concerning human resources development and training. This text was incorporated in Report IV (1).<sup>1</sup>

Governments were invited to send, after consulting the most representative employers' and workers' organizations, any amendments or comments on the text so as to reach the Office by 30 November 2003. Alternatively, they were asked to inform the Office, by the same date, whether they considered that the proposed text constituted a satisfactory basis for discussion by the Conference at its 92nd Session (2004).

At the time of drawing up this report, the Office had received replies from the governments of the following 44 member States: Australia, Belgium, Brazil, Canada, China, Costa Rica, Croatia, Czech Republic, Denmark, Dominican Republic, Egypt, El Salvador, Eritrea, Estonia, Finland, France, Germany, Greece, India, Ireland, Italy, Japan, Kuwait, Lebanon, Lithuania, Mauritius, Mexico, Morocco, New Zealand, Nicaragua, Norway, Philippines, Portugal, Singapore, Slovakia, Spain, Switzerland, Syrian Arab Republic, Thailand, Tunisia, Turkey, United Kingdom, United States, Uruguay.

In the case of 27 countries (Australia, Belgium, Brazil, Canada, China, Croatia, Czech Republic, Denmark, Dominican Republic, Eritrea, Estonia, Finland, Greece, Italy, Japan, Netherlands, New Zealand, Norway, Portugal, Slovakia, Spain, Switzerland, Syrian Arab Republic, Thailand, Turkey, United States, Uruguay), the replies of employers' and/or workers' organizations were incorporated into those of the government, appended to the government's reply, or communicated directly to the Office. Comments were also received from the European Commission and an international non-governmental organization.

To ensure that the English and French texts of the proposed Recommendation concerning human resources development and training are in the hands of the governments within the time-limit laid down in article 39, paragraph 7, of the Standing Orders of the Conference, these texts have been published in a separate volume, Report IV (2B), that has been sent to them. The present volume, Report IV (2A), which has been drawn up on the basis of the replies from governments and from employers' and workers' organizations contains the essential points of their observations. It is divided into two sections: the first comprises observations of a general nature, while the second section contains observations on the proposed Recommendation,

---

<sup>1</sup> ILO: *Human resources development and training*, Report IV (1), International Labour Conference, 92nd Session, Geneva, 2004.

with the Office commentaries on these observations. At times it has been necessary to reduce the length while retaining the substance of the comments. Most comments followed closely the structure of the text of the Recommendation and specified the parts of the text that were being referred to. Where this was not the case, the Office has, to the best of its judgment, allocated observations to appropriate parts of the report.

## **REPLIES RECEIVED AND COMMENTARIES**

The replies received with regard to the proposed Recommendation concerning human resources development and training are presented below. The replies are followed, where appropriate, by brief Office commentaries. Replies from employers' and workers' organizations have been included when they do not correspond to those submitted by the government.

The governments of the following six member States stated that they had no observations to put forward or that they had no comments other than to state that they considered that the proposed text constituted a satisfactory basis for discussion at the 92nd Session of the Conference: Croatia (including the Union of Autonomous Trade Unions of Croatia); Greece (including the National Confederation of Greek Commerce); India; Kuwait; Slovakia (including the Federation of Employers' Unions and Associations and the Confederation of Trade Unions of the Slovak Republic); and Turkey.

### **General observations**

#### **AUSTRALIA**

The state government of New South Wales indicates that the text is consistent with existing and emergent policies in human resources development and training (HRDT): specifically, support and encouragement for lifelong learning, alignment of HRDT with the strategic goals of the organization, workplace and individual, resource commitments supporting training and development of staff, support for innovation and research, integration with a national qualifications framework, development of information and communication technology supporting adult learning, involvement of stakeholder groups in planning, and commitment to ensuring access for all staff members to training and development.

The state government of Queensland notes that, while the emphasis on lifelong learning is welcome, the term is too narrowly defined. A broader approach to lifelong learning should be taken. It should include all formal and informal learning activities undertaken by individuals throughout their lives in a range of settings, rather than learning activities solely undertaken to develop competencies and qualifications (which imply only formal educational and training experiences). Linking the imperative for lifelong learning to employment objectives is a reductionist approach. The personal and social development of individuals and the benefits to society from lifelong learning should be highlighted. The text argues that members should establish a national qualifications framework to facilitate lifelong learning and to realize other objectives. The state government of Queensland supports this, but points out that there are other principal factors underpinning the establishment of the national qualifications framework that should be recognized in the text.

The text sets the objective for member countries to ensure the provision of appropriate career information and guidance services. This is an extremely ambitious and almost unattainable objective, given the rate at which new jobs are now created and the extent to which many individuals change careers regularly. A more realistic and attainable approach would be to support the development of individuals' skills in career information and guidance to enable them to access and interpret information in this area and thereby make informed career choices throughout their working lives.

Finally, the Report makes little mention of the importance of developing and implementing appropriate evaluations of education and training arrangements. Research and evaluation programmes should be developed at both the system and the local levels, and should include formative approaches. These programmes are critical for ongoing policy-making, assessing particular initiatives and guiding future implementation.

In general, the Australian Council of Trade Unions (ACTU) supports the proposed Recommendation. However, some sections need to be amended to emphasize the need for universal access to education and training to attain the increasingly advanced knowledge and skills required by the workforce and demanded of modern competitive economies. The proposed Recommendation should guarantee the right of young people to access education to obtain, as a minimum, a nationally recognized post-school education qualification, and for all workers to gain a vocational education qualification.

The proposed Recommendation should emphasize that workers should be able to access education and training to enhance not only their employability but also their personal development and the development of active citizenship, and to encourage greater cohesion in the context of increasingly mobile and multicultural societies. Particular attention should be given to the education and training needs of developing countries and to the creation of an environment conducive to universal access to the "knowledge society" by, for example, developing a post-primary school curriculum that integrates vocational education and training. This could be facilitated by debt relief for developing countries.

#### BELGIUM

The proposed Recommendation should incorporate links, where necessary, at the supranational level to provide a more comprehensive process when policy goes beyond the national level. It would be beneficial to include a section on developing a method of direct coordination at the international level. Long-term investment in knowledge must be made, with tripartite dialogue at every level. The social cohesion established by a global training and skills-development strategy is an important factor in achieving sustainability.

The National Labour Council (CNT) states its support for the proposed Recommendation, which follows a line that has been mapped out by the social partners over the past several years and encourages the participation of the social partners in policies relating to HRDT.

#### BRAZIL

The Single Central Organization of Workers (CUT) indicates that the proposed Recommendation was based on a proposal for human resources development (HRD)

as it relates to training to develop skills for employability – a set of technical skills and vocational aptitudes to ensure access to and/or allow greater stability of workers in the labour market. The proposed Recommendation falls short with regard to the economic and social conditions in developing countries. It emphasizes the need to teach people how to learn and manage their careers by developing their own skills, with little relevance to the key issues of social and human resources development, such as high illiteracy rates, the lack of public youth and adult education policies, low education levels and limited access to intermediate and higher levels of education, weak public employment and social protection policies, and the coexistence of technologically highly advanced productive systems and archaic production systems, among others.

There is the need for more precise wording on the responsibilities for financing HRDT. Given the importance of the debate on financing HRD policies, in particular education and training, the text should clarify the responsibilities of national governments and the participation of workers and employers.

#### CANADA

The Canadian Employers Council (CEC) believes that the omission of self-employment flaws the proposed Recommendation by overlooking a significant portion of the population. Self-employment is a viable employment option and should be included in this instrument.

#### DENMARK

The Danish Government agrees with the main elements and aim of the proposed Recommendation, but would prefer more general recommendations about political goals, frameworks and prioritized fields of action and less about the practical implementation into national systems. The involvement of the social partners and their important role in promoting HRD and the implementation of strategies on lifelong learning is a positive feature in the proposed Recommendation.

#### EGYPT

The proposed text constitutes a sufficient basis for the discussion of this revised standard for the following reasons: it is realistic, includes basic accepted values and concentrates on outcomes in the framework of equality between States; it includes new methods of training in order to achieve decent work and increase productivity; it encourages the application of new technology and professional merits; it promotes employability and improved labour markets, facing challenges and benefiting from opportunities in the framework of globalization; it recognizes the importance of investment in the fields of education and continuous training; it concentrates on the importance of the participation of social partners; it promotes the recognition of qualifications and certification of different skill levels universally; it recognizes the importance of coherence between national HRDT policies and other economic and social policies; it realizes that education and training contribute to achieving justice and gender equality, non-discrimination and social responsibility; and it concentrates on the importance of HRDT transforming the informal sector into the formal.

## ERITREA

Generally speaking, the proposed Recommendation is significant and indispensable for accommodating the dynamic progress of science and technology; the Recommendation can be updated from time to time as science and technology increasingly develop as a result of globalization.

## FRANCE

The text has one significant omission: namely, the notion that lifelong education and training are contributing factors to personal development, access to culture and active citizenship.

## ITALY

In general terms, there appears to be a marked tendency to focus on strategies and modalities related to the promotion of employment, but scant attention to the other key aspect of HRD – the promotion of active citizenship by helping people to acquire the knowledge, skills and capacities required to participate fully in a highly integrated and complex society. The text speaks chiefly of vocational guidance and does not place sufficient emphasis on the personal dimension. Guidance must be regarded as a service permanently accessible to all social groups at all levels, regardless of their employment situation.

The attention paid to non-formal and informal learning is limited, yet this is one of the key themes. Non-formal activities are those that take place outside mainstream education and training and that, while not leading to legally recognized certification, are formally organized for the purpose of training. These activities are provided in the workplace and through civil society organizations and groups (such as associations, trade unions and political parties). Informal learning, on the other hand, is a natural accompaniment to everyday life.

The General Union of Labour (UGL) notes that the proposed Recommendation should reflect the idea that training is not only to accelerate opportunities to enter the world of work but also to create the conditions whereby someone who loses a job can find other opportunities, or employees can update their skills and adapt to the demands of the market.

The Italian General Confederation of Labour (CGIL), the Italian Confederation of Workers' Unions (CISL) and the Italian Labour Union (UIL) emphasize the importance of the right to education and training. In particular, the right to education must be directly linked to employment and development policies, otherwise the framework of the new "knowledge economy" would not be credible.

Given the problems related to the spread of the informal sector, even in industrialized countries, training should be considered a key instrument to move from the informal to the formal economy. Paid time off for training should be guaranteed; the modalities of this could be left to collective bargaining procedures. The proposed Recommendation should recall the need for bold and substantial debt relief as the debt problem is an obstacle to investment in education and training for many developing countries.

## NORWAY

The proposed Recommendation covers the most important principles for making lifelong learning available to everyone. However, it uses the term “lifelong learning” narrowly, so that it is merely synonymous with various forms of adult education. The proposed Recommendation should clearly state that the purpose of lifelong learning goes beyond the economic aspects to affect areas such as the development of democracy, particularly with regard to developing countries.

## PORTUGAL

The Confederation of Trade and Services of Portugal (CCP) stated, in a previous document, that it would like the proposed Recommendation concerning human resources development and training to address the following matters: the linkage between education, training and employment policies, in order to adapt skills to the evolving demands of the labour market; a balanced approach to the question of productivity and competitiveness of enterprises and the question of workers’ “personal job satisfaction”; references to basic skills in the area of employability, as well as the need to implement systems for the recognition, validation and certification of skills acquired by non-formal means; references to the importance of modernizing labour, in the light of requirements and conditions of work; a clear definition of the division of responsibilities between the various parties involved, including the role of the social partners and workers’ personal responsibility in relation to the creation of conditions for their employability; references to the importance of information and communication technology; references to the need to develop effective methodologies for analysing future employment trends, the need for a linkage with premature school leaving and a better division of responsibilities between the public employment services, schools and vocational training centres; references to the need to create support services for all employees and the reintegration of women who have left the labour market for a period following maternity; and references to migrant workers, in particular, language learning. The text presented covers all these points and, therefore, is a sufficient and appropriate basis for discussion at the 92nd Session of the International Labour Conference.

## SWITZERLAND

The Swiss Federation of Trade Unions (USS/SGB) expresses overall satisfaction with the proposed text adopted at the 91st Session of the International Labour Conference in 2003. Very progressive wording has been used and a clear connection between HRD and globalization, rights in the broader sense of the term (the right to education and training as well as the right to work), the first definition of the concept of “employability” and the importance of a tripartite infrastructure for social dialogue have been established. It is important to give greater weight to the following issues: paid leave (both time and cost could be significant hindrances to training); free and substantial debt relief (to allow developing countries to invest in education and training); training as a means of transferring from the informal economy to the formal economy; and collective agreements as a means of achieving goals.

## UNITED KINGDOM

There is a need to look more closely at how the proposed text attempts to reflect and balance rights and responsibilities. Any successful HRD strategy will bring enormous economic and social benefits to the country as a whole, to employers and to individuals. It should follow, therefore, that while employers and individuals should be able to expect governments to accept and meet certain rights, employers need to articulate their skills needs and invest in training their workforce, and individuals have a responsibility to take ownership of, and invest in, their own futures. Clearly the social partners have a key role to play in the development and implementation of HRD policy, but this is not the only model. The proposed Recommendation would be further strengthened if reference were made to the involvement of the wide range of other important stakeholders, such as education and HRD experts and training providers. There is a need to strengthen the arguments about recognizing and adapting HRDT to local demand (national, community, organizational and individual) in the text. Much of the current text focuses on supply mechanisms.

## OFFICE COMMENTARY

The overwhelming majority of respondents indicated that the text of the proposed Recommendation was a satisfactory basis for discussion at the 92nd Session of the International Labour Conference. General support was expressed for the role of the social partners and tripartite dialogue in this instrument. Concern was raised by a few respondents with regard to the narrow focus of lifelong learning and the focus on skills for employability, while excluding skills for active citizenship.

**Observations on the general comment<sup>2</sup>**

*Australia.* Agrees with the importance of consistent treatment of “pre-employment training” and that there is a need to define such terms adequately to avoid confusion. In respect of “social partners”, the nuances of the terms typically reflect different forms of interaction and, therefore, this is not an overriding concern.

*ACTU.* Suggests the possible consolidation of the terms “in cooperation with the social partners”, “with the involvement of the social partners”, and “in consultation with the social partners” and suggests “in consultation with the social partners”. This wording emphasizes the importance of the social partners in HRDT.

*Brazil.* Suggests replacing “human resources development” with “training” throughout the text. Recommends “... the participation of the social partners, ensuring tripartite dialogue” for references to the involvement of the social partners.

*Canada.* The current text is too long and repetitive; it should be shorter and more focused. For example, the reference to information and communication technology is

<sup>2</sup> The general comment is set out in ILO: *Human resources development and training*, Report IV (1), op. cit.

cited in several subparagraphs (4(e), 20(a) and (b)), subparagraphs 5(e) and (m) repeat each other, and unemployed workers are needlessly mentioned in both Parts IV and VI.

*Costa Rica.* The word “involvement” is more specific and binding than “cooperation” and “consultation”. Given the purpose of the ILO and of the proposed Recommendation, it would be preferable to use “with the involvement of the social partners” throughout.

*Czech Republic.* The phrases “in cooperation with the social partners” and “with the involvement of the social partners” have similar meanings, so, for clarity, use one, preferably the former. Retain “in consultation with the social partners” in all other formulations.

Confederation of Employers’ and Entrepreneurs’ Unions (KZPS). Recommends “in consultation with the social partners” when referring to tripartite dialogue with the aim of reaching an agreement; and “in cooperation with the social partners” when cooperation is needed in the process of elaborating materials, proposals and decisions.

Confederation of Industry and Transport (SPD). Recommends “in cooperation with the social partners” when active participation of the social partners is presumed; and “in consultation with the social partners” to refer to the process of information sharing and consultation only.

Czech-Moravian Confederation of Trade Unions (ČMKOS). Recommends “in cooperation with the social partners” only.

*Denmark.* With regard to the expressions “in cooperation with the social partners”, “with the involvement of the social partners”, and “in consultation with the social partners”, the use of the different terms depends on the context; their use in the text seems correct. Generally, the expression “in cooperation with” is preferred as this does not place responsibility with the government or parties beforehand.

*Finland.* Efforts should be made to clarify the text and avoid repetition. Definitions that are too concise might narrow the scope of application, and an “over-extensive” Recommendation does not add to its applicability. Regarding the use of the terms “in cooperation with social partners”, “with the involvement of the social partners”, and “in consultation with the social partners”, it is preferable to opt for one term.

*France.* Suggests to standardize the text by using “lifelong education and training” as a generic term. The term “investments” is ambiguous and could give rise to misunderstandings. The expressions “in cooperation with the social partners” and “with the involvement of the social partners” mean the same thing and imply participation, whereas “in consultation with the social partners” carries a less “strong” meaning: namely, that the social partners simply give their opinion.

*Italy.* CGIL, CISL, UIL. All the expressions regarding the involvement of the social partners are compatible and unambiguous; the different wording depends on national experience.

*Japan.* With regard to repetition and duplication, clarification is needed on the use of the word “education” in various paragraphs (Paragraph 1 refers to “human resources development, education and training”; subparagraphs 4(e) and (f), 5(a), (e) and (j) and Paragraph 6 refer to “education and training”; subparagraphs 5(b) and (g)

refer to “education”; subparagraph 5(m) refers to “training and development”; Paragraph 7 refers to “training”; Paragraph 9 refers to “education and pre-employment training”). Clarification is needed on the subject of implementation in Paragraphs 8, 12, 13 and 15 (i.e. ILO or ILO member States). Emphasis is placed on the use of information and communication technology in subparagraphs 4(e), 9(c), 10(e) and 20(b). These should be accompanied by the phrase “considering the conditions of each country”.

Japanese Trade Union Confederation (JTUC-RENGO). The expressions “in cooperation with the social partners”, “in consultation with the social partners”, and “with the involvement of the social partners” are compatible. To avoid any misunderstandings, the International Labour Conference should ensure consistency throughout its discussions.

*Lebanon.* Agrees that there is a degree of repetition in the text. It would be better to use “in consultation with the social partners” throughout.

*Morocco.* Suggests to retain the expression “in consultation with the social partners”.

*New Zealand.* Prefers “in consultation with the social partners”, which recognizes the critical importance of the social partners in HRDT.

New Zealand Council of Trade Unions (NZCTU). While “in consultation” is not completely satisfactory, it is easily the best of the three expressions. For consistency, whenever the other phrases are used, they should be changed to “in consultation”.

*Norway.* The reference to dialogue with the social partners should also include other organizations and interested parties in order to ensure the development of competencies within sectors that do not follow traditional organizational patterns. (This comment is from the Government and is not fully supported by the social partners.)

*Portugal.* There is a need for harmonization of the expressions used so that there is no duplication or ambiguity in the text. Wherever reference is made to the participation of the social partners, the expression “with the involvement of the social partners” should be used.

*Spain.* Trade Union Confederation of Workers’ Committees (CCOO). The use of one formulation or another (“cooperation”, “involvement”, “consultation”) corresponds to the relevance that one wishes to attribute to the commitment of the social partners. “Consultation” and “involvement” are used in policies and institutions of differing significance. The second formulation demands greater commitment on the part of both the administrations and the social partners themselves.

*Switzerland.* The current draft is far too long and complicated; removing the repetitions would shorten the text and make it more readable. It is reasonable to employ numerous terms to refer to the involvement of the social partners, as they reflect the particular context.

USS/SGB. The phrases “in cooperation with the social partners”, “with the involvement of the social partners”, and “in consultation with the social partners” are mutually compatible and unambiguous.

*Thailand.* Prefers the word “participation” rather than “involvement”, “consultation” or “cooperation”.

*United Kingdom.* In relation to the terminology used to refer to the social partners, use the same formulation throughout. However, “in cooperation with” and “involvement with” have different meanings to “in consultation with”; therefore, a discussion is needed to reach consensus. There are sections of the draft that are not easy to understand and could benefit from being redrafted (subparagraph 5(c) is just one example).

*United States.* Recommends that, where possible, repeated items are deleted. It supports the use of the formula “with the involvement of the social partners” because it is the least restrictive formula of the three that currently appear.

*Uruguay.* Agrees that the use of similar expressions may lead to confusion, ambiguity or digressions that are difficult to interpret, and that such terms should be standardized. In particular, the expressions “in cooperation with”, “with the involvement of”, and “in consultation with” should be standardized using the expression “in consultation with”, given that consultation is a form of collaboration and involvement. As regards the issue of with whom the consultations should be conducted, in keeping with tradition, and in accordance with the composition and competence of the ILO, consultations should be conducted with employers’ and workers’ organizations instead of the “social partners”.

Inter-Trade Union Assembly-Workers’ National Convention (PIT-CNT). The wording of the text is ambiguous when referring to the participation of the social partners and government responsibilities. For example, on some occasions reference is made to social dialogue (Paragraph 7 and subparagraph 5(i)), tripartite dialogue (Paragraph 11), involvement (subparagraphs 5(b), 10(a) and 10(d)), consultation (Paragraphs 12 and 21 and subparagraph 20(c)), collective bargaining (subparagraph 10(c)), recognizing the role of the social partners (subparagraphs 10(j) and 14(b)), and the establishment of a guiding framework (subparagraph 5(c)). For key aspects, terms such as the following should be used: “promote social dialogue” (instead of “strengthen” in subparagraph 5(i) and “consider” in Paragraph 11); “establish a tripartite institutional framework” (instead of “a guiding framework”, which does not have a specific meaning, in subparagraph 5(c)); “encourage effective participation” (instead of “the enhancement of social dialogue” in Paragraph 7); “promote collective bargaining in training and human resources development, including career development” (in subparagraph 10(c)); and “participation” (instead of “consultation” in Paragraph 12).

### *Office commentary*

A number of respondents acknowledged the duplication and repetition in the text; several suggested numerous edits to various paragraphs in an attempt to address this concern.

The Drafting Committee has made further minor changes to the text in order to rectify the concerns, to add clarity, to improve readability and/or to align the French and English versions of the text.

In addressing the Legal Adviser’s comments on the various references to the involvement of the social partners, some agreed it was problematic, but there was no consistency in the solutions proposed. Other respondents felt that the different terminology used reflected different forms of interaction and was, therefore, appropriate.

The Drafting Committee has noted a discrepancy between the word “consultation” in English and its French translation “*concertation*”. The meaning of the French expression does not correspond exactly to the English text. Given that the word “*concertation*” in the French text was specifically requested during the discussions at the 2003 session of the International Labour Conference, the Drafting Committee decided not to change the text but to bring this discrepancy to the attention of the International Labour Conference.

### **Observations on the proposed Recommendation concerning human resources development and training<sup>3</sup>**

The General Conference of the International Labour Organization,

Having been convened at Geneva by the Governing Body of the International Labour Office, and having met in its 92nd Session on June 2004, and

Recognizing that education, training and lifelong learning contribute significantly to promoting the interests of people, enterprises, the economy and society as a whole, especially considering the critical challenge of attaining full employment, social inclusivity and sustained economic growth in the global economy, and

Calling on governments, employers and workers to renew their commitment to lifelong learning: governments by investing to enhance education and training at all levels; the private sector by training employees; and individuals by making use of the education, training and lifelong-learning opportunities, and

Recognizing that education, training and lifelong learning are fundamental, but by themselves insufficient, to ensure sustainable economic and social development and that they should therefore be consistent with, and form an integral part of, comprehensive economic, social and labour market policies and programmes, and

Recognizing also the need for consistency between human resources development policy and other policies important for economic growth and employment creation, such as economic, fiscal and social policies, and

Recognizing that many developing countries need support in the design, funding and implementation of modern education and training policies to attain development and economic growth, and

Recalling that the realization of decent work for workers everywhere is a primary objective of the International Labour Organization, and

Noting the rights and principles embodied in the relevant ILO instruments, and in particular:

- (a) the Human Resources Development Convention, 1975; the Employment Policy Convention and Recommendation, 1964; and the Paid Educational Leave Convention, 1974;
- (b) the ILO Declaration on Fundamental Principles and Rights at Work and its Follow-up;
- (c) the Tripartite Declaration of Principles concerning Multinational Enterprises and Social Policy;

---

<sup>3</sup> The observations are preceded by the relevant texts of the proposed Recommendation set out in Report IV (1).

(d) the Conclusions concerning human resources training and development, adopted at the 88th Session (2000) of the International Labour Conference, and

Having decided upon the adoption of certain proposals with regard to human resources development and training, which is the fourth item on the agenda of the session, and

Having determined that these proposals shall take the form of a Recommendation;

adopts this day of June of the year two thousand and four the following Recommendation, which may be cited as the Human Resources Development and Training Recommendation, 2004.

### *Observations on the Preamble*

*Australia.* State government of Queensland. The meaning of “decent work” and “decent jobs” needs to be clarified; a definition should be included in the list of definitions. This could reflect the sentiments in the resolution concerning decent work and the informal economy: that all workers, irrespective of employment status and place of work, should be able to enjoy, exercise and defend their rights as provided for in the ILO Declaration on Fundamental Principles and Rights at Work and its Follow-up and the core labour standards. The Office proposal to add accompanying Recommendations is acceptable.

ACTU. The Conclusions of the 88th Session of the International Labour Conference in 2000 outlined the growth in demand for HRDT and stated that “Education and training are a right for all. Governments, in cooperation with the social partners, should ensure that this right is universally accessible.” This sentence should be included in the Preamble along with wording to reinforce the fact that governments need to “recognize the critical challenges faced by human society in attaining full employment, social inclusiveness, sustained economic growth, together with reaffirmation of the role of education and training in combating discrimination and in promoting social justice and workers’ rights”.

The Preamble should also reaffirm the “right to education and training and to free, universal, quality, public ... education for all children”, which was explicitly endorsed at the 88th Session of the International Labour Conference in 2000 and reaffirmed by the United Nations in adopting the achievement of universal primary education by 2015 as one of the Millennium Development Goals. Children are an important human resource in all societies and should be appropriately recognized in the proposed Recommendation.

*Belgium.* CNT. Retain “in terms of both its quantity and quality”; include relevant Recommendations.

*Brazil.* Retain “in terms of both its quantity and quality”; include relevant Recommendations. Insert an introductory paragraph to the Preamble as follows: “Recognizing that education, training and decent work are rights that must be guaranteed for every individual”. Replace paragraph 1 of the Preamble with “Recognizing that education, training and lifelong learning are strategic policies to further the sustainable development of countries by contributing significantly to promoting the interests of people, enterprises, the economy and society as a whole, especially considering the fundamental importance of achieving full employment, social inclusion and income management in a global village economy”. Amend paragraph 2 to read “Recognizing

the need for governments, employers and workers to meet the joint commitment to lifelong education and training: governments by investing resources to guarantee constant access to education and training at all levels; employers and representative workers' organizations by providing the means to reinforce workers' supplementary training that would be specific to sectors of production; and individuals by taking advantage of opportunities offered by the government, employers and representative workers' organizations with regard to lifelong training and education". Amend paragraph 5 by replacing "modern" with "appropriate". Add a further subparagraph (e) to paragraph 7, "the rights recognized in the Universal Declaration of Human Rights (1948), the International Covenant on Civil and Political Rights (1966) and the International Covenant on Economic, Social and Cultural Rights (1966)".

*National Confederation of Commerce (CNC).* Agrees with both suggestions of the Office.

*Canada.* Agrees with both suggestions of the Office; notes that instruments usually refer to Conventions and Recommendations, not Declarations and Conclusions.

*CEC.* The notion that an individual needs to invest in his or her learning is not explicit – it is couched in vague terms such as "... individuals in developing their own abilities and careers" Part I, Paragraph 2). Employers believe there has to be a commitment by individuals to invest in their development, especially if it is explicit that governments are responsible for basic education and pre-employment training, and employers need to invest in their employees. What is meant by education and training and who pays for it must be clarified. Employers believe that it means basic education and pre-employment training, which is paid for by the government. Education and training does not include free college/university education nor does it include anything more than pre-employment training. Employers train their employees on an "as required" basis to develop skills and competencies to remain competitive.

*Costa Rica.* Agrees with both suggestions of the Office.

*Czech Republic.* Agrees with both suggestions of the Office.

*Denmark.* Danish Confederation of Trade Unions (LO), Danish Confederation of Professional Associations (AC) and Salaried Employees' and Civil Servants' Confederation (FTF). Retain the phrase "in terms of both its quantity and quality". The Office suggestion to add the relevant Recommendations is acceptable.

*Dominican Republic.* The reference to paid educational leave should be deleted, as this would mean high costs for employers.

*El Salvador.* Agrees with both suggestions of the Office.

*Eritrea.* Agrees with the suggestion of the Office to add the relevant Recommendations. Suggests revising paragraph 3 of the Preamble to read: "... social and labour market policies, plans and programmes, and ...". In paragraph 5, add "sustained" before "development".

*Finland.* Agrees with the suggestions of the Office to delete "in terms of both its quantity and quality" as this is implicit in "decent work", and to add the Employment Policy (Supplementary Provisions) Recommendation, 1984 (No. 169), and the Paid Educational Leave Recommendation, 1974 (No. 148).

*France.* Proposes replacing “Recognizing that education, training and lifelong learning ...” with the generic formula “Recognizing that lifelong education and training ...”; and that “governments” be replaced by “public authorities” because, in many countries, the central or federal government is not the only body responsible for training. Replace “Recognizing also the need for consistency between human resources development policy and other policies ...” with “Recognizing that lifelong education and training should form a consistent and integral part of human resources development policy and other policies ...”. In the phrase “modern education and training policies”, the adjective “modern” is rather outdated and should be replaced with “innovative”. Agrees with the suggestion of the Office to remove “in terms of both its quantity and quality”.

*Germany.* Agrees to add the accompanying Recommendations.

*Italy.* CGIL, CISL, UIL. Maintain the expression “in terms of both its quantity and quality”, as the added value of this instrument is exactly in enhancing the quality of jobs. Agree with the suggestion of the Office to include the relevant Recommendations.

*Japan.* Japan Business Federation. The Preamble is lengthy and redundant. It should be shortened, while retaining the ideas. The Recommendation should be completely independent and not linked to the Human Resources Development Convention, 1975 (No. 142). Individual commitments should be proactive and should not be limited to making use of the opportunities for education, training and lifelong learning. Therefore, the phrase “making use of the education, training and lifelong-learning opportunities” should be replaced with “by developing their own abilities and careers”, which is consistent with the wording in Paragraph 2. The reference to the Employment Policy Convention, 1964 (No. 122), and its Recommendation (No. 122), and the Paid Educational Leave Convention, 1974 (No. 140), should be deleted, because the former is outdated and the latter is ratified by very few member States.

*JTUC-RENGO.* The expression “in terms of both its quantity and quality” should be retained, as the added value of this instrument is in enhancing the quality of jobs. Include the relevant Recommendations.

*Lebanon.* Reword paragraph 1 of the Preamble to read: “Recognizing that education, training, orientation and lifelong learning contribute significantly to promoting the interests of people, enterprises, the economy and society as a whole, especially considering the critical challenge of attaining full and productive employment, social inclusivity and sustained economic growth in the global economy”. Reword paragraph 2 of the Preamble to read: “... governments and, to the extent possible, the private sector by investing to enhance education and training at all levels; the governments and private sector by training employees or functionaries, each in his or her field; and individuals by making use of the education, training, vocational orientation and lifelong-learning opportunities”. Add the expression “vocational orientation” after the word “training” in paragraph 3.

*Lithuania.* Agrees with both suggestions of the Office.

*Mauritius.* Agrees with both suggestions of the Office.

*Mexico.* Agrees with both suggestions of the Office.

*Netherlands.* Confederation of Netherlands' Industry and Employers (VNO-NCW). The rewording of the text, "and individuals by making use of the education, training and lifelong-learning opportunities", is more restrictive than the text that was adopted in June, "and by individuals, making use of the opportunities". New opportunities such as access to the Internet and assessment and recognition of prior learning are as important as traditional opportunities. Prefers the text of paragraph 2: "and by individuals in developing their own abilities and careers", which is much more proactive and reflects individuals' responsibility. Delete the references to the Employment Policy Convention, 1964 (No. 122), and its Recommendation (No. 122), because they are outdated, and to the Paid Educational Leave Convention, 1974 (No. 140), because very few member States have ratified this Convention.

*New Zealand.* Agrees with both suggestions of the Office.

*Nicaragua.* Agrees with both suggestions of the Office.

*Philippines.* Agrees with both suggestions of the Office.

*Portugal.* Agrees that the expression "in terms of both its quantity and quality" is implicit in "decent work", but keeping this in the text could strengthen the notion. The corresponding Recommendations should appear in the text. The expression "governments by investing to enhance education and training at all levels" needs to be clarified.

CCP. It was decided at the 91st Session of the International Labour Conference that the Preamble should not be too long and the references to ILO instruments were, therefore, limited. However, if that puts the harmonization of procedures used in the ILO at risk, the inclusion of the Recommendations is not opposed.

*Spain.* Regarding the definition of "decent work", it is advisable and relevant to clarify as follows: "according to the ILO Declaration on Fundamental Principles and Rights at Work and its Follow-up, which is cited below". Include the corresponding Recommendations, as well as the texts of other international organizations that champion social dialogue.

CCOO. Include the corresponding Recommendations.

*Switzerland.* The Preamble is already long enough; the proposal of the Office to include the Recommendations accompanying the Conventions cited should be abandoned. The phrase "in terms of both its quantity and quality" should be deleted.

Confederation of Swiss Employers (UPS). Paragraph 2 of the Preamble should be reworded to read "... and individuals by developing their own abilities and careers" in keeping with the wording used in Paragraph 2 of Part I. As regards reference to the relevant ILO instruments in the Preamble, this should be limited to the Human Resources Development Convention, 1975 (No. 142); references to the Employment Policy Convention, 1964 (No. 122), and its Recommendation (No. 122), and the Paid Educational Leave Convention, 1974 (No. 140) should be deleted.

USS/SGB. The phrase "in terms of both its quantity and quality" should be retained, given that the value added of this instrument is quite specifically the promotion of job quality. The accompanying Recommendations should be included.

*Syrian Arab Republic.* Agrees with both suggestions of the Office.

*Thailand.* Agrees with both suggestions of the Office.

*Tunisia.* Agrees with both suggestions of the Office.

*Turkey.* Confederation of Turkish Trade Unions (TÜRK-İS). Agrees with both suggestions of the Office.

*United Kingdom.* Supports the suggestions of the Office to delete “in terms of both its quantity and quality” and the addition of the relevant Recommendations. Suggests rewording of paragraphs in the Preamble as follows: “Recognizing that education, training and lifelong learning contribute significantly to promoting the interests of the economy and enterprises, as well as individuals and society as a whole, especially considering the critical challenge of attaining full employment, social inclusivity and sustained economic growth in the global economy”, and “Calling on governments, employers and workers to renew their commitment to lifelong learning; governments by investing to enhance education and training at all levels; the private and public sector by training employees; and individuals by making use of the education, training and lifelong-learning opportunities”.

*United States.* Agrees with both suggestions of the Office.

United States Council for International Business (USCIB). The Preamble is too lengthy and does not give focus to the proposed Recommendation. In particular, it should not include areas that encompass matters that are outside of HRDT, or are outdated. Although the Employment Policy Convention, 1964 (No. 122), is a priority Convention, it does not encompass HRDT. Similarly, the Employment Policy Recommendation, 1964 (No. 122), contains 40-year-old, outdated, general recommendations that detract from the focused and modern proposed Recommendation concerning human resources development and training that will be finalized in 2004. Reference to Convention No. 122 and Recommendation No. 122 should be deleted from the Preamble. The Paid Educational Leave Convention, 1974 (No. 140), has very few ratifications 30 years after its adoption. The lack of ratifications highlights its lack of policy relevance; therefore, it should be deleted from the Preamble. The 1998 ILO Declaration on Fundamental Principles and Rights at Work and its Follow-up relates to worker rights in a country and not the fundamentals of HRDT; it should be deleted from the Preamble. The principal focus of the Tripartite Declaration of Principles concerning Multinational Enterprises and Social Policy is to assure that multinational company practice is aligned to the policies of the country in which they operate. As multinationals account for less than 25 per cent of the world’s economy, the Tripartite Declaration has limited applicability to the proposed Recommendation, particularly considering that it has only four general paragraphs relating to training; it should be deleted from the Preamble. An outstanding issue is the relationship of the proposed Recommendation to the Human Resources Development Convention, 1975 (No. 142). Convention No. 142 has been ratified by one-third of the ILO member States. As early as 1991, the Committee of Experts on the Application of Conventions and Recommendations noted, with concern, that the implementation of the objectives of Convention No. 142 faced considerable obstacles in several countries. In view of these circumstances, the proposed Recommendation should be independent of the Convention.

*Uruguay.* Agrees with both suggestions of the Office.

PIT-CNT. The right to education and training should be a prevalent feature of the document and, therefore, should be referred to in the Preamble and Paragraph 1 of

Part I rather than in subparagraph 5(a). This should be the starting point for the rest of the instrument.

### *Office commentary*

The majority of respondents agreed with the suggestion of the Office to delete the phrase “in terms of both its quantity and quality” as the phrase was implicit in “decent work”. A few stated that, although the term was implicit, it would not hurt to include it to reinforce the message. Other respondents preferred to retain the original phrase.

The majority of respondents agreed to the inclusion of the Recommendations that accompany the international labour Conventions in the Preamble, as this is ILO standard practice with regard to instruments. A few felt that the list of ILO instruments was already too long and that the inclusion of further instruments complicated this problem, while others objected to the inclusion of Conventions (and accompanying Recommendations) that they felt were outdated (the Employment Policy Convention, 1964 (No. 122), and its Recommendation (No. 122)) or that few countries had ratified (the Paid Educational Leave Convention, 1974 (No. 140), and its Recommendation (No. 148)). The Recommendations have been included in the text, in line with ILO practice and the support of the majority of respondents. Some sentences have also been reworded to improve clarity.

The Preamble, as amended, appears as the Preamble of the proposed Recommendation.

## I. OBJECTIVE, SCOPE AND DEFINITIONS

### *General observations on Part I*

*France.* The expression “objective, scope and definitions” does not refer to “information and guidance”, which is what is meant by the “support services” referred to in the title of Part VIII. These measures are more than support services – they form an integral and significant part of training policy and, therefore, they should be integrated into Part I.

1. Members should formulate, apply and review national human resources development and education and training policies which are consistent with, and complementary to, other economic and social policies, based on social dialogue, and which reflect the different roles of government and the social partners.

### *Observations on Paragraph 1*

*Australia.* The full wording “consistent with, and complementary to,” is preferred; the words “and complementary to”, recognize the complementary or supportive nature of human resource policies in the overall policy mix.

*Belgium.* Does not oppose the amendment.

CNT. Retain the original text.

*Brazil.* Redraft to read as follows: “Members should formulate, apply and review national policies that guarantee the right to education and training for all individuals and ensure that such policies are compatible with, and complementary to, other policies adopted in the social and economic sectors, and that they are based on social dialogue and take into account the various duties incumbent upon the Government and the social partners in order to achieve sustainable development.”

*Costa Rica.* Retain the original text.

*Canada.* Retain the original text.

CEC. Agrees with the suggestion of the Office.

*Czech Republic.* Delete “and complementary to”.

SPD. Retain “and complementary to” as it implies a qualitatively new relationship between HRD principles and other policies.

*Denmark.* Agrees with the suggestion of the Office.

*Egypt.* Retain the original text, which is clearer.

*El Salvador.* Delete “and complementary to”.

*Eritrea.* Delete “and complementary to”.

*Finland.* The suggestion to delete “and complementary to” is acceptable.

*France.* The proposed Recommendation deals with HRD in the particular context of education and training. It would be clearer if the phrase were to refer to “policies for human resources development through education and training”.

*Germany.* Retain “and complementary to”.

*Ireland.* Delete “and complementary to”.

*Italy.* CGIL, CISL, UIL. Do not agree with the suggestion of the Office; if “and complementary to” is deleted, the text, in our opinion, is less clear.

*Japan.* Japan Business Federation. As participation of the social partners is very important for HRD, “in cooperation with the social partners” should be added after “Members should”.

JTUC-RENGO. Retain the original text.

*Lebanon.* Retain the original text.

*Lithuania.* Agrees with the suggestion of the Office.

*Mauritius.* Retain “and complementary to” as it enhances the important link between national HRDT policies and other national policies.

*Mexico.* Retain the original text.

*Netherlands.* VNO-NCW. Proposes to add “Members should, in cooperation with the social partners, formulate ...”; retain “and complementary to”.

*New Zealand.* Retain “and complementary to”. It would be appropriate to include “and other interested parties” at the end of this Paragraph, as the government and the social partners are not the only players in HRDT; it is important to recognize other parties, such as education and training providers.

NZCTU. Does not support the Government's suggestion to include "other interested parties", which gives equal credence to other agencies (i.e. the private sector). It may be appropriate to seek comment from other agencies, such as private training establishments, but not to the extent of consultation.

*Nicaragua.* Delete "and complementary to".

*Philippines.* Retain "and complementary to".

*Portugal.* Retain "consistent with, and complementary to,", as they reflect different ideas. Suggests that "enterprises and individuals" be added to the end of the Paragraph.

CCP. The expression "consistent with" is appropriate.

General Confederation of Portuguese Workers (CGPT-IN). Delete "and complementary to".

*Spain.* Retain the expression "and complementary to". However, if it is believed to cause confusion, agrees to delete the expression, in the interests of greater clarity.

CCOO. The expression "consistent with" is sufficient.

*Switzerland.* Agrees with the Office's proposal to delete the phrase "and complementary to".

UPS. Suggests that "in collaboration with the social partners" be added to the first line after the word "should". The phrase "and complementary to" should remain in the text.

USS/SGB. Retain the original text.

*Syrian Arab Republic.* Retain "consistent with, and complementary to,".

*Thailand.* Delete "and complementary to".

National Congress of Thai Labour (NCLT). Retain the original text.

*Tunisia.* Delete "and complementary to".

*Turkey.* TÜRK-IS. Retain the original text.

*United Kingdom.* Supports the deletion of "and complementary to" for the sake of brevity as much as clarity.

*United States.* Delete "and complementary to".

*Uruguay.* The deletion of "and complementary to" would neither clarify nor obscure the meaning of the Paragraph. However, since the issue is debatable, we would suggest keeping this part of the text to show that national HRD and education and training policies are complementary to the broad spectrum of economic and social policies.

### *Office commentary*

Approximately the same number of respondents indicated that "consistent with, and complementary to," should be retained as indicated that "and complementary to" should be deleted. A variety of explanations were provided to support each respondent's preference. Owing to the nature of the responses and the lack of consensus, the original text has been retained.

Paragraph 1, without amendment, appears as Paragraph 1 of the proposed Recommendation.

2. The realization of lifelong learning should be based on the explicit commitment: by governments to invest in enhancing education and training at all levels; by the private sector in training employees; and by individuals in developing their own abilities and careers.

### *Observations on Paragraph 2*

*Brazil.* Redraft to read: “Education, training and skills certification policies should be implemented through nationwide state systems based on tripartism and should have the specific commitment: of governments, in guaranteeing the right to education, training and certification at all levels and investing in improvements to those areas; of employers, representative workers’ organizations and training establishments, in providing people with supplementary and specific skills; and of individuals, in taking advantage of the opportunities offered.”

*France.* This Paragraph makes too sharp a distinction between the different players in education and training. The word “commitment” is sufficient; remove the word “explicit”, which is unsuitable with regard to employees. Replace “by the private sector in training employees” with “by businesses in training their employees”. Regarding the phrase “by individuals in developing their own abilities and careers”, the word “abilities” is unsuitable and too restrictive; the word “skills” would be more suitable. Reword to read: “commitment: ... by individuals in taking opportunities to develop their skills and qualifications”. If this proposal is not accepted, then replace “abilities and careers” with “skills and career paths”.

*Lebanon.* Questions whether the private sector has a role to play in investment to enhance education and training.

*Portugal.* This Paragraph, like the Preamble, speaks of the responsibility of governments to invest in enhancing education and training at all levels. Governments are responsible for establishing conditions favourable to investment in education and training for all (equality of access), but as regards investment, their responsibility is more concerned with basic education (compulsory basic education) and initial training of certain specific groups (e.g. disabled persons, long-term unemployed). This statement should, therefore, be clarified.

*United Kingdom.* Suggests rewording as follows: “Lifelong learning will become a reality if it has the commitment of governments to invest in enhancing education and training at all levels; of the private and public sector in training employees; and of individuals in developing their own abilities and careers.”

### *Office commentary*

The Drafting Committee noted that the expression “the private sector” was unclear. This has been replaced by the word “enterprises”.

Paragraph 2, as amended, appears as Paragraph 2 of the proposed Recommendation.

3. For the purpose of this Recommendation:

- (a) the term “lifelong learning” encompasses all learning activities undertaken throughout life for the development of competencies and qualifications;
- (b) the term “competencies” covers the knowledge, skills and know-how applied and mastered in a specific context;
- (c) the term “qualifications” means a formal expression of the vocational or professional abilities of a worker which is recognized at international, national or sectoral level; and
- (d) the term “employability” relates to portable competencies and qualifications that enhance an individual’s capacity to make use of the education and training opportunities available in order to secure and retain decent work, progress within the enterprise and between jobs and cope with changes in technology and labour market conditions.

### *Observations on Paragraph 3*

*Australia.* Subparagraph 3(c): The word “sectoral” in the definition of “qualifications” is vague; the term “industry” is preferable. Subparagraph 3(d): The proposed change is a textual improvement, albeit marginal.

ACTU. Subparagraph 3(d): Retain the original text.

*Belgium.* Subparagraph 3(d): Retain the original text.

Government of Flanders. Subparagraph 3(b): The definition of “competencies” should include “attitude”; as skills are encompassed under competencies, there should be no duplication of these terms (see, for example, the title of Part IV). Subparagraph 3(c): The same comments on 3(b) can be applied to “qualifications”; suggests replacing “worker” with “individual”.

*Brazil.* Add the following and renumber subsequent subparagraphs: “in drawing up policies, Members should take account of the fact that qualifying presupposes a social relationship which, as it involves work and education, has a bearing on people’s ability to gain access to and retain employment, on job classification, on workers’ independence, on remuneration, on the definition of skills, and on other conditions of work”. Subparagraphs 3(b) and (c) could be placed in reverse order. Subparagraph 3(d): Add the following: “employability is not solely the responsibility of the individual but the result attained once the commitments mentioned in Paragraph 2 have been fulfilled”.

*Canada.* Subparagraph 3(d): Agrees with the suggestion of the Office.

*China.* Suggests adding the concept of “the ability of business creation” (entrepreneurship), as the encouragement of the independent creation of business is actively promoted by government, and business creation has become a major trend in today’s social development.

*Costa Rica.* Subparagraph 3(d): Retain the original text.

*Czech Republic.* KZPS. Subparagraph 3(d): Proposes to delete “and between jobs”.

SPD. Subparagraph 3(d): Retain the original text.

ČMKOS. Subparagraph 3(d): Agrees with the suggestion of the Office.

*Denmark.* Subparagraph 3(d): Agrees with the suggestion of the Office.

Danish Employers' Confederation (DA). Subparagraph 3(d): Prefers the original text.

*Egypt*. Subparagraph 3(d): The sentence "in order to secure ... progress within enterprises and between jobs" should be replaced by "in order to secure ... progress within and between enterprises".

*El Salvador*. Subparagraph 3(d): Agrees with the suggestion of the Office.

*Eritrea*. Subparagraph 3(d): Agrees with the suggestion of the Office.

*Finland*. Subparagraph 3(d): The suggestion to add "and between enterprises" is acceptable, but retain "and between jobs". The definition of the term "employability" lacks all reference to an individual's social abilities/potential or adaptability and personality.

Paragraph 3 does not refer to the term "skills", which should probably also be considered in the definitions.

*Ireland*. Subparagraph 3(d): The text should not be changed.

*Italy*. Subparagraph 3(a): The definition of "lifelong learning" is not exhaustive; it does not include active citizenship, which is a core element of lifelong learning at the European level.

CGIL, CISL, UIL. Subparagraph 3(d): Retain the original text. The concept of employability also refers to the possibility of changing jobs, which is a much wider concept than "progress within and between enterprises" as proposed by the Office.

*Japan*. As Paragraph 3 defines terminology, it should include HRD, pre-learning education, prior learning, decent work, career, among others. It should clarify the distinction between skills, abilities and competencies.

Japan Business Federation. Subparagraph 3(d): The phrase "... capacity to develop his or her own abilities and career in order to ..." is more appropriate than "... capacity to make use of the education and training opportunities available in order to ...".

JTUC-RENGO. Subparagraph 3(d): Retain the original text.

*Lebanon*. Subparagraph 3(d): Suggests "... progress in jobs within and among enterprises".

*Lithuania*. Subparagraph 3(d): Agrees with the suggestion of the Office.

*Mauritius*. Subparagraph 3(d): Agrees with the suggestion of the Office.

*Mexico*. Subparagraph 3(d): Retain the original text.

*Netherlands*. VNO-NCW. Subparagraph 3(d): Prefers the text adopted in June 2003: "... to make use of the opportunities available" instead of "... to make use of the education and training opportunities available". Prefers the proposed text: "within the enterprise and between jobs" rather than "within and between enterprises".

*New Zealand*. Subparagraph 3(d): Agrees with the suggestion of the Office.

Business New Zealand. Subparagraph 3(d): Retain the original text.

NZCTU. Subparagraph 3(d): Suggests that the social context of the term "employability", as well as its technical meanings, should be acknowledged.

*Nicaragua*. Subparagraph 3(d): Agrees with the suggestion of the Office.

*Philippines.* Subparagraph 3(d): Agrees with the suggestion of the Office.

*Portugal.* Subparagraph 3(d): Agrees with the suggestion of the Office.

General Union of Workers (UGT). Subparagraph 3(d): The suggested change does not enhance the clarity of the text; retain the original text.

CGTP-IN. Subparagraph 3(d): Retain the original text.

*Spain.* Subparagraph 3(d): Both expressions are acceptable; suggests: “progress within and between enterprises and/or between jobs”.

General Union of Workers (UGT). Subparagraph 3(d): Does not support the suggestion of the Office as “between jobs” has a broader meaning than “between enterprises”; it includes moving to other productive sectors, for which portable skills based on cross-cutting and diverse training are more necessary.

*Switzerland.* Subparagraph 3(d): Agrees with the suggestion of the Office.

UPS. Subparagraph 3(d): The phrase “education and training” should be deleted, since the aim is to highlight the capacity to make use of all opportunities to secure work. The notion of “decent work” is not a clearly defined concept.

USS/SGB. Subparagraph 3(d): Retain the original text; the concept of “jobs” is much broader.

*Syrian Arab Republic.* Subparagraph 3(d): Agrees with the suggestion of the Office.

*Thailand.* Subparagraph 3(d): Retain the original text.

NCLT. Subparagraph 3(d): Agrees with the suggestion of the Office.

*Tunisia.* Subparagraph 3(d): Agrees with the suggestion of the Office.

*Turkey.* TÜRK-IS. Subparagraph 3(d): Agrees with the suggestion of the Office.

*United Kingdom.* Subparagraph 3(a): Seems a restrictive definition of lifelong learning as it allows no place for cultural, personal and social development. Subparagraph 3(d): Agrees with the suggestion of the Office.

*United States.* Subparagraph 3(d): The suggested revision is acceptable. The subparagraph should be revised to read “the term ‘employability’ relates to an individual’s capacity to secure and retain decent work, progress within and between enterprises and cope with changes in technology and labour market conditions”.

USCIB. Subparagraph 3(b): In HRDT, “competencies” are typically used to identify the requirements for a particular range or type of work activity, and are usually defined as knowledge, skills and abilities. The use of “know-how” duplicates what is intended by the word “knowledge” and removes “ability” from the HRDT equation. The word “abilities” should be substituted for the term “know-how”.

*Uruguay.* Subparagraph 3(d): The expression “progress within the enterprise and between jobs” is more appropriate than the suggestion of the Office.

### *Office commentary*

Although the majority of respondents agreed with the suggestion of the Office to change subparagraph 3(d) of the text, a number of respondents pointed out how the

change would distort the meaning and intention of the text. Some suggestions were made on other possible rewordings to improve clarity, but there was not sufficient agreement to amend the text.

Paragraph 3, without amendments to the English text and with minor changes to the French text, appears as Paragraph 3 of the proposed Recommendation.

4. Members should identify human resources development and training policies which:
- (a) facilitate lifelong learning and employability and are part of a range of policy measures designed to achieve quality and safe jobs as well as sustainable economic and social development;
  - (b) give equal consideration to economic and social objectives, emphasize sustainable economic development in the context of the globalizing economy and the knowledge- and skills-based society, as well as develop competencies, and promote decent work, job retention, social development, social inclusion and poverty reduction;
  - (c) stress the importance of innovation, competitiveness, productivity and growth of the economy, as well as the creation of decent jobs and the employability of people, considering that innovation creates new employment opportunities and also requires new approaches to education and training to meet the demand for new skills;
  - (d) address the challenge of transforming activities in the informal economy into decent work fully integrated into mainstream economic life; policies and programmes should be developed with the aim of creating decent jobs and opportunities for education and training, as well as validating prior learning and skills gained to assist workers and employers move into the formal economy;
  - (e) promote and sustain public and private investment in the infrastructure needed for the use of information and communication technology in education and training, in hardware and software for training purposes, as well as in the training of teachers and trainers, using local, national and international collaborative networks; and
  - (f) reduce inequalities in the participation of adults in education and training.

#### *Observations on Paragraph 4*

*Australia.* Subparagraph 4(b): The intent of promoting “job retention” is not clear.

*Brazil.* Subparagraph 4(a): Amend as follows: “facilitate lifelong learning, access to and retention of employment, initial earnings and increasing income, progress within the enterprise or a change of employment, as well as adaptation to developments in technology and conditions in the world of work, and which form part of the policy measures designed to achieve quality, secure employment and also promote sustainable economic and social development”. Subparagraph 4(b): Amend as follows: replace “skills-based” with “based on qualifications acquired through lifelong learning”; replace “develop competencies” with “develop the content of qualifications”. Subparagraph 4(c): Amend as follows: after the words “growth of the economy” add “social effectiveness, teaching quality”; replace “employability of people” with “access to and retention of employment, of initial earnings and increasing income”; delete “to meet the demand for new skills”. Subparagraph 4(d): After “learning”, add “abilities”. Subparagraphs 4(d) and (e): Add a new subparagraph between (d) and (e) to read: “foster and maintain public and private investment geared to initial, continuing and refresher training for educators; developing and enhancing

methods appropriate to the range of audiences and training situations; carrying out studies and surveys on training policies and processes and their outcome; having a national classification of courses that correspond to the national job classification, linking training to vocational certification and guidance, skills reporting and documentation; developing planning indicators and systems, monitoring and evaluation that guarantee social effectiveness and teaching quality". Subparagraph 4(f): Add the following: after "adults" insert "women, different ethnic groups, and people with special needs, among others".

*China.* Subparagraph 4(c): Add "the ability of business creation" (entrepreneurship) after "employability" (see comment on Paragraph 3). Subparagraph 4(d): Suggests to delete "to assist workers and employers move into the formal economy", because in developing countries, governments encourage people to realize employment through different ways, such as flexible employment and self-employment, and others. Even in developed countries without sound labour markets, the informal economy also exists. To realize employment in the informal economy is a universal phenomenon in today's world.

*Dominican Republic.* Subparagraph 4(d): Endorses the subparagraph, but the wording could be made clearer with regard to the informal economy.

*France.* Introductory phrase: Refer to "human resources development policies" and take out "and training", which is made redundant by the text that follows. Subparagraph 4(a): Replace "safe jobs" with "stable jobs". Subparagraph 4(b): Should be simplified, as it contains details already given (from "as well as" onwards); the phrase "social inclusion and poverty reduction" should be moved to the Preamble. Subparagraphs 4(a) and (b) should be combined to read "facilitate lifelong education and training and employability and are part of a range of policy measures designed to achieve quality and stable jobs as well as sustainable economic and social development, in the context of the globalizing economy and the knowledge- and skills-based society". Subparagraph 4(c): The second part of the sentence, "considering that ... new skills", should be moved to the Preamble. Subparagraph 4(d): The text is too detailed and is redundant. Only the first part should be kept; "policies and programmes ... into the formal economy" should be removed. Subparagraph 4(e): Questions what is meant by "using local, national and international collaborative networks". Distance learning needs to be included; add "and through the use of distance learning".

*Italy.* Subparagraph 4(f): Reference should be made to both adults and young people.

*Japan.* Subparagraph 4(a): The meaning of "quality and safe jobs" is not clear and could be clarified by adding "for the purpose of employment security and improvement of workers' social status". Subparagraph 4(b): The meaning of "social inclusion" should be clarified. Subparagraph 4(e): The expression "teachers and trainers" should be replaced with "instructors".

*Lebanon.* Subparagraph 4(d): Proposes to add the phrase "and until that" after "into mainstream economic life". Moving into the formal economy may take some time. Therefore, it is useful to develop policies and programmes to ensure decent jobs in the informal economy until workers become capable of moving into the formal economy. Subparagraph 4(e): Rephrase the end of the subparagraph to read "... using

local, national and international networks that provide access to required knowledge and cooperation”.

*New Zealand.* Business New Zealand. Subparagraph 4(b): The word “equal” should be deleted as social objectives can only be realized if economic objectives can be achieved. Subparagraph 4(c): As “decent jobs” grow out of economic development, reword the subparagraph to read “stress the importance of innovation, competitiveness, productivity and growth of the economy as the means of creating decent jobs and also stress the importance of employability, recognizing that, while innovation can lead to new employment opportunities, new approaches to education and training may be needed to meet the demand for new skills”.

NZCTU. Subparagraph 4(b): Reword to read “... sustainable economic and social development”.

*Norway.* Subparagraph 4(b): The significance of lifelong learning for the individual and the importance of learning should be integrated into this subparagraph. Subparagraph 4(c): Innovation in a society requires the presence of general conditions that give an individual the opportunity to develop his or her creativity. Subparagraph 4(f): Emphasis should also be given, in this context, to motivating adults to participate in adult education and post-qualifying education.

*Portugal.* Subparagraph 4(f): Expresses doubts about the reference to adults only, without any specification.

*Switzerland.* UPS. Subparagraph 4(d): Add the word “vocational” to qualify “learning and skills”. Subparagraph 4(f): Use positive wording, such as “encourage the participation of adults in education and training”.

### *Office commentary*

Paragraph 4, without amendments to the English text and with minor editorial changes to the French text, appears as Paragraph 4 of the proposed Recommendation.

#### 5. Members should:

- (a) recognize that education and training are a right for all and, in cooperation with the social partners, work towards ensuring access for all to lifelong learning;
- (b) define, with the involvement of the social partners, a national strategy for education;
- (c) define, with the involvement of the social partners, a national strategy, as well as establish a guiding framework, for training policies at different levels – national, regional, local, sectoral, enterprise – which promote social dialogue;
- (d) align human resources development and training policies with policies and strategies aimed at creating economic growth and employment opportunities such as economic, fiscal and social policies;
- (e) create a general economic environment and incentives to encourage: enterprises to invest in education and training; individuals to develop their own abilities and careers, and enable and motivate them to participate in education and training programmes;
- (f) facilitate the development of a training delivery system consistent with national conditions and practices;

- (g) assume the primary responsibility for investing in education and pre-employment training recognizing that qualified teachers and trainers, working under decent conditions, are of fundamental importance in providing quality education to assist children and adults reach high standards in academic and vocational competencies;
- (h) establish a national qualifications framework to facilitate lifelong learning, assist 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 and previously acquired skills, competencies and experience. This framework should be responsive to changing technologies and trends in the labour market and recognize regional and local differences, without losing transparency at the national level;
- (i) strengthen social dialogue on training at the different levels – international, national, regional, local, sectoral, enterprise;
- (j) promote equal opportunities for women and men in education and training;
- (k) promote access to education and training for people with special needs, notably youth, people with disabilities, migrants, older workers and the socially excluded; and for workers in small and medium-sized enterprises, in the informal economy, in the rural sector and in self-employment. The identification of such groups should be made at the national level;
- (l) provide support to the social partners to enable them to participate in social dialogue on training; and
- (m) provide for supportive social and other policies to enable all persons to participate in training and development.

#### *Observations on Paragraph 5*

*Australia.* Subparagraph 5(a): Remains unsatisfactory with regard to the reference to “Members should: recognize that education and training are a right for all”. This is open-ended and could embrace education at various levels, and underpin an expectation of government funding for this “right”. Such an overarching right to education could have the effect of placing undue pressure on limited government resources, and thus, potentially, limit education and training opportunities. Subparagraphs 5(b) and (c): References to a “national strategy” for education and training are probably appropriate, but what such a national strategy would entail is unclear. Subparagraph 5(c): While “a guiding framework” may be a little unclear, it may be difficult to find more appropriate words. Perhaps “guiding” is redundant and could be omitted. Subparagraph 5(e): The wording of this is not clear. The reference of concern is to “incentives” to encourage enterprises to invest in education and training – there are typically good returns to investment in training by enterprises, even though some of these returns may flow to an industry generally rather than to individual enterprises. The suggested rewording of subparagraph 5(h) is clearer and preferable. The suggested rewording for subparagraph 5(l) is clearer.

State government of Queensland. Subparagraph 5(h): Prefers to retain original text.

ACTU. Subparagraph 5(e): The enterprise should be responsible for investing in education and training for existing workers and a number of incentives and mechanisms should be used to encourage enterprises to invest. Add a sentence that reads: “Enterprises should have the primary responsibility for investing in education and training for their workers and mechanisms such as national and/or industry training levies, public grants, tax credits for small and medium-sized enterprises, and special

incentives for low-paid workers to participate in training, through tripartite or collective training agreements, should be implemented.”

*Belgium.* Subparagraph 5(c): Replace the phrase “a guiding framework” with “guidelines”, which is appropriate and easier to understand. Subparagraphs 5(h) and (l): Agrees with the suggestions of the Office.

Government of Flanders. Subparagraph 5(h): If the redrafted text means that national qualification frameworks are open, where different means and methods can be used to acquire and recognize a qualification, then supports the Office rewording.

CNT. Subparagraph 5(c): Considers this expression vague and imprecise; if the phrase was to be retained, it would have to be clarified. Subparagraphs 5(h) and (l): Retain the original texts.

*Brazil.* Subparagraph 5(a): Amend as follows: replace “in cooperation with the” with “with the participation of the”. Subparagraphs 5(b) and (c): Merge the two subparagraphs to read: “define, with the participation of the social partners and on the basis of guaranteed tripartite discussion, a national strategy for education, training and lifelong learning, and develop parameters and guidelines to foster the creation of a nationwide integrated system that would link in the regional, local, sectoral and enterprise levels, and that would encourage social dialogue”. Subparagraph 5(i): Add “and tripartite discussion” after “social dialogue”. Subparagraph 5(h): Retain the original text. Subparagraph 5(l): Agrees with the suggestion of the Office.

*Canada.* Subparagraph 5(a): Suggests the subparagraph be reworded to read “... ensuring access to training and lifelong learning for all who are qualified”. Subparagraph 5(c): Delete “as well as establish a guiding framework”. The Office suggestion to delete Point 14(h) of the proposed Conclusions is acceptable. Subparagraph 5(d): Add the following: “... especially with regard to each country’s development potential ...”. Subparagraph 5(f): Delete. Subparagraph 5(g): Add “skills, qualifications” after “education”. Subparagraph 5(h): Proposes to delete “and be consistent nationally”. Subparagraph 5(k): Prefers not to list groups with special needs, but to leave their identification to the competent authority. If a list is to be included, add “indigenous peoples”. Subparagraph 5(l): Agrees with the suggestion of the Office.

CEC. Subparagraph 5(a): The issue “education and training are a right for all” is too broad and can be interpreted to mean that the social partners, except the workers, are required to provide education/training and access to education and training until death. Lifelong learning is a key to economic development but it should not put an additional burden on existing enterprises. Subparagraph 5(c): Delete “guiding”.

*China.* Subparagraph 5(i): Suggests adding the words “training institutions, employees”, because strengthening social dialogue on training at the different levels should not be restricted to the international, national, regional, local, sectoral and enterprise levels; the opinions of the training institutions and the employees should also be considered.

*Costa Rica.* Subparagraph 5(c): The term “a guiding framework” is clear and understandable. Subparagraph 5(h): The proposed rewording is clearer. Subparagraph 5(l): Agrees with the suggestion of the Office.

*Czech Republic.* Subparagraphs 5(h) and (l): Agrees with the suggestions of the Office.

SPD. Subparagraph 5(c): Recommends using “an appropriate framework” rather than “a guiding framework”. The Office suggestion to delete Point 14(h) of the proposed Conclusions is acceptable. Subparagraph 5(f): With regard to “... the development of an appropriate delivery system ...”, the Office deleted the word “appropriate”; prefers to keep it in the text.

KZPS. Subparagraph 5(b): Proposes to include “human resources development and for” before the word “education”. Subparagraph 5(c): Substitute “programme” for “framework”.

ČMKOS. Subparagraph 5(c): The expression “a guiding framework” is acceptable.

*Denmark.* Paragraph 5: Agrees with the suggestions of the Office.

DA. Subparagraph 5(a): With regard to the phrase “education and training are a right for all”, the meaning of “right” has not been determined. It should be emphasized that Members are obligated to ensure financial means for basic training and youth training and, in cooperation with the social partners, there should be access to lifelong learning for all. Subparagraph 5(c): Can be deleted.

LO, AC and FTF. Subparagraph 5(c): Delete “guiding”. Subparagraph 5(l): Retain the original text.

*Egypt.* Subparagraph 5(c): Prefers the phrase “lays down general policies”. The Office suggestion to delete Point 14(h) of the proposed Conclusions is acceptable. Subparagraph 5(h): The text should read: “This framework should be responsive to changing technologies and trends in the labour market and recognize regional and local differences and be coherent at the national level.” Subparagraph 5(l): Agrees with the suggestion of the Office.

*El Salvador.* Subparagraph 5(c): The term “a guiding framework” implies a single standard, or a set of basic rules that provide the model for training policies at different levels, which promote social dialogue. The Office suggestion to delete Point 14(h) of the proposed Conclusions is acceptable. Subparagraph 5(h): Both versions are coherent. Subparagraph 5(l): Agrees with the suggestion of the Office.

*Eritrea.* Subparagraph 5(c): The term “a guiding framework” should be replaced by either “directive” or “regulations”, or deleted. Subparagraph 5(h): Supports including the term “be consistent”. Subparagraph 5(l): Retain the original text.

*Finland.* Subparagraph 5(c): The use of the term “a guiding framework” is not ambiguous and could be retained. The Office suggestion to delete Point 14(h) of the proposed Conclusions is acceptable. Subparagraph 5(h): The Office formulation “... recognizing regional and local differences and be consistent nationally” is acceptable, but it has lost the “transparency”. Subparagraph 5(l): Agrees with the suggestion of the Office to clarify the text.

Commission for Local Authority Employers (KT). The reference to a “national strategy” is contrary to the opinion of the KT and the Association of Finnish Local and Regional Authorities (Kuntaliitto). In implementation, the central role of government is emphasized as the coordinator of lifelong learning.

*France.* Subparagraph 5(b): The social partners are not involved in determining education strategy; proposes that “with the involvement of the social partners” be deleted. Subparagraph 5(c): The expression “a guiding framework” is not explicit; re-

place with “legal framework”. National strategies and legal frameworks are not there to promote social dialogue; replace “which promote social dialogue” with “based on social dialogue”. Subparagraph 5(d): The phrase “human resources development and training policies” should be replaced with “lifelong education and training policies”. Subparagraph 5(e): Repeats what has already been said in the Preamble and preceding paragraphs; delete. Subparagraph 5(f): The term “delivery” is too restrictive and implies the method of training, which is not the intention here; replace “training delivery system” with “training provision system”. Subparagraph 5(g): If these are financial investments, then to speak of the primary responsibility of “Members” meaning “States” would be inaccurate in the case of a number of countries (see comments on the Preamble). Subparagraph 5(h): Proposes that “career” be replaced by “career path”; agrees with the suggestion of the Office “and be consistent nationally”. Subparagraph 5(l): Agrees with the suggestion of the Office.

*Germany.* Subparagraph 5(c): Delete the phrase “a guiding framework” as the concept is unclear in this context. Subparagraphs 5(h) and (l): Agrees with the suggestions of the Office.

*Ireland.* Subparagraph 5(c): The term “a guiding framework” is clear – a template to work from. Subparagraphs 5(h) and (l): Agrees with the suggestions of the Office.

*Italy.* Subparagraph 5(h): It would be useful to specify that the participation of the social partners refers to initial and continuing vocational training. Subparagraph 5(g): Reference should include youth.

UGL. Subparagraph 5(a): Agrees with the suggestion of the Office. Subparagraph 5(i): Social dialogue on training must be strengthened at the different levels – international, national, regional, local, sectoral and enterprise.

CGIL, CISL, UIL. Subparagraph 5(c): The expression “a guiding framework” is clear, meaning a set of rules and guidelines to be used at the different levels. Keep the original text as is. Point 14(h) of the proposed Conclusions: Agree with the deletion. Subparagraph 5(h): The original text should be retained. Subparagraph 5(l): Keep the original text; it is important to facilitate conditions to create institutions of social dialogue, especially where social dialogue is not regular or common.

*Japan.* Subparagraph 5(d): In order to make the objectives clearer in the broad perspective, replace “creating employment opportunities” with “employment security and improvement of workers’ social status”. Subparagraph 5(g): As investment in training is considered necessary even after employment, suggests the deletion of “pre-employment”. “Teachers and trainers” should be replaced by “instructors”. Subparagraph 5(h): The definition of “prior learning” needs to be clarified. In order to have “recognition of prior learning and previously acquired skills, competencies and experience” more comprehensively expressed, this should be replaced by “appropriate evaluation of vocational ability and practical experience”. Subparagraph 5(m): Clarify the meaning of “development” in “training and development”.

Japan Business Federation. Subparagraph 5(a): It is unclear whether “right” means “right to claim” or “right to access”. It is understood that education is a “right for all”, but do not consider that training is the same. Even if training as well as education is identified as a “right for all”, the government should guarantee the right; add “to be guaranteed by governments” after “right”. Subparagraph 5(c): The notion of “a guiding framework” is so vague that it should be deleted. Subparagraph 5(f): Delivery

of training should not be included in this Recommendation, because it is, principally, a matter of market. This point should, therefore, be deleted. Subparagraph 5(h): In order to take into account various situations of different countries, “and recognize regional and local differences, without losing transparency at the national level” should be replaced with “and leave room for regional and local differences without losing transparency at the national level”, which was used in the previous text. Subparagraph 5(i): The notion of social dialogue at international level is so vague that “international” should be deleted. Subparagraph 5(k): It is not necessary to cite examples of “people with special needs” because the text provides that “the identification of such groups should be made at the national level”. The examples, therefore, should be deleted. Subparagraph 5(m): There is an overlap with subparagraph 5(e); therefore, this point should be deleted.

*JTUC-RENGO*. Subparagraph 5(c): The expression “a guiding framework” is clear, meaning a set of rules or guidelines; retain the term. Point 14(h) of the proposed Conclusions: Agrees with the deletion. Subparagraph 5(h): Retain the original text. Subparagraph 5(l): As the concept discussed is social dialogue, generally, the original text should be retained.

*Lebanon*. Subparagraphs 5(a), (b) and (c): Proposes to use “in consultation with the social partners”. Subparagraph 5(c): Agrees that “a guiding framework” is unclear; proposes “a directive framework”. Subparagraph 5(h): Agrees with the suggestion of the Office. Subparagraph 5(i): Asks how the government can strengthen social dialogue at an international level, and by which means. Subparagraph 5(l): Agrees with the suggestion of the Office.

*Lithuania*. Subparagraph 5(c): The phrase “as well as establish a guiding framework” could be deleted. Subparagraphs 5(h) and (l): Agrees with the suggestions of the Office.

*Mauritius*: Subparagraph 5(c): Replace “a guiding framework” with “an appropriate framework”. Subparagraphs 5(h) and (l): Agrees with the suggestions of the Office.

*Mexico*. Subparagraph 5(c): Suggests rewording as follows: “define, with the involvement of the social partners, a national strategy which provides a broad outline for developing training policies ...”. Point 14(h) of the proposed Conclusions: Agrees with the deletion. Subparagraph 5(h): Agrees with the suggestion of the Office. Subparagraph 5(l): Suggests rewording as follows: “facilitate mechanisms enabling the social partners to participate in social dialogue on training; and ...”.

*Netherlands*. VNO-NCW. Subparagraph 5(a): The concept of “education and training are a right for all” should be understood as a responsibility of government to ensure access to free basic and pre-employment education and of social partners to agree on arrangements that offer wide access to training opportunities. The present wording is not clear on the issue of responsibilities; proposes “recognize that education and training are a right for all, guaranteeing publicly financed basic and pre-employment education for all and, in cooperation with social partners, ensuring access for all to lifelong learning”. Subparagraph 5(c): The phrase “as well as establish a guiding framework” is unclear and should be deleted. Subparagraph 5(f): With regard to: “... the development of an appropriate delivery system ...”, the Office deleted the word

“appropriate”; prefers to keep this in the text. As delivery of training is a matter of the market, there are serious doubts about whether this subparagraph should be retained; proposes to delete subparagraph 5(f). Subparagraph 5(l): Agrees with the suggestion of the Office.

*New Zealand.* Subparagraph 5(h): Agrees with the suggestion of the Office. Subparagraph 5(k): The groups listed under “special needs” should include indigenous peoples and ethnic minority groups, because these groups often have specific needs in relation to education and training and the labour market in general. Subparagraph 5(l): Agrees with the suggestion of the Office.

NZCTU. Subparagraph 5(c): Notes that the “guiding framework” could be more fully described as a “qualifications framework”. Subparagraph 5(h): Recommends adding: “The qualifications framework should take account of workforce planning for particular sector and occupation group needs, with a long term approach to education and training to meet the country’s workforce needs.”

*Nicaragua.* Subparagraph 5(c): Suggests replacing “establish a guiding framework, for” with “for the development and strengthening of”. Subparagraph 5(h): Agrees with the suggestion of the Office. Subparagraph 5(l): Recommends that this subparagraph be deleted as it is contained in subparagraph 5(c) and developed at length in Part II.

*Norway.* Subparagraph 5(c): The term “a guiding framework” should be retained. Subparagraph 5(h): Suggests “... recognizing regional and local differences and be consistent and transparent nationally”.

*Philippines.* Subparagraph 5(c): The term “a guiding framework” can be read simply as “framework”. It is inherent that framework *per se* in the context of developing a plan of action is being used as a guide in formulating strategic plans for a specific training programme; or the subparagraph may still retain the term “a guiding framework” which means it will serve as a road map or an outline in defining training policies. Subparagraphs 5(h) and (l): Agrees with the suggestions of the Office.

*Portugal.* Subparagraph 5(c): The term “a guiding framework” should be retained, as it was the subject, following extensive discussion, of a broad consensus, and it reflects the set of basic principles inherent in the institutional framework that underlies a national strategy. Subparagraph 5(f): It is arguable whether this subparagraph should be retained, since its content has now been incorporated in other provisions. Subparagraph 5(h): The proposed insertion could help to clarify the meaning of the sentence. Subparagraph 5(l): Prefers the original text as it is more wide-ranging. Subparagraph 5(m): “when necessary or when justified” should be added to the end of the subparagraph or, alternatively, the subparagraph should be deleted.

CCP. Subparagraph 5(h): Needs to convey the idea of the need for a framework that can be applied at national level but that is sufficiently flexible to take account of regional and local differences as well as technological change and labour market trends. Subparagraph 5(l): Agrees with the suggestion of the Office.

UGT. Subparagraph 5(c): The meaning is not clear; thus, the wording should be changed. The issue is the establishment of a set of key points that training policies should address at the various levels. Subparagraph 5(k): It would be desirable that, in addition to the workers listed, reference should be made to detainees or persons deprived of liberty.

CGTP-IN. Insert two new subparagraphs in Paragraph 5: the first, following subparagraph 5(a), to read “create conditions to ensure implementation of the right of all to training to which the previous paragraph refers”; the second, at the end of the Paragraph, to read “provide for a linkage and permeability between education and training”. Subparagraph 5(l): Agrees with the suggestion of the Office.

Confederation of Farmers of Portugal (CAP). Subparagraph 5(l): Agrees with the suggestion of the Office, but emphasizes that this should not be restricted to social dialogue in the area of vocational training. The words “on training” should be deleted in order to broaden the scope of social dialogue.

*Spain*. Subparagraph 5(c): Proposes “define, with the involvement of the social partners, a national strategy for the development of training policies at different stages (initial, continuous) and at different levels (national, regional, local, sectoral, enterprise) through the establishment, where appropriate, of the corresponding social dialogue bodies and authorities and the establishment of general and specific priorities and objectives aimed at achieving such a purpose”. Point 14(h) of the proposed Conclusions: Agrees with the suggestion of the Office to delete. Subparagraph 5(h): Proposes “establish a national qualifications framework as a technical instrument to facilitate lifelong learning, assist 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 and previously acquired skills, competencies and experience. This should be responsive to changing technologies and trends in the labour market and be able to be updated according to these, and recognize regional and local differences, without losing transparency at the national level and the ability to be communicated at the transnational level”. Subparagraph 5(l): Add to the end: “through the creation, where appropriate, of the necessary bodies and authorities in education and training”.

Spanish Employers’ Confederation (CEOE). Subparagraph 5(a): This is the most relevant issue in the proposed Recommendation. The problem lies in mentioning the right to education and to training in the same Paragraph, treating both concepts at the same level, without any distinction between the right to education (which should be guaranteed without exception to 100 per cent of the population, at least at primary levels) and the right to access to training. Governments are not going to be able to ensure a right to lifelong learning with universal access; therefore, a distinction should be made, stating, on the one hand, the right to education and guaranteeing universal access, and, on the other hand, the need to promote access to training and the elimination of the barriers that make this difficult throughout life.

UGT. Subparagraph 5(c): Delete “a guiding framework”, as this concept is introduced and developed in subparagraph 5(h).

CCOO. Understands that “a guiding framework” aims at specific objectives that result from the “national strategy”. Subparagraph 5(h): The word “transparency” is more expressive and clearer than the word “consistency” with regard to the objectives of “a national qualifications framework”.

*Switzerland*. Subparagraph 5(c): The meaning of “a guiding framework” is unclear; delete. Subparagraph 5(h): Agrees with the suggestion of the Office. Subparagraph 5(l): Agrees with the suggestion of the Office.

UPS. Subparagraph 5(a): The wording is not clear as regards the respective responsibilities of government and the social partners. Therefore, after “a right for all”,

the text should be amended by adding “by guaranteeing a basic education and pre-employment training for all, financed by public funds, and, in cooperation with the social partners, by working towards ensuring access for all to lifelong learning”. Subparagraph 5(c): The expression “as well as establish a guiding framework” is not clear and should be deleted. Subparagraph 5(f): The term “consistent” should be replaced by “relevant”. Subparagraph 5(h): Trying to match skill demand with supply is a particularly distorted viewpoint. On the contrary, the problem is one of aligning skill supply with enterprise demand, since the enterprises themselves have to adapt to market demand. Therefore, this part of the text should be amended. Subparagraph 5(k): The category of gifted children, whose development is held back when they attend “normal” schools, should be added to the list of people “with special needs”.

USS/SGB. Subparagraph 5(c): The expression “a guiding framework” is perfectly clear; it refers to a body of rules and guiding principles. The expression should be retained. Subparagraph 5(h): The original text should be retained. Subparagraph 5(l): The original text should be retained.

*Syrian Arab Republic.* Subparagraph 5(c): Suggests “establish and define training policies” to replace “a guiding framework for training policies”.

*Thailand.* Subparagraph 5(c): Retain “a guiding framework”. Point 14(h) of the proposed Conclusions: Agrees with the deletion. Subparagraphs 5(h) and (l): Agrees with the suggestions of the Office.

NCLT. Subparagraph 5(c): Suggests using “a guide”.

*Tunisia.* Subparagraph 5(c): The term “a guiding framework” should be replaced by “terms of reference”. Point 14(h) of the proposed Conclusions: Agrees with the deletion. Subparagraphs 5(h) and (l): Agrees with the suggestions of the Office.

*Turkey.* TÜRK-IS. Subparagraph 5(c): Replace the phrase “a guiding framework” with “the presentation of alternatives which could serve as a guide”. Point 14(h) of proposed Conclusions: Agrees with the deletion. Subparagraphs 5(h) and (l): Agrees with the suggestions of the Office.

*United Kingdom.* Subparagraph 5(a): The reference to rights to education and training requires further explanation. Subparagraph 5(c): There is a need to redraft the entire text. As well as being unsure of the meaning of the term “a guiding framework”, as currently drafted, the intention appears to be to develop training policies for the promotion of social dialogue. Subparagraph 5(h): This formulation is no clearer than the original; seeks advice from the Office on what is meant by “be consistent nationally”. If this means that it should be consistent with national legislation while allowing for regional differences, this would be acceptable, with the insertion of “and demand” after the words “local differences”; replace “guide” with “inform and advise”. Subparagraph 5(l): Agrees with the suggestion of the Office (subject to earlier comments on “social dialogue”; see General observations.

*United States.* Subparagraph 5(a): Agrees that an individual has a right to invest in human capital and to determine the levels and types of training that are appropriate for him or for her. However, the phrase “training [is] a right” may be interpreted to mean an unconstrained legal entitlement, and for this reason it is not supported. A broad reference to training as a right may create an excessively high and perhaps unfocused demand for resources and may compete with other priorities, for example, education,

for funding. A strong and explicit commitment on the part of Members to provide appropriate training opportunities for workers has been established throughout the proposed text. Consequently, removing the reference to training as a right would not weaken the instrument. Amend to read: “recognize the individual’s right to education and pre-employment training, and to pursue other forms of training, and should, in cooperation with the social partners, work towards ensuring access for all to lifelong learning”. Subparagraph 5(c): Interprets “a guiding framework” to be a set of concepts, guidelines and practices; proposes that, since a strategy would presumably include or be based on an established set of concepts, guidelines and practices, the words “as well as establish a guiding framework” be deleted. Point 14(h) of the proposed Conclusions: Agrees with the deletion. Subparagraph 5(h): Agrees with the suggestion of the Office. Subparagraph 5(l): The revision is sensible. Subparagraph 5(m): This is redundant as several earlier subparagraphs cover equality of access (e.g. 4(f), 5(a), 5(d), 5(j) and 5(k)); recommends 5(m) be deleted.

USCIB. Subparagraph 5(i): Recommends replacing the word “international” with “intergovernmental”, as this Paragraph should not be interpreted as promoting collective bargaining at the international level.

*Uruguay.* Subparagraph 5(c): The term “a guiding framework” relates to the theoretical outline of how to approach a problem or issue, the social and economic context, previous experience, public and private institutional structures relating to services, and identifying actors with the relevant skills or abilities. Subparagraph 5(h): The suggested text is more appropriate. Subparagraph 5(l): Suggests “provide support to employers’ and workers’ organizations for holding consultations on training through social dialogue”.

PIT-CNT. Subparagraph 5(c): Suggests “establish a tripartite institutional framework” instead of “a guiding framework”.

### *Office commentary*

In subparagraph 5(c), the Office request for clarification of the term “a guiding framework” was met with a range of explanations and solutions to add clarity. There was no pattern to the solutions offered; therefore, the original text has been retained for further discussion at the 92nd Session of the International Labour Conference.

In subparagraph 5(h), the majority of respondents indicated that they agreed with the suggested rewording by the Office, although some preferred the original text. Other comments reflected confusion about the implications of the proposed changes. In light of the responses, the original text has been retained.

In subparagraph 5(l), the overwhelming majority of respondents indicated that they agreed with the rewording proposed by the Office.

Paragraph 5, with minor editing to improve clarity, appears as Paragraph 5 of the proposed Recommendation.

## II. DEVELOPMENT AND IMPLEMENTATION OF EDUCATION AND TRAINING POLICIES

6. Members should establish and maintain a coordinated education and training system, along with a commitment to make further improvements to it, within the concept of lifelong

learning, taking into account the primary responsibility of government for education and pre-employment training and for training the unemployed, as well as recognizing the role of the social partners in further training. Education and pre-employment training includes compulsory basic education incorporating basic knowledge, literacy and numeracy skills and appropriate use of information and communication technology.

### *Observations on Paragraph 6*

*Australia.* While the initial part of the Paragraph refers to “primary responsibility of government for education and pre-employment training”, the last sentence defines the education role as “compulsory basic education”. It is important to preserve this definition of education in this Paragraph. Members have a primary responsibility to basic education and pre-employment training.

State government of Queensland. Proposed rewording is acceptable.

ACTU. Governments need to formulate objectives and evaluate achievements of educational systems to ensure greater consistency and coherence between schooling, vocational and higher educational systems. Therefore, a sentence should be added that reads: “Furthermore, training policies should be based on development of national systems of recognition of prior learning and recognition of existing skills wherever they are acquired. Where no formal employment relationship exists, governments should provide skills recognition systems to allow workers to access the formal education system in order to upgrade their skills and access lifelong learning.”

*Belgium.* Government of Flanders. The definitions of compulsory basic education and pre-employment training are not clear; they should be made clear and appear in Paragraph 3.

CNT. Agrees with the suggestion of the Office.

*Brazil.* Agrees with the suggestion of the Office.

*Canada.* Has no objection to the suggestion of the Office, but much of Part II is repetitive.

*Costa Rica.* The suggestion of the Office is clearer.

*Czech Republic.* SPD, KZPS. Agree with the suggestion of the Office.

ČMKOS. Recommends changing “... the role of the social partners in further training” to “... the role of the social partners in lifelong learning”.

*Denmark.* Agrees with the suggestion of the Office.

*Dominican Republic.* The Paragraph is too long and should be shortened.

*El Salvador.* Agrees with the suggestion of the Office.

*Finland.* The Office rewording of the Paragraph adds clarity without changing the meaning.

*France.* The text needs to be made more readable; proposes that it be split into three subparagraphs as follows: “Members should:

- (a) establish and maintain a coordinated system of lifelong education and training, along with a commitment to make further improvements to it;

- (b) in order to achieve this, take into account their primary responsibility for education and pre-employment training and for training the unemployed, and recognize the role of the social partners in further training; and
- (c) affirm that education and pre-employment training includes compulsory basic education incorporating, at least, basic knowledge, i.e. literacy and numeracy skills and appropriate use of information and communication technology.”

*Ireland.* Questions what constitutes basic literacy and numeracy skills in this context. Questions whether people with learning difficulties are included here.

*Italy.* CGIL, CISL, UIL. Agree with the suggestion of the Office.

*Japan.* JTUC-RENGO. Agrees with the suggestion of the Office.

*Lebanon.* Considers this Paragraph to be a repetition of what has been stated in subparagraph 5(g); proposes to delete it.

*Lithuania.* Agrees with the suggestion of the Office.

*Mauritius.* Agrees with the suggestion of the Office.

*Mexico.* Agrees with the suggestion of the Office.

*New Zealand.* Agrees with the suggestion of the Office.

*Business New Zealand.* Given the Government proposal to include a reference to “other interested parties” in Paragraph 1, it is suggested that the same reference be included in this Paragraph, to recognize that private training partners, as well as the government and social partners, have a role to play in the provision of education and training; insert “and other interested parties” after “social partners”.

*NZCTU.* Recommends that Paragraphs 6 and 7 refer to the concept of paid educational leave and the role of collective bargaining in ensuring that lifelong learning and access to education and training are embedded in the industrial relations system.

*Nicaragua.* Agrees with the suggestion of the Office.

*Norway.* Should highlight the broad perspective of lifelong learning by including “early childhood education” in “education”.

*Philippines.* Agrees with the suggestion of the Office.

*Portugal.* Agrees with the suggestion of the Office.

*Spain.* Suggests replacing “further” with “continual”.

*Switzerland.* Agrees with the suggestion of the Office; the explanation of “pre-employment education and training” should form part of Paragraph 3 (definitions).

*Syrian Arab Republic.* Retain the original paragraph.

*Thailand.* Agrees with the suggestion of the Office.

*Tunisia.* The revised text provides greater clarity and should be retained.

*Turkey.* TÜRK-IS. The revised text adds clarity.

*United States.* The revised text adds clarity.

*Uruguay.* The redrafted paragraph is sufficiently clear.

*Office commentary*

The vast majority of respondents indicated support for the rewording of this Paragraph, agreeing that it added clarity. Some respondents suggested further editing of the text to make the Paragraph more coherent. Others suggested the Paragraph was too long and should be broken down into subparagraphs. A number of respondents noted that the last sentence provided a definition of “education and pre-employment training” and would, therefore, be better placed in Paragraph 3, which provides definitions of key terms in the instrument.

Based on the majority of responses received, Paragraph 6, as amended, now appears as 6.1 and 6.2 of the proposed Recommendation.

7. Members should encourage the enhancement of social dialogue on training as a basic principle for systems development, programme relevance, quality and cost-effectiveness.

*Observations on Paragraph 7*

*Brazil.* Amend as follows: “Members should: (a) promote tripartite social discussion on training as a basic principle for developing training systems; (b) with a view to ensuring their relevance, consider, when developing and implementing training policies, those objectives and aims that are geared to social effectiveness and teaching quality. Such consideration will be demonstrated in the attention paid to vulnerable sectors, to integration into employment policies, to the proper content and methods, to continuing training of educators and to ensuring that the services rendered meet the needs of employers and workers.”

*France.* Proposes that this Paragraph be simplified as follows: “Members should encourage the enhancement of social dialogue on training for systems development, programme relevance, quality and cost-effectiveness.”

*Lebanon.* Repeats what has been stated in subparagraph 5(i); these two Paragraphs can be merged.

*Office commentary*

Paragraph 7, without amendments, appears as Paragraph 7 of the proposed Recommendation.

8. Investment in education and training should consider benchmarks in relation to comparable countries, regions and sectors.

*Observations on Paragraph 8*

*Australia.* State government of Queensland. Agrees with the suggestion of the Office.

ACTU. To encourage increased recognition and participation in education and training, include an additional sentence as follows: “International and national bench-

marks should also be developed for entry level and workforce education and training participation rates within a quality assurance framework.”

*Belgium.* CNT. Agrees with the suggestion of the Office.

*Brazil.* Agrees with the suggestion of the Office.

*Canada.* Has no objection to the suggestion of the Office, but much of Part II is repetitive.

*Costa Rica.* The original text is clearer.

*Czech Republic.* SPD, KZPS, ČMKOS. Agree with the suggestion of the Office.

*Denmark.* Agrees with the suggestion of the Office.

LO, AC and FTF. Retain the original text.

*Egypt.* Suggests that investment in education and training is a point of orientation for comparable countries, regions and sectors.

*El Salvador.* The new wording is more precise.

*Eritrea.* Agrees with the suggestion of the Office.

*Finland.* Agrees with the suggestion of the Office.

KT. Approves of national level support and guidance given to coordinate employment demands and training supply and supports references made to regional and local differences.

*France.* The Paragraph is extremely unclear; the word “investment” needs to be clarified as to whether it means “involvement” or “financial commitments”.

*Germany.* The Paragraph should be deleted, as benchmarking processes are not considered to have any meaning in the educational sphere.

*Ireland.* Benchmarking is suitable; comparison might be better.

*Italy.* CGIL, CISL, UIL. Agree with the suggestion of the Office.

*Japan.* JTUC-RENGO. Agrees with the suggestion of the Office.

*Lebanon.* The term “benchmarks” remains unclear even with the suggestion of the Office; “milestones” is clearer than “benchmarks”.

*Lithuania.* Questions whether this Paragraph should be included; the meaning of “comparable countries” is not clear.

*Mauritius.* Agrees with the suggestion of the Office.

*Mexico.* Agrees with the suggestion of the Office.

*New Zealand.* Agrees with the suggestion of the Office; while cross-country comparisons are useful, countries will invest in education and training according to their individual circumstances.

*Nicaragua.* Agrees with the suggestion of the Office.

*Philippines.* Member States differ in terms of economic development; therefore, investment in education and training should consider benchmarks applicable only to comparable countries.

*Portugal.* Agrees with the suggestion of the Office.

CCP. Does not agree with the change: there was no redundancy in the previous wording.

*Spain.* Agrees with the suggestion of the Office.

CCOO. The term “benchmarks” is an overly ambiguous concept; use “reference indicators”.

*Switzerland.* Agrees with the suggestion of the Office.

*Thailand.* Agrees with the suggestion of the Office.

*Tunisia.* Agrees with the suggestion of the Office.

*Turkey.* TÜRK-İS. Agrees with the suggestion of the Office.

*United States.* Proposes “Investment in education and training should be considered in relation to comparable countries, regions, and sectors.”

#### *Office commentary*

There was a great deal of support expressed for the rewording of this Paragraph as suggested by the Office, agreeing that the term “point of orientation” is implicit in “benchmarks”. A few respondents indicated that the term “benchmarks” was inappropriate and suggested alternatives. Others questioned whether this Paragraph should be included.

Paragraph 8, without amendments, appears as Paragraph 8 of the proposed Recommendation.

### III. EDUCATION AND PRE-EMPLOYMENT TRAINING

#### *General observations on Part III*

*Australia.* ACTU. Governments should ensure access to free universal basic education as a key responsibility. This responsibility should not be undermined by international development aid or conditions attached to structural adjustment programmes and should include resources and funding to overcome barriers to participation by people in rural and regional areas or those unable to participate in education and training because of the “digital” divide. The proposed Recommendation should encourage governments to provide basic education as a key element for sustainable development and as a priority to achieve functional literacy and numeracy for all, including for adults who were denied opportunities when young.

*Dominican Republic.* Agrees with the proposals but should be more precise and specific with regard to the actions taken by governments.

9. Members should:

- (a) recognize their responsibility for education and pre-employment training and improve access for all to enhance employability and to prevent social exclusion;

- (b) develop approaches to non-formal education and training, especially for adults who were denied education and training opportunities when young;
- (c) make use of new information and communication technology in learning and training, to the extent possible;
- (d) ensure provision of vocational, labour market and career information and guidance and employment counseling, supplemented by information on the rights and obligations of all concerned under labour-related laws and other forms of labour regulation;
- (e) ensure that education and pre-employment training programmes are relevant and that their quality is maintained; and
- (f) ensure that vocational education and training systems are developed and strengthened to provide appropriate opportunities for the development and certification of skills relevant to the labour market.

### *Observations on Paragraph 9*

*Australia.* Refer to comment on Paragraph 6.

*Brazil.* Subparagraph 9(a): Amend as follows: replace “employability” with “access to and retention of employment, of initial earnings and increasing income”. Subparagraph 9(b): Add the following at the end: “recognizing and promoting successful experiments of grassroots’ organizations, workers’ and employers’ organizations with regard to the education of young people and adults, in particular when linked to vocational training”.

*Canada.* CEC. Subparagraph 9(d): When discussing the possibility of providing vocational, labour market and career information, information on self-employment should be included. References to labour-related laws, rights and obligations do not add clarity to the text.

*Denmark.* DA. Subparagraph 9(d): It seems very modest just to refer to guidance in one subparagraph; reference should be made to the meaning of guidance (career guidance) both in the Preamble and in Part I, and added, appropriately, in the text.

*France.* Subparagraph 9(a): The text is redundant and could be simplified; proposes “improve access for all to education and pre-employment training”. Subparagraph 9(c): Is poorly constructed. It is not the Members who are undergoing the “learning and training”; proposes “promote the use of new information and communication technology in learning and training, to the extent possible”. Subparagraph 9(d): Replace “supplemented by” with “as well as”. Subparagraph 9(f): Skills certification has already been mentioned in subparagraph 9(b); this subparagraph should therefore be simplified; proposes that “opportunities...labour market” be replaced by “opportunities adapted to the labour market”.

*Italy.* Before subparagraph 9(a), a reference should be made to education and initial training.

*Japan.* Subparagraph 9(b): Clarification is sought on the meaning of “non-formal education and training”.

*Lebanon.* Subparagraph 9(a): Merge with subparagraph 5(g). Subparagraph 9(b): Proposes to add “and establish a specialized educational body to form trainers in this

approach” at the end of this subparagraph. Subparagraph 9(c): This subparagraph has been subsumed under Paragraph 4 and does not need to be repeated. Subparagraph 9(d): Replace “ensure provision” with “undertake provision”. Subparagraph 9(f): Proposes “to undertake the development of vocational education and training systems and the supervision of their application to provide ...”.

*New Zealand.* Subparagraph 9(b): Questions the use of the word “denied”; suggests “unable to access education and training”.

*Norway.* Subparagraph 9(b): The phrase “who were denied” may be too narrow and should be replaced with the phrase “who had no opportunity of”.

*Portugal.* CGTP-IN. Subparagraph 9(b): Amend the wording to “develop approaches to formal and non-formal education and training, especially for adults who were denied education and training opportunities when young”.

*United Kingdom.* Subparagraph 9(d): Suggests inserting “appropriate” before “vocational, labour market and career information and guidance ...”.

*United States.* Subparagraph 9(f): The content is already covered in Paragraph 6 and subparagraphs 9(d) and (e); therefore, recommends that subparagraph 9(f) be deleted.

#### *Office commentary*

As a diverse range of comments were received, there was insufficient support to change the existing text.

Paragraph 9, with minor editorial changes, appears as Paragraph 9 of the proposed Recommendation.

#### IV. DEVELOPMENT OF SKILLS AND COMPETENCIES OF EMPLOYED AND UNEMPLOYED WORKERS

##### *General observations on Part IV*

*Australia.* ACTU. Part IV should emphasize the role of the social partners in the development of high-level skills resulting in decent stable jobs; giving priority to low-skilled workers and measures to combat social exclusion and discrimination, particularly for women, migrants, informal and indigenous workers, through collective agreements.

*Brazil.* Amend the title as follows: “Development of qualifications and competencies of employed and unemployed workers”.

*France.* Part IV is confusing, dealing with the training of employed and unemployed persons together; proposes dedicating a particular section to the unemployed. Paragraph 10 is too long – ten subparagraphs; consider separate paragraphs.

*Japan.* The word “skills” should be removed from the title as it is encompassed in “competencies”.

*Mauritius.* Proposes to reword the title as follows: “Development of skills and competencies of employed, redeployed and unemployed workers” and add a subparagraph (k) “formulate training policies to ensure effective redeployment of workers across sectors”.

*Mexico.* In order to apply the concept of competency, it should be stated that, in all countries, competency directly depends on the specific way in which education and labour policies are drawn up and developed. However, at the same time, there are shared and complementary features as regards the skills, knowledge, competence and specialized technical know-how that are used and that prevail in given contexts. It would be appropriate to clarify the notions of basic or fundamental competencies and so-called specific competencies, so as to define the responsibilities of governments and of other agents such as enterprises when developing both these types of competencies. Furthermore, there should be a definition of occupational competency assessment, given that this issue is referred to in Part V.

#### *Office commentary*

As there was a discrepancy in the title between the English and French versions, and as subparagraph 3(b) defines competencies to cover skills, the Drafting Committee has reworded the title of this part to bring these two versions into line.

The title, as amended, appears as the title of Part IV of the proposed Recommendation.

#### 10. Members should:

- (a) promote, with the involvement of the social partners, the ongoing identification of trends in the skills needed by individuals, enterprises, the economy and society as a whole;
- (b) recognize workplace learning, including formal and informal learning, and work experience;
- (c) support initiatives by the social partners in the field of training in bipartite dialogue, including collective bargaining;
- (d) recognize the role of the social partners, enterprises and workers in contributing to training; provide positive measures to stimulate investment and participation in training; and assume primary responsibility for the training of the unemployed;
- (e) promote the expansion of workplace-based learning and training by:
  - (i) utilizing high-performance work practices;
  - (ii) organizing on- and off-the-job training with public and private training providers, and making greater use of information and communication technology; and
  - (iii) encouraging the use of new forms of learning along with appropriate social policies and measures to facilitate participation in training;
- (f) urge private and public employers to adopt best practices in human resources development;
- (g) develop equal opportunity strategies, measures and programmes to promote and implement training for women, as well as specific groups and economic sectors, and people with special needs, with the objective of reducing inequalities;
- (h) promote equal opportunities for, and access to, career guidance and skill upgrading for all workers, as well as support for retraining employees whose jobs are at risk;

- (i) call upon multinational enterprises to provide training for all levels of their employees in home and host countries, to meet the needs of the enterprises and contribute to the development of the country; and
- (j) promote the development of training policies for their own employees, recognizing the role of the social partners in the public sector, as well as provide equitable training opportunities to all workers.

### *Observations on Paragraph 10*

*Australia.* Subparagraph 10(g): The wording of this is not clear, particularly the reference to “as well as specific groups and economic sectors, and people with special needs”, and should be reviewed to make the intent clearer. Subparagraph 10(h): The phrase “support for retraining employees whose jobs are at risk” needs to be qualified as, while such assistance is appropriate in many instances, it is often preferable for jobseekers to test the labour market first and then focus assistance on those who have difficulty making a successful transition to alternative employment. Subparagraph 10(j): The phrase “all workers” incorporates more than just the employees of the government; it infers employees of the private sector as well. If the sentence were to remain unchanged then we would suggest that the word “provide” be replaced with “promote”. The wording of this Paragraph: “provide equitable training opportunities for all workers” (in the private and public sectors) needs to be clearer – promotion of such training opportunities may be Members’ responsibility, but “provision of” appears too embracing.

*Belgium.* Subparagraph 10(j): Refers to public sector employees.

*Brazil.* Subparagraph 10(d): Amend as follows: “recognize the role played by the social partners, enterprises and workers in helping to develop and manage training policies, and provide practical measures to stimulate investment and participation in training”. Subparagraph 10(i): Amend as follows: “guarantee that, in order to provide vocational training for workers, multinational enterprises must establish a process of negotiation and recruitment in the countries of origin and destination with the union organizations that represent such workers”. Subparagraph 10(j): Refers to public sector employees.

*CNC.* Subparagraph 10(j): Understands “all workers” to refer to all workers in the public and private sectors.

*Canada.* Subparagraph 10(j): Refers to public sector employees.

*CEC.* Subparagraph 10(c): As the majority of the world’s workers are not represented by labour organizations, the instrument should not make reference to collective bargaining. Delete the words “collective bargaining”, as bipartite dialogue includes collective bargaining.

*China.* Subparagraph 10(d): Suggests changing the phrase “assume primary responsibility” to “assume corresponding responsibility”, because Paragraph 6 sets forth “the primary responsibility of government for education and pre-employment training and for training the unemployed”.

*Costa Rica.* Subparagraph 10(j): Suggests “... equitable training opportunities for all workers, whether in the public or the private sector”.

*Czech Republic.* Subparagraph 10(j): Refers to workers in the public sector only.  
*KZPS.* Subparagraph 10(j): Refers to state administration only.  
*SPD.* Subparagraph 10(j): Refers to workers in the public and private sectors.  
*ČMKOS.* Subparagraph 10(j): Refers to workers in the public and private sectors.

*Denmark.* Subparagraph 10(e): Delete (i), (ii) and (iii). Subparagraph 10(j): Refers to workers in the public and private sectors.

*DA.* Subparagraph 10(j): Should be clarified at the International Labour Conference.

*LO, AC and FTF.* Subparagraph 10(j): Refers to public sector employees.

*Dominican Republic.* Subparagraph 10(d): The primary responsibility for training the unemployed is already contained in Paragraph 6; it should not be repeated. Subparagraph 10(f): References to “human resources”, a phrase which also appears in a number of other paragraphs, should be replaced by “human management”. It is widely accepted that people are not “resources” because they are not equipment or machinery. Subparagraph 10(i): There could be discussion on this, as it must be applicable to all types of enterprise, not just multinationals.

*Egypt.* Subparagraph 10(j): Refers to the employees only, not to all workers in both private and public sectors.

*El Salvador.* Subparagraph 10(j): To clarify this issue, proposes “to foster the establishment of training policies for both public and private sector workers which recognize the role of the social partners and provide these workers with equitable training opportunities”.

*Eritrea.* Subparagraph 10(j): Replace “all workers” with “public and private sector workers”.

*Finland.* Subparagraph 10(j): In line with subparagraph 10(h), consideration could be given to using the term “workers in the public and private sectors”.

*France.* Subparagraph 10(b): See comments on subparagraph 9(b). The term “experience” covers knowledge and skills acquired informally, which can be acquired outside the occupational setting as well as within it; proposes that subparagraph 10(b) be replaced by “recognize learning acquired in the workplace and from personal and professional experience”. Subparagraph 10(e): Confuses the responsibilities of the State and those of businesses; refers to on- and off-the-job training without making clear which is being discussed, and deals with broad policy direction and technical applications at the same time. Subparagraph 10(e)(ii): Replace “greater use” with “appropriate use”. Subparagraph 10(g): The expression “with the objective of reducing inequalities” is obvious and, therefore, redundant; proposes it be removed. Subparagraph 10(h): After “promote equal opportunities for, and access to”, add “information, career guidance and ...”.

*Germany.* Subparagraph 10(j): Refers to public sector employees.

*Ireland.* Subparagraph 10(j): Refers to public sector employees.

*Italy.* CGIL, CISL, UIL. Subparagraph 10(j): This subparagraph should be clarified by adding: “... equitable training opportunities to all workers in both public and private sectors”.

*Japan.* Subparagraph 10(b): Clarification is needed on what is meant by “recognize ... formal learning”. Subparagraph 10(e)(i): Clarification is needed on what is meant by “utilizing high-performance work practices”. Subparagraph 10(i): Why a special subparagraph should be established for “multinational enterprises” is not clear and should be clarified.

*Japan Business Federation.* Subparagraph 10(c): Identifies “collective bargaining” as one form of bipartite dialogue. However, we do not find the reason why only “collective bargaining” is pointed out among other forms of bipartite dialogue; therefore, delete “including collective bargaining”. Subparagraph 10(i): Providing training for employees is a role for all enterprises including multinational enterprises. Furthermore, the Preamble has already referred to “the Tripartite Declaration of Principles concerning Multinational Enterprises and Social Policy”; therefore, this subparagraph should be deleted.

*JTUC-RENGO.* Subparagraph 10(j): Reference should be made to “all workers in both the public and the private sectors”.

*Lebanon.* Subparagraph 10(a): Suggests “promote, in consultation with the social partners, the ongoing identification of trends ...”. Subparagraph 10(b): Add the following phrase at the end: “... in conformity with standards set up for this end”. Subparagraph 10(c): Prefers “encourage” rather than “support”. Subparagraph 10(d): Add “... within the national laws and practices in force” to the end of the subparagraph. Subparagraph 10(h): Reword to read “promote equal opportunities for, and access to, career guidance and skill upgrading for all workers, provide equitable opportunities for training, as well as establish constraints for retraining employees whose jobs are at risk”. Subparagraph 10(j): Refers to public sector employees.

*Lithuania.* Subparagraph 10(j): Understands this subparagraph to address employees in the public sector.

*Mauritius.* Subparagraph 10(j): Replace “all workers” with “all workers in that sector”.

*Mexico.* Subparagraph 10(j): Refers to workers in the public sector.

*Morocco.* Subparagraph 10(j): Refers to workers in the private sector as well.

*Netherlands.* VNO-NCW. Subparagraph 10(l): Proposes to insert “... to provide relevant training ...”, which is the wording used in the Tripartite Declaration of Principles concerning Multinational Enterprises and Social Policy.

*New Zealand.* Subparagraph 10(d): Seeks clarification on what “positive measures” were envisaged for governments to stimulate investment and participation in training; suggests that a partnership approach with the social partners, enterprises and employees would be more appropriate. Subparagraph 10(g): The expression “people with special needs” should include indigenous peoples and ethnic minority groups. Subparagraph 10(j): Understands “all workers” to refer to all workers in both the public and the private sectors.

*NZCTU.* Subparagraph 10(d): Agrees with the partnership approach suggested by the Government and notes that it is consistent with the rest of the document that governments should be the key initiators in this area.

*Nicaragua.* Subparagraph 10(j): It is an obligation of the State to establish training policies that are valid for workers in general – in both the public and the private sectors. However, it is important to ensure that public employees have equal access to training programmes and plans that will ensure institutional strengthening. The following wording is proposed: “draw up training programmes and plans for workers in the public sector, with the participation of the social partners”.

*Philippines.* Subparagraph 10(j): As this subparagraph addresses the role of government to promote training for government employees, there is no need to add the phrase “... as well as provide equitable training opportunities to all workers” because the provision of equal training opportunities to private sector employees was already included in subparagraphs 10(h) and (i); or the phrase can be reworded to read: “... as well as provide equitable training opportunities to all workers in the public sector”.

*Portugal.* Subparagraph 10(e)(iii): The phrase “in particular, workers in micro- and small enterprises” could be added at the end. Subparagraph 10(j): Refers to state employees.

CGTP-IN. Subparagraph 10(e): Introduce a new subparagraph to read “recognizing training undertaken by the worker for the purposes of career development”. Subparagraph 10(j): This provision should be extended to all workers, in both the public and the private sectors.

CAP. Subparagraph 10(j): Member States must be responsible for the creation and support of a national vocational training system, providing all workers with opportunities to acquire qualifications and skills, whether they are state or private sector workers. It is emphasized, however, that the various social partners need to participate in the “construction” of the system.

*Spain.* Subparagraph 10(j): The expression “own employees” refers to the public sector and the expression “all workers” should refer to all workers in the public and private sectors.

UGT. Subparagraph 10(j): Substitute “all workers” with “all their workers”.

CCOO. Subparagraph 10(j): Suggests “to promote the development of training policies for workers in their employ, providing equitable training opportunities and recognizing the role of the social partners in the public sector”.

*Switzerland.* Subparagraph 10(a): Does not support the Office’s proposed amendment: “promote ... the ongoing identification of trends” does not mean the same thing as “further the ongoing identification of trends”. Subparagraph 10(j): Understands the meaning of the term “all workers” in this context as referring to those employed by the State.

UPS. Subparagraph 10(i): Add “relevant” before “training”.

USS/SGB. Subparagraph 10(j): Could be clarified by reference to “all workers in both the public and the private sectors”.

*Syrian Arab Republic.* Subparagraph 10(j): Proposes “encourage the development of training policies for all workers in the private and public sectors”.

*Thailand.* Subparagraph 10(j): Refers to workers in both the public and the private sectors.

*Tunisia.* Subparagraph 10(j): Replace “all workers” with “all their employees”; the term “workers” is, generally, used for those working in the private sector and “employees, agents and officials” for those in the public sector.

*Turkey.* TÜRK-IS. Subparagraph 10(j): The words “in both the public and the private sectors” should be added.

*United Kingdom.* Subparagraph 10(j): Understands the meaning of the term “all workers” in this context to refer to all workers in the public sector.

*United States.* Subparagraph 10(c): Suggests “support the social partners in initiatives that prepare workers and employers to participate in bipartite dialogue, including collective bargaining”. Subparagraph 10(j): As this subparagraph specifically addresses employees in the public sector, interprets “all workers” to mean all public sector employees. The need for equitable training opportunities for all workers, including both private and public sector workers, has been addressed elsewhere in the proposed text.

USCIB. Subparagraph 10(d): It is important to recognize the responsibility of the individual for seeking out opportunities and investing in his or her own training and development. This idea, which is introduced here, could be strengthened with a reference to individuals investing in themselves.

*Uruguay.* Subparagraph 10(e)(iii): Reword to read: “encouraging the use of new forms of learning along with appropriate social policies and measures to facilitate the participation of workers in training”. Subparagraph 10(j): Should read “all public sector employees”.

PIT-CNT. Subparagraph 10(d): It is stated that governments are primarily responsible for education and pre-employment training (subparagraph 5(g)) and for the training of the unemployed (subparagraph 10(d)), whereas the Preamble indicates – and correctly so – that governments should invest “to enhance education and training at all levels”. Owing to this contradiction, the reference made to this issue in the substantive provisions of the document must be improved, given that governments are responsible for all education and training. Since investment is a primary responsibility of governments, subparagraph 10(d) should be substantially rewritten, as workers taken individually cannot assume a role on the same level as governments, enterprises, or even trade unions.

### *Office commentary*

Paragraph 10 has been redrafted, including the subdivision of subparagraph 10(d), and reordered to improve clarity. The respondents that provided comments on subparagraph 10(j) were uncertain as to whether or not the reference to “all workers” referred to workers in the public sector. The Drafting Committee noted that the text was referring to the role of Members in relation to the training of their employees; therefore, the subparagraph has been revised accordingly.

Paragraph 10, as amended, appears as Paragraph 10 of the proposed Recommendation.

11. Members should consider the possibility of undertaking tripartite dialogue on training at various levels of government.

*Observations on Paragraph 11*

*Australia.* State government of Queensland. The rewording proposed by the Office is acceptable.

*Belgium.* Agrees with the suggestion of the Office.

*Brazil.* Delete “consider the possibility of”.

*Canada.* Proposes to delete this Paragraph as the principle of tripartite dialogue on training is already well reflected throughout the text.

CEC. Has no problem if the Government wants to pursue tripartite discussions on all their training; not clear why they would not want to restrict it to bipartite.

*Costa Rica.* The proposed text is better than the original.

*Czech Republic.* ČMKOS. Agrees that it should be a separate paragraph.

*El Salvador.* Agrees with the new wording of the Paragraph.

*France.* Should be attached to the end of subparagraph 10(j).

*Ireland.* Retain the original text.

*Italy.* CGIL, CISL, UIL. Agree with the suggestion of the Office.

*Japan.* The Paragraph appears to duplicate Paragraph 7; therefore, its necessity should be clarified.

JTUC-RENGO. Agrees with the suggestion of the Office.

*Lebanon.* Agrees with the suggestion of the Office.

*Mauritius.* Agrees with the suggestion of the Office.

*Mexico.* It would be appropriate to consider the fact that competencies are developed through informal and formal training procedures. Also, the notions of lifelong learning and training should not be used separately, as the text implies that these are two different things.

*New Zealand.* Agrees with the suggestion of the Office.

*Nicaragua.* Agrees with the suggestion of the Office.

*Philippines.* Agrees with the suggestion of the Office.

*Portugal.* Agrees with the suggestion of the Office.

UGT. The original text should not be amended, as, although the state obviously cannot consider the possibility of conducting tripartite dialogue by itself, it can always take the initiative.

CGTP-IN. Delete the expression “consider the possibility of”, leaving the following wording: “Members should undertake tripartite dialogue on training at various levels of government.”

*Spain.* Current wording is unclear and vague.

*Switzerland.* Is uncertain what purpose is served by this Paragraph, as the concept of social dialogue has already been dealt with in many parts of this text; suggests that this Paragraph be deleted.

USS/SGB. Agrees with the creation of a separate paragraph.

*Syrian Arab Republic.* Proposes to delete the Paragraph as its contents are reflected in several provisions of the proposed Recommendation.

*Thailand.* Agrees with the suggestion of the Office.

*Tunisia.* Agrees with the suggestion of the Office.

*United States.* Creating a separate paragraph is appropriate.

#### *Office commentary*

The majority of respondents supported the adjustment made by the Office.

Paragraph 11, without amendment, appears as Paragraph 11 of the proposed Recommendation.

### V. FRAMEWORK FOR RECOGNITION AND CERTIFICATION OF SKILLS

#### *General observations on Part V*

*France.* This technical section applies to all individuals, and particularly those suffering from exclusion, whose situation is, currently, dealt with in Part VI: Training for decent work and social inclusion; proposes that Part V be placed after Part VI. The title does not take into account the informal skills referred to in Paragraph 12; proposes to amend the title to “Framework for recognition and certification of formal and informal skills”.

12. Measures should be adopted, in consultation with the social partners, to promote the development, implementation and financing of a transparent mechanism for the assessment, certification and recognition of skills and credentials, including the accreditation and validation of prior learning and previous experience, irrespective of the countries where they were acquired and of whether acquired formally or informally, and using a national qualifications framework. Such an assessment methodology should be fair, linked to standards and non-discriminatory, and the national framework should include a credible system of certification which will ensure that skills are portable and recognized across enterprises, sectors, industries and educational institutions.

#### *Observations on Paragraph 12*

*Australia.* State government of Queensland. Agrees with the suggestion of the Office.

ACTU. Does not support the notion that the social partners should be required to share responsibility for financing the mechanism for the recognition and certification of skills; financing these mechanisms is the responsibility of governments and/or employers.

*Belgium.* CNT. Agrees with the suggestion the Office.

*Brazil.* Agrees with the suggestion of the Office, but replace “consultation” with “participation”.

*Canada.* Proposes to add “with national jurisdictions, as well as” before “across enterprises, sectors ...”.

CEC. Questions how effective a national programme would be in federal countries.

*Costa Rica.* Proposed text is clearer than the original.

*Czech Republic.* ČMKOS. Agrees with the suggestion of the Office; but add “and regional institutions” at the end of the Paragraph.

*Denmark.* Agrees with the suggestion of the Office.

*Dominican Republic.* The wording needs to be improved as, even though this is a proposed Recommendation, it is difficult to implement as it stands.

*El Salvador.* Both drafts are concurrent.

*Finland.* Agrees with the suggestion of the Office.

*France.* Replace “a transparent mechanism” with “transparent mechanisms”. The phrase “irrespective of the countries where they were acquired” should be deleted; a reliable and transparent framework needs to be established to allow the recognition of previously acquired skills. Automatic transferability or recognition of qualifications between countries is impossible.

*Italy.* CGIL, CISL, UIL. Agree with the suggestion of the Office.

*Japan.* The phrase “irrespective of the countries where they were acquired and of whether acquired formally or informally” should be deleted; frameworks for assessment are country specific.

JTUC-RENGO. Agrees with the suggestion of the Office.

*Lebanon.* Place the word “financing” before the word “implementation”.

*Lithuania.* Agrees with the suggestion of the Office.

*Mauritius.* Agrees with the suggestion of the Office.

*Mexico.* Agrees that Members should have transparent mechanisms for the assessment, certification and recognition of the skills and credentials of (their) migrant workers so as to encourage fair and non-discriminatory treatment. People with special needs, older persons and specific groups should be included in this section. It would be appropriate to refer to the role of skills recognition and certification, as well as the principles for ensuring that certification is “reliable”.

*New Zealand.* Agrees with the suggestion of the Office.

NZCTU. Suggests that the words “across countries” be added at the end of the Paragraph.

*Nicaragua.* Agrees with the suggestion of the Office and proposes to delete the word “credible” when referring to the inclusion of systems of certification, as this tends to discredit them from the outset.

*Philippines.* Agrees with the suggestion of the Office.

*Portugal.* The words “non-formally” should be added after “whether acquired formally” and “and between countries” to the last line.

*CAP.* Agrees with the suggestion of the Office.

*Singapore.* Proposes rewording the text to read: “Measures should be adopted to the extent possible, in consultation with the social partners, to promote the development, implementation and financing of a transparent credible mechanism for the assessment, certification and recognition of skills and credentials acquired under formal education, and using a national qualifications framework. Such an assessment methodology should be fair, linked to standards and non-discriminatory, and the national framework should include a credible system of certification which will ensure, where possible, that relevant skills in demand are portable and recognized across enterprises, sectors, industries and educational institutions.”

*Spain.* The current wording is not as clear as it should be given that it sets out central points of the proposed Recommendation. This Paragraph refers, above all, to “a national qualifications framework”. The double reference in the Paragraph, preceded, moreover, by subparagraph 5(h), raises the question of the need to distinguish the form of the technical aspect of the “national qualifications framework” and its functions better.

*UGT.* It is not acceptable to substitute “in agreement with the social partners” with “in consultation with the social partners”; the duty of the public authorities in this area is to come to agreements and formal consultation is not sufficient.

*Switzerland.* Agrees with the suggestion of the Office.

*UPS.* Replace “recognized” with “comparable” in the last line.

*Syrian Arab Republic.* Agrees with the suggestion of the Office.

*Thailand.* Agrees with the suggestion of the Office.

*Tunisia.* Agrees with the suggestion of the Office.

*Turkey.* TÜRK-İS. Agrees with the suggestion of the Office.

*United States.* Does not object to the proposed text. The “development” and “implementation” of the mechanism imply that it will be financed, and therefore “development, implementation, and financing of a transparent mechanism” can be shortened to “development and implementation of a transparent mechanism”. Also, “accreditation” of prior learning and previous experience implies that the prior learning and previous experience have been validated; therefore, “accreditation and validation of prior learning and previous experience” can be shortened to “accreditation of prior learning and previous experience”.

*Uruguay.* Agrees with the suggestion of the Office.

#### *Office commentary*

As this Paragraph was long and dealt with numerous issues, it has been subdivided and reworded to improve clarity.

Paragraph 12, as amended, now appears as 12.1, 12.2 and 12.3 of the proposed Recommendation.

13. Special provisions should be designed for migrant workers in order to ensure recognition and certification of competencies and qualifications.

#### *Observations on Paragraph 13*

*Australia.* State government of Queensland. Agrees with the suggestion of the Office.

*Belgium.* CNT. Agrees with the suggestion of the Office.

*Brazil.* Agrees with the suggestion of the Office, but after “certification of” add “knowledge”.

*Canada.* Paragraph 12 explicitly includes migrant workers as it states “irrespective of the countries where they were acquired”, making Paragraph 13 redundant; should be deleted.

*Costa Rica.* Proposed text is clearer than the original.

*Czech Republic.* SPD. Recommends changing “migrant workers” to “foreign workers”.

ČMKOS. Agrees with the suggestion of the Office.

*Denmark.* Agrees with the suggestion of the Office.

*Dominican Republic.* Suggests changing “migrant workers” to “foreign workers” or “expatriate workers”.

*El Salvador.* Both drafts are concurrent.

*Finland.* Agrees with the suggestion of the Office.

*France.* This is a sensitive issue, as many countries have no legal provisions to allow recognition of qualifications of migrants and transferability of those qualifications; proposes Paragraph 13 be deleted.

*Italy.* CGIL, CISL, UIL. Agree with the suggestion of the Office.

*Japan.* Clarification is needed on why migrant workers are specifically identified in this Paragraph; if it is necessary, “considering the circumstances of each country” should be added.

Japan Business Federation. The term “migrant workers” should be replaced with “foreign workers”.

JTUC-RENGO. Agrees with the suggestion of the Office.

*Lebanon.* Reword this Paragraph to read: “Special provisions should be designed for migrant workers that specify the conditions of recognition and certification of competencies and qualifications.”

*Lithuania.* Agrees with the suggestion of the Office.

*Mauritius.* Agrees with the suggestion of the Office.

*Mexico.* See comments on Paragraph 12.

*Netherlands.* VNO-NCW. Suggests “foreign workers” instead of “migrant workers”, because the issue is recognition and certification of skills, which refers not only to more permanent (im)migration, but to all kinds of international labour mobility.

*New Zealand.* Agrees with the suggestion of the Office.

*Nicaragua.* Agrees with the suggestion of the Office.

*Philippines.* Agrees with the suggestion of the Office.

*Portugal.* CAP. Agrees with the suggestion of the Office.

*Singapore.* This paragraph makes particular reference to a framework for the recognition and certification of skills designed specifically for migrant workers. This Paragraph should be deleted since the accreditation framework outlined in Paragraph 12 is fair and non-discriminatory, hence provides for the protection of the interests of migrant workers.

*Switzerland.* Agrees with the suggestion of the Office.

UPS. Replace “migrant workers” with “foreign workers”.

*Syrian Arab Republic.* Agrees with the suggestion of the Office.

*Thailand.* Agrees with the suggestion of the Office.

*Tunisia.* Agrees with the suggestion of the Office.

*Turkey.* TÜRK-IS. Agrees with the suggestion of the Office.

*United States.* Does not object to the proposed text.

*Uruguay.* Agrees with the suggestion of the Office.

### *Office commentary*

The Drafting Committee has reworded the text to improve clarity and consistency, while retaining the substance.

Paragraph 13, as amended, appears as Paragraph 13 of the proposed Recommendation.

## VI. TRAINING FOR DECENT WORK AND SOCIAL INCLUSION

### *General observations on Part VI*

*Australia.* ACTU. The list of people with special needs should be read in its broadest sense to include all those suffering physical, mental, geographic or other disadvantages and include, but not be limited to, women, rural workers, workers with disabilities, older workers, long-term unemployed, young people, migrant workers, indigenous people and workers laid off. Part VI should ensure equal access to education and training opportunities for social development and ensure the integration of training with other measures, such as childcare facilities, in order to promote decent work.

*France.* Paragraph 15 is a general statement and should precede the current Paragraph 14.

*Japan.* Japan Business Federation. As Part VI is redundant, it would be better that it be merged with other existing paragraphs.

14. Members should recognize:

- (a) the primary role of government for the training of the unemployed, those seeking to enter or re-enter the labour market and people with special needs, to develop and enhance their employability in securing decent work in the private and public sectors through such measures as incentives and assistance;
- (b) the role of the social partners to support, through human resources development policies and other measures, the integration of the unemployed and people with special needs in jobs; and
- (c) the role of the local authorities and communities in implementing programmes for people with special needs.

#### *Observations on Paragraph 14*

*Brazil.* Subparagraph 14(a): Replace “employability” with “access to, and retention of, employment, initial earnings and increasing income”.

*Czech Republic.* Subparagraph 14(c): The phrase “the involvement of the social partners” has been deleted; recommends retaining the original text.

*Dominican Republic.* Subparagraph 14(b): Must be clarified to avoid any interference at enterprise level.

*Finland.* Subparagraph 14(a): The primary role of government for training of people with special needs apparently addresses the needs of vulnerable groups, including those socially excluded from the labour market. However, for clarification, this point merits revisiting.

*France.* Subparagraph 14(a): The word “government” is not appropriate here (see comments on the Preamble); proposes that the beginning of the subparagraph be replaced by “their primary role”. Questions why the text refers to the “unemployed”; this was dealt with in the previous section. The text should be amended to read “for the training of those seeking to enter or re-enter ...”. The phrase “in the private and public sectors” serves no purpose and should be deleted. Subparagraph 14(b): The phrase “through human resources development policies and other measures” is vague and adds nothing; delete.

*Italy.* Subparagraph 14(c): The role of regional and local authorities is much broader than indicated in the text.

*UGL.* Subparagraph 14(b): It is necessary to recognize the crucially important role of the social partners in supporting, through human resources development policies and other measures, the integration of the unemployed and people with special needs in jobs.

*Lebanon.* Introductory phrase: Replace the word “recognize” with “take into account”.

*Portugal.* Subparagraph 14(c): Make reference to the role of civil society and non-governmental organizations.

*United Kingdom.* Subparagraph 14(a): Suggests adding “and voluntary sectors” after “public sector ...”.

#### *Office commentary*

As there was no clear pattern to the comments on Paragraph 14, it appears, without amendments to the English text and with minor editorial changes to the French text, as Paragraph 14 of the proposed Recommendation.

15. Measures should be adopted to promote the countering of the social exclusion of people with special needs by paying attention to their access to lifelong-learning possibilities and programmes which assist them to secure decent work.

#### *Observations on Paragraph 15*

*Australia.* Prefers “promote the social inclusion of people with special needs”.

*Belgium.* Agrees with the suggestion of the Office.

*Brazil.* Agrees with the suggestion of the Office.

*Canada.* Agrees with the suggestion of the Office.

*Costa Rica.* Prefers “promote the social inclusion of people with special needs”.

*Czech Republic.* Prefers “promote the social inclusion of people with special needs”.

*Denmark.* Agrees with the suggestion of the Office.

*Egypt.* Proposes “the instrument shall encourage the social integration of people with special needs”.

*El Salvador.* There is an absolute difference between the two proposed phrases. The idea of countering the social exclusion of people with special needs implies that there are two forces working in opposite directions and an obvious antagonism. The phrase “promote the social inclusion of people with special needs” evokes the idea of introducing or stimulating, through legitimate means, the social inclusion of such people, which is more in keeping with the need to adopt various proposals on HRDT.

*Eritrea.* Agrees with the suggestion of the Office.

*Finland.* Prefers “promote the social inclusion of people with special needs”.

*France.* Agrees with the suggestion of the Office: “promote the inclusion of ...”.

*Germany.* Agrees with the suggestion of the Office.

*Ireland.* Prefers “promote the inclusion of people with special needs”.

*Italy.* CGIL, CISL, UIL. Agree with the suggestion of the Office.

*Japan.* JTUC-RENGO. Agrees with the suggestion of the Office.

*Lebanon.* Merge with subparagraph 5(k).

*Lithuania.* Agrees with the suggestion of the Office.

*Mauritius.* Agrees with the suggestion of the Office.

*Mexico.* Agrees with the suggestion of the Office.

*Morocco.* Agrees with the suggestion of the Office.

*Netherlands.* VNO-NCW. Suggests a more positive wording: "... to promote the social inclusion ...".

*New Zealand.* Agrees that "promote the social inclusion of people with special needs" reads better.

*Nicaragua.* Prefers the Office formulation.

*Norway.* Should also reflect the broad definition of the term "lifelong learning". The expression "promote the countering of the social exclusion of" should be replaced with "promote the social inclusion of ...".

*Philippines.* Agrees with the suggestion of the Office.

*Portugal.* Agrees with the suggestion of the Office.

CCP. Does not agree with this change, because the proposed wording implies a higher degree of obligation. If the issue is consistency between the Paragraph and the title, amend the title.

*Spain.* Agrees with the suggestion of the Office.

*Switzerland.* Prefers the text proposed by the Office.

*Syrian Arab Republic.* Retain the original text.

*Thailand.* Agrees with the suggestion of the Office.

*Turkey.* TÜRK-IS. Agrees with the suggestion of the Office.

*United Kingdom.* Agrees with the suggestion of the Office.

*United States.* The phrase "promote the social inclusion of people with special needs" reads better and is consistent with the title.

*Uruguay.* Agrees with the suggestion of the Office.

### *Office commentary*

Almost all respondents agreed that this Paragraph should be reworded to reflect the title of this Part as well as the more positive wording "promote the social inclusion". The text has been changed accordingly.

Paragraph 15, as amended, appears as Paragraph 15 of the proposed Recommendation.

## VII. TRAINING PROVIDERS

*General observations on Part VII*

*France.* Prefers the title to read “Provision of training”.

16. Members should, in cooperation with the social partners, promote diversity of training provision to meet the different needs of individuals and enterprises and to ensure high-quality standards, recognition and transferability of competencies and qualifications within a national quality assurance framework.

*Observations on Paragraph 16*

*Belgium.* Government of Flanders. Clarification is needed on what is meant by a “national quality assurance framework”.

*Brazil.* Replace “in cooperation with the social partners” by “with the participation of the social partners”.

*Dominican Republic.* Suggests eliminating the ambiguity in the final part of Paragraph 16; this is a tripartite instrument and it should be clear and precise to avoid possible disputes in the future.

*Lebanon.* Use “in consultation with the social partners” rather than “in cooperation with the social partners”; replace the word “ensure” with “to work on ensuring”, because nothing can be absolutely ensured.

*New Zealand.* NZCTU. Is concerned that the “diversity of training” can be read as the promotion of the private sector; should recognize the primacy of the state sector as first provider and the private sector as complementary.

*Portugal.* The international level should also be considered.

*Spain.* CEOE. Makes reference to “ensure high-quality standards”, an issue that is often linked to certification, which is a difficult issue for small and medium-sized enterprises, owing to the complexity and cost. It would be preferable to speak of “development, management and improvement of quality”, which is a broader expression that includes not only certification but also other approaches based on self-evaluation.

*Office commentary*

As there was no clear pattern in the limited number of comments on this Paragraph, it appears, without amendments to the English text and with editorial changes to the French text, as Paragraph 16 of the proposed Recommendation.

17. Members should:

- (a) develop a 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;

- (c) include quality assurance in the public system and promote its development within the private training market and evaluate the outcomes of education and training; and
- (d) develop quality standards for trainers and create the opportunities for trainers to meet such standards.

### *Observations on Paragraph 17*

*Australia.* State government of Queensland. Subparagraph 17(c): The revised text is more reader-friendly; however, it could appear that the evaluation of outcomes is a different issue to including quality assurance within the public system.

*ACTU.* Governments should regulate training providers to ensure quality provision including national standards for human and physical resources, establishment and management processes, staff career training and development, auditing, reporting and accountability and quality assurance processes, teaching staff certification, emphasis on collaboration of training effort and greater effective coordination among the training providers.

*Belgium.* Subparagraph 17(c): Does not think the amendment necessary but has no particular objection to it.

*Government of Flanders.* Paragraph 17 is not consistent. Subparagraph 17(a): Questions whether this is discussing the certification of the qualifications of training providers themselves or the certification of qualifications issued by training providers. Subparagraph 17(b): Addresses the role of actors; suggests that a separate paragraph under Part I be created to explain the role of the social partners. Subparagraph 17(c): Does not agree that the evaluation of outcomes should be part of the quality assurance. Subparagraph 17(d): This subparagraph has to be part of the quality framework.

*CNT.* Subparagraph 17(c): Retain the original text.

*Brazil.* Subparagraph 17(a): Replace “framework” with “parameters”. Subparagraph 17(c): Accepts the suggestion of the Office, but add “include, develop and render quality control compatible with the public training system and the private training market and evaluate the results of education and training”. Subparagraph 17(d): Replace “trainers” with “vocational training educators”.

*Canada.* Subparagraph 17(c): Agrees with the suggestion of the Office.

*Costa Rica.* Subparagraph 17(c): It should read “and evaluate the outcomes of education and training”.

*Czech Republic.* Subparagraph 17(c): Agrees with the suggestion of the Office.

*Denmark.* Subparagraph 17(c): Agrees with the suggestion of the Office.

*Egypt.* Subparagraph 17(c): Proposes “evaluation of the outcomes of education and training”.

*El Salvador.* Subparagraph 17(c): Agrees with the suggestion of the Office.

*Eritrea.* Subparagraph 17(c): Retain the original text.

*Finland.* Subparagraph 17(c): The text proposed by the Office is the better alternative.

*France.* Subparagraph 17(a): Questions whether this refers to the qualifications of trainers themselves or those of training institutions. Use “of training institutions” for the sake of clarity. Subparagraph 17(b): Amend to “identify their role and that of the social partners” (see comments regarding the use of “government” in Preamble). Subparagraph 17(c): Agrees with the suggestion of the Office. Subparagraph 17(d): The proposed Recommendation addresses education as well as training; it is, therefore, appropriate to address teachers as well as trainers; proposes rewording to “for teachers and trainers”.

*Germany.* Subparagraph 17(c): Retain the original text.

*Ireland.* Subparagraph 17(c): Should read “evaluate the outcomes of education and training”.

*Italy.* Subparagraph 17(b): A reference to the role of regional and local authorities is lacking.

CGIL, CISL, UIL. Subparagraph 17(c): The proposal of the Office changes the meaning of the sentence; suggest the following: after “private training market” insert “through the evaluation of the outcomes of education and training”.

*Japan.* Subparagraph 17(c): Clarification is needed on the meaning of “include quality assurance in the public system”. Subparagraph 17(d): The meaning of “trainers” is ambiguous and should be changed to “training instructors”.

JTUC-RENGO. Subparagraph 17(c): Suggests “through the evaluation of the outcomes of education and training”.

*Lebanon.* Subparagraph 17(c): Retain the original text. Subparagraph 17(d): Re-word to read: “develop quality standards for trainers and work on creating the opportunities for trainers to meet such standards”.

*Lithuania.* Subparagraph 17(c): Retain the original text. Quality assurance measures in the public system can be different, not only the evaluation of outcomes.

*Mauritius.* Subparagraph 17(c): Agrees with the suggestion of the Office.

*Mexico.* Subparagraph 17(c): Agrees with the suggestion of the Office.

*New Zealand.* Subparagraph 17(c): Generally supports the proposed wording; however, to assist clarity, suggests “include quality assurance in the public system, promote its development within the private training market, and evaluate the outcomes of education and training”.

NZCTU. Subparagraph 17(d): Recommends adding “and consistent” after “quality” and substituting “provide” for “create”.

*Philippines.* Subparagraph 17(c): Agrees with the suggestion of the Office.

*Portugal.* Subparagraph 17(c): The term “evaluating” should be used, because it is by evaluating the results of education and training that it will be possible to control its quality.

CAP. Subparagraph 17(c): The expression “and evaluate the outcomes of education and training” would be more appropriate.

*Switzerland.* Subparagraph 17(c): Agrees with the suggestion of the Office.

USS/SGB. Subparagraph 17(c): Should read “by evaluating the outcomes of education and training”.

*Syrian Arab Republic.* Subparagraph 17(c): Agrees with the suggestion of the Office.

*Thailand.* Subparagraph 17(c): Agrees with the suggestion of the Office.

*Tunisia.* Subparagraph 17(c): Retain “evaluating”.

*Turkey.* TÜRK-IS. Subparagraph 17(c): Agrees with the suggestion of the Office.

*United Kingdom.* Subparagraph 17(c): Agrees with the suggestion of the Office.

*Uruguay.* Subparagraph 17(c): The quality requirements relating to private training providers are not sufficiently developed, as Members will “include quality assurance in the public system”, whereas they will merely “promote its development” within the private training market. There should be stricter requirements for private training agents as regards their quality control measures, as well as their trainers, procedures and results.

#### *Office commentary*

In subparagraph 17(c), the vast majority of respondents felt that the suggestion of the Office was a more appropriate wording of this subparagraph. A few indicated a preference to retain the original text, while others suggested alternative wording. As there was no consensus on this, the existing text has been retained.

Paragraph 17, without amendments to the English text and with minor changes to the French text, appears as Paragraph 17 of the proposed Recommendation.

### VIII. RESEARCH AND TRAINING SUPPORT SERVICES IN HUMAN RESOURCES DEVELOPMENT, LIFELONG LEARNING AND TRAINING

#### *General observations on Part VIII*

*France.* The title is far too long and confused; proposes it be amended to “Research and support services in lifelong education and training”, subject to the following reservation: Paragraphs 19 and 21 of this section deal with research, while Paragraph 20 deals with career information and guidance measures. As already stated in the general comments on Part I, career information and guidance are not merely support services but important aspects of education and training systems; proposes that Paragraph 20 be placed in Part II as a new Paragraph 9. The title of Part VIII would then become “Research in lifelong education and training”. The order of the paragraphs dealing with research needs to be reviewed, as Paragraph 21 gives broad guidance on the main areas of research, while Paragraph 19 is more technical and contains more detail; proposes the following order: Paragraph 18, Paragraph 21, Paragraph 19.

*Mexico.* Reference should be made to the link between training, which is provided using various methods, and the world of work. This link helps to provide the productive sector with better-qualified and more suitable human resources, improves the employability of workers, lays the foundations for continuous education and thereby

helps to reduce unemployment caused by a labour force that is not trained to meet productive sector demand. It should be mentioned that human resources are an essential factor for encouraging national economic and social development, and reference should be made to at least three basic aspects (employment and the employability of individuals, levels of productivity and competitiveness, and the rational use of resources) used to invest in human resources development.

*Portugal.* Given its importance, academic and vocational information and guidance should be given a separate heading. If, however, this is not possible, suggests the following order: Paragraph 20, Paragraph 19, Paragraph 21.

18. Members should promote and facilitate the development of their own capacity, as well as assisting in developing that of the social partners, to analyse trends in labour markets and human resources development and training.

#### *Observations on Paragraph 18*

*Lebanon.* Add “if possible” after “assisting”.

#### *Office commentary*

The Paragraph, without amendments, appears as Paragraph 18 of the proposed Recommendation.

19. Members should:

- (a) collect information, disaggregated by gender and age, on educational levels, qualifications, training activities, and employment and incomes, especially when organizing regular surveys of the population, so that trends can be established and comparative analysis undertaken to inform policy;
- (b) establish databases and quantitative and qualitative indicators, including by gender and age, on the national training system and gather data on training in the private sector, taking into account the impact of data collection on enterprises; and
- (c) collect information on skills, competencies and emerging trends in the labour market from a variety of sources, including longitudinal studies and not confined to traditional occupational classifications.

#### *Observations on Paragraph 19*

*Brazil.* Subparagraph 19(a): After “gender and age” add “and other socio-economic characteristics specific to the working population in the countries concerned”.

*France.* Subparagraph 19(b): The meaning of “taking into account the impact of data collection on enterprises” is unclear.

*Japan.* Subparagraph 19(a): Reasons should be stated as to why the gathering of information from regular surveys of the population is necessary when surveys on enterprises and other areas are undertaken.

*New Zealand.* Subparagraphs 19(a) and (b): Suggests that the collection of data should be disaggregated by ethnicity as well as by gender and age. Indigenous peoples and ethnic minority groups should be explicitly included because these groups often have specific needs in relation to education and training and the labour market in general.

*Norway.* Subparagraphs 19(a), (b) and (c): Setting requirements on data collection and the establishment of databases at this level of detail would be highly resource-demanding and, for some countries, serve little purpose. It must be up to the individual country to decide what elements this type of data collection should contain and in what form.

### *Office commentary*

As there was no clear pattern in the small number of comments, the Paragraph, without amendments to the English text and with minor changes to the French text, appears as Paragraph 19 of the proposed Recommendation.

#### 20. Members should:

- (a) assure and facilitate, throughout life, participation in, and access to, vocational and career information and guidance, job placement services and job search techniques, as well as access to education, training and active labour market programmes and skills recognition;
- (b) promote and facilitate the use of information and communication technology, as well as traditional best practices in information and guidance services; and
- (c) identify, in consultation with the social partners, roles and responsibilities with respect to career information and guidance, employment services, training providers and other relevant service providers; and
- (d) provide information and guidance on entrepreneurship, promote entrepreneurial skills and awareness among educators and trainers of the important role of enterprises, among others, in creating growth and decent jobs.

### *Observations on Paragraph 20*

*France.* Subparagraph 20(a): The second part of this phrase is redundant; delete “as well as access ... skills recognition”.

*Lebanon.* Subparagraph 20(a): Replace “assure” with “work on providing and facilitating ...”.

*New Zealand.* Business New Zealand. Subparagraph 20(d): Replace “enterprises” with “business” and delete “among others”; it is the private, not the state, sector that creates sustainable employment.

*Portugal.* Subparagraph 20(a): Should refer to academic guidance, not just vocational.

*Switzerland.* Subparagraph 20(a): Is unsure of the meaning of the final part of this subparagraph. The Office has proposed significant changes, including the deletion of the references to “employability development” and “skills ... services”; the reasons for the amendment are unclear.

*United States.* USCIB. Subparagraph 20(d): This subparagraph calls for promotion of entrepreneurship and recognizes the role of enterprises in contributing to economic growth and employment. Employers worked hard to introduce these concepts and we should make every effort to defend, and if possible strengthen, this.

### *Office commentary*

In response to the comments received, the Drafting Committee has reworded subparagraphs 20(a) and (c) to improve clarity.

The Paragraph, as amended, appears as Paragraph 20 of the proposed Recommendation.

21. Members should, in consultation with the social partners, and while taking into account the impact of data collection on enterprises, support and facilitate research on human resources development 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 trends in supply and demand for skills, competencies and qualifications in the labour market;
- (f) identifying and overcoming gender bias in skills assessment; and
- (g) using the information obtained through research to guide programme planning and implementation.

### *Observations on Paragraph 21*

*Australia.* ACTU. While enterprise data is relevant for larger enterprises, it is important to ensure that education and training policies discourage gender segmentation and target discriminatory practices in the workforce. Research should provide data on international trends and comparisons between countries and encourage increased emphasis on career guidance and counseling for adults and for vulnerable groups in order to promote equal opportunity for all.

*Brazil.* Introductory phrase: Replace “in consultation with the social partners” by “with the participation of the social partners”; after “enterprises” add “workers and society”. Add a new subparagraph (h) to read: “maintain reporting and documentation on policies, surveys and analyses of available data, including issuing periodical publications that promote access to information”.

*France.* The meaning of “taking into account the impact of data collection on enterprises” is unclear. Subparagraph 21(a): The phrase “in training” is redundant at the end of this sentence and should be deleted. Subparagraph 21(b): Given 19(c), this subparagraph is redundant; delete. Subparagraph 21(c): As this is a general statement, proposes that it be moved to become a new subparagraph 21(a). Subparagraph 21(f): Questions why gender bias needs to be overcome only in the area of skills assessment; questions whether there is “gender bias in career guidance choices” as well.

*New Zealand.* NZCTU. Employers have raised issues about the compliance costs of data collection for small enterprises and consideration of this could be reflected in the text.

*Norway.* Subparagraphs 21(a)–(g): Contain requirements for collection of data from enterprises, which could prove difficult to obtain. The information in question refers to concepts and issues which are a long way from the reality facing most small and medium-sized enterprises.

*Switzerland.* Introductory phrase: Does not agree with the suggestion of the Office to introduce the list with “including”, instead of “including by”. This renders the list completely incomprehensible, as the reader may not understand what is being referred to.

### *Office commentary*

In response to the comments received, the Drafting Committee has reworded Paragraph 21 to improve clarity.

The Paragraph, as amended, appears as Paragraph 21 of the proposed Recommendation.

To further improve clarity, and the meaning of the existing subparagraph 21(g), it has been separated and now appears as Paragraph 22 of the proposed Recommendation.

## IX. INTERNATIONAL AND TECHNICAL COOPERATION

22. International and technical cooperation in human resources development and training should:

- (a) promote greater opportunities for women and men to obtain decent work;
- (b) 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) promote the development of entrepreneurship and decent employment and share experiences on international best practices;
- (d) strengthen the capacity of the social partners to contribute to dynamic lifelong-learning policies, in particular in relation to the new dimensions of regional economic integration, migration and the emerging multicultural society;
- (e) promote national, bilateral and regional recognition and transferability of skills, competencies and qualifications;
- (f) increase technical and financial assistance for less advanced countries and promote, at the level of the international financial institutions and funding agencies, coherent policies and programmes which place education, training and lifelong learning at the centre of development policies; and
- (g) promote technical cooperation between and among governments, the social partners, the private sector and international organizations on all other issues and strategies encompassed in this instrument.

*Observations on Paragraph 22*

*Australia.* State government of Queensland. Subparagraph 22(f): The expression “developing countries” assumes that a country, while it may be “less advanced” or “least developed”, is making progress to some degree and is, therefore, a more positive statement.

*ACTU.* Supports increased international assistance and aid to enable access to education and training, especially to developing countries, through strategies to discourage the “brain drain” and provision of appropriate compensation for countries investing in education but suffering from the loss of skilled workers to other countries. Greater cooperation with countries losing skilled workers should be encouraged by countries benefiting from the inflow of skilled migration. There needs to be a concerted development of common regional qualifications accreditation systems on a tripartite basis and support for education and training as part of a holistic strategy on poverty eradication.

*Belgium.* Subparagraph 22(f): The term “developing countries” is broad enough to cover the intended recipients of technical and financial assistance.

*Brazil.* Subparagraph 22(a): Delete. Subparagraph 22(c): Replace “entrepreneurship” with “entrepreneurial spirit” and then add “and the feeling of solidarity”. Subparagraph 22(f): Amend to read as follows: “increase technical and financial assistance to developing countries and promote, among international financial institutions and financial bodies, consistent policies and programmes that place education, training and lifelong learning at the centre of the development policies implemented in those countries”. Add a new subparagraph 22(h): “socialize and share experiences on best international practices, on promoting decent work and education and socio-occupational qualifications as rights”.

*CNC.* Subparagraph 22(f): Prefers “developing countries” or “least developed countries”.

*Canada.* Subparagraph 22(f): To be consistent with the Preamble, this subparagraph should read “increase technical and financial assistance for developing countries in need of support and promote, at the level of the international financial institutions and funding agencies, coherent policies and programmes which place education, training and lifelong learning at the centre of development policies; and”.

*CEC.* This document should not be discussing the need to increase financial assistance to less developed countries; it is based on developing appropriate policies and measures for HRDT. Providing assistance (knowledge, support, research, technical, and others) is beneficial to all; monetary assistance is not always the answer.

*Costa Rica.* Subparagraph 22(f): Prefers “developing countries”.

*Czech Republic.* SPD. Subparagraph 22(f): The term “less advanced countries” is suitable and commonly used.

*KZPS.* Subparagraph 22(f): Recommends “less developed countries”.

*ČMKOS.* Subparagraph 22(f): Recommends “developing countries”.

*Dominican Republic.* Merge subparagraphs (b) and (d) or place the latter immediately after the former.

*Egypt.* Subparagraph 22(f): Prefers “developing countries”.

*El Salvador.* Subparagraph 22(f): Prefers “developing countries”, which is more equitable. The expression “less advanced countries” could be considered derogatory.

*Eritrea.* Subparagraph 22(f): Prefers “developing countries”.

*Estonia.* Subparagraph 22(f): Prefers “developing countries”.

*Finland.* Subparagraph 22(f): Prefers “least developed countries” or “developing countries”.

*France.* Subparagraph 22(f): Proposes “less advanced countries” be retained.

*Germany.* Subparagraph 22(f): Prefers “developing countries”.

*Ireland.* Subparagraph 22(f): Should read “developing countries”.

*Italy.* Before subparagraph 22(a): There should be a reference to access for all to education and training, which is particularly important in developing countries.

CGIL, CISL, UIL. Subparagraph 22(f): Prefer “less advantaged countries” (which includes both developing countries and countries in transition).

*Japan.* Subparagraph 22(f): To use “developing countries”, which is consistent with the Development Assistance Committee (DAC).

Japan Business Federation. Subparagraph 22(f): Referring to “international financial institutions and funding agencies” in this proposed Recommendation deviates from the mandate of the ILO. Therefore, the reference should be deleted.

JTUC-RENGO. Subparagraph 22(f): Should retain “less advantaged countries” (which includes both developing and transitional countries); should not be changed to “least developed countries”, which has an extremely narrow meaning.

*Lebanon.* Subparagraph 22(f): Use “less developed countries” rather than “less advanced countries” and reword the subparagraph to read: “increase technical and financial assistance for less developed countries and those who are in need of such assistance, and promote, at the level of the international financial institutions and funding agencies, coherent policies and programmes ...”.

*Lithuania.* Subparagraph 22(f): The expression “developing countries” is more acceptable.

*Mauritius.* Subparagraph 22(f): The expression “developing countries” is more appropriate.

*Mexico.* Recommends using the expression “developing countries”, given that this expression appears in the Preamble.

*Morocco.* Subparagraph 22(f): The expression “developing countries” is preferable.

*New Zealand.* Subparagraph 22(f): Prefers “developing countries”, as it is the term most often applied and recognized in international discourse.

*Nicaragua.* Subparagraph 22(f): Recommends using “developing countries”.

*Norway.* Subparagraph 22(f): Prefers “developing countries”.

*Philippines.* Subparagraph 22(f): Recommends the term “developing countries” because it is more accommodating and not discriminatory as compared to “less advanced countries” and “less advantaged countries”.

*Portugal.* Subparagraph 22(f): Prefers “developing countries”.

UGT. Subparagraph 22(f): The substitution of the expression “less advantaged countries” is not appropriate. *De facto*, these are countries whose economic and social disadvantages contribute to their lagging behind other countries with more favourable conditions.

*Singapore.* Subparagraph 22(e): Proposes adding “where possible”. Subparagraph 22(f): Proposes rewording to read: “at the level of the international financial institutions and funding agencies, increase technical and financial assistance for less advanced countries and promote coherent policies and programmes which place education, training and lifelong learning at the centre of the development of policies; and”.

*Spain.* Subparagraph 22(f): Proposes “developing countries” or “less developed countries”.

UGT. Subparagraph 22(f): Proposes to substitute “less advanced countries” with “developing countries”.

CCOO. Subparagraph 22(f): Prefers “developing countries”, as it does not imply the value judgements of the other expressions.

*Switzerland.* Subparagraph 22(f): Is satisfied with the expression “less advanced countries”, which is in keeping with the terminology of the United Nations system.

USS/SGB. Subparagraph 22(f): The expression “less advantaged countries” should be retained, as this includes both developing countries and countries in transition. The expression should definitely not be replaced by “less advanced countries”, as this phrase has far too narrow a meaning.

*Syrian Arab Republic.* Subparagraph 22(f): Proposes “developing countries”.

*Thailand.* Subparagraph 22(f): Prefers “less advanced countries”.

*Tunisia.* Subparagraph 22(f): Recommends using “developing countries”, which is consistent with the Preamble.

*Turkey.* TÜRK-IS. Subparagraph 22(f): It would be more appropriate to use the terms “developing countries” and “less advanced countries”.

*United Kingdom.* Subparagraph 22(f): Prefers “least developed countries”, which is consistent with the language used in the wider United Nations context, and suggests the following: “increase technical and financial assistance for least developed countries in support of the Millennium Development Goals and poverty reduction and promote, at the level of the international financial institutions and funding agencies, coherent policies and programmes which place education, training and lifelong learning at the centre of development policies; and”.

*United States.* The purpose of Part IX – International and technical cooperation – is to address how international technical cooperation should be applied to improve HRDT. The essence of subparagraph 22(f) is that international and technical cooperation should “promote coherent policies and programmes that place education, training, and lifelong learning at the centre of development policies”. While this should be done at all levels of development; clearly, the countries that are considered for assistance are those that are in need. But, specifying a set of countries in which this should be

done, or the specific group of institutions that should promote these types of policies, seems to be too limiting. The focus of the subparagraph should not be on a stipulated level of development but on whether an applicant country places education, training and lifelong learning at the centre of its development policies. As currently written, subparagraph 22(f) is not consistent with the other subparagraphs in Paragraph 22: with the exception of subparagraph 22(d), which begins with “strengthen the capacity ...”, all other subparagraphs begin with “promote”. Recommends that subparagraph 22(f) be revised to read “promote coherent policies and programmes that place education, training and lifelong learning at the centre of development policies”.

USCIB. Subparagraph 22(f): Should be deleted. The proposed Recommendation is not the appropriate vehicle for calls for increased development assistance to a specific group of countries and the reference to international financial institutions and funding agencies is objectionable. This goes beyond the mandate of the ILO, and misses the broader point, i.e. that policy-makers should recognize the vital role of education, training and lifelong learning in development. If it is to remain, the text should simply read “promote coherent policies and programmes which place education, training, and lifelong learning at the centre of development policies”.

Uruguay. Subparagraph 22(f): The expression “less advanced countries” could be replaced by “developing countries”, “less developed countries” or “countries with lower levels of relative development”.

### *Office commentary*

In subparagraph 22(f), the majority of respondents stated a preference for the term “developing countries”, which has been used in the Preamble. Some indicated that “less advanced countries” was more appropriate; others suggested “least developed countries” or “less developed countries”. This suggests that the issue should be pursued by the Committee and the text has remained unchanged. The Drafting Committee slightly reworded subparagraphs 22(e) and (g) to improve clarity.

Paragraph 22 has been renumbered and, as amended, appears as Paragraph 23 of the proposed Recommendation.