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The 303rd Session of the Governing Body of the International Labour Office was held in Geneva, from Tuesday, 18 to Friday, 21 November, under the chairmanship of Mr Zdzislaw Rapacki (Poland).

The list of persons who attended the session of the Governing Body is appended.
# Table of contents by order of item on the agenda

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Item No.</th>
<th>Document No.</th>
<th>Title</th>
<th>Page</th>
<th>Decision paragraph No.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>GB.303/1/1, GB.303/1/1(Add.) and GB.303/1/2</td>
<td>Appointment of the Director-General</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Special sitting</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Visit of His Excellency Mr José Luis Rodríguez Zapatero, Prime Minister of Spain</td>
<td>9</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Special sitting</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Visit of His Excellency Mr Ban Ki-Moon, Secretary-General of the United Nations</td>
<td>11</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>GB.303/2</td>
<td>Approval of the minutes of the 302nd Session of the Governing Body</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>61</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>GB.303/3/1</td>
<td>Date and agenda of the International Labour Conference</td>
<td>13</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>GB.303/3/2</td>
<td>(a) Agenda of the 99th Session (2010) of the Conference</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>65</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>GB.303/3/3</td>
<td>(b) Proposals for the agenda of the 100th Session (2011) of the Conference</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>93</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>GB.303/3/3</td>
<td>(c) Date of the 98th Session (2009) of the International Labour Conference</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>94</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>GB.303/4/1</td>
<td>Other matters arising out of the work of the 97th Session (2008) of the International Labour Conference</td>
<td>18</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>GB.303/4/2</td>
<td>Follow-up to the adoption of the conclusions on skills for improved productivity, employment growth and development</td>
<td>18</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>GB.303/4/3</td>
<td>Follow-up to the adoption of the conclusions on the promotion of rural employment for poverty reduction</td>
<td>18</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>GB.303/4/3</td>
<td>Follow-up to the adoption of the resolution concerning the ILO’s and the tripartite constituents’ role in tackling the global food crisis</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>102</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>GB.303/5</td>
<td>Composition of the Governing Body</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>133</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>GB.303/6</td>
<td>The ILO and the multilateral system</td>
<td>54</td>
<td>318</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>GB.303/7</td>
<td>Enhanced programme of technical cooperation for the occupied Arab territories</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>148</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>GB.303/8/1 and GB.303/8/2</td>
<td>Developments concerning the Forced Labour Convention, 1930 (No. 29)</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>177–184</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>GB.303/9/1</td>
<td>Reports of the Committee on Freedom of Association</td>
<td>33</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>GB.303/9/2</td>
<td>351st Report</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>209, 210</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>GB.303/10</td>
<td>Oral report by the Chairperson of the Steering Group, Mr Z. Rapacki (Poland)</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>229</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Item No.</td>
<td>Document No.</td>
<td>Title</td>
<td>Page</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---------</td>
<td>--------------</td>
<td>----------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>------</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11</td>
<td>GB.303/11/1(Rev.)</td>
<td>Reports of the Programme, Financial and Administrative Committee</td>
<td>42</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>First report: Financial questions</td>
<td>42</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Programme and Budget for 2008–09:</td>
<td>42</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Regular budget account and Working Capital Fund</td>
<td>42</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Strategic Policy Framework 2010–15 and preview of the</td>
<td>42</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Programme and Budget proposals for 2010–11</td>
<td>230</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Evaluation</td>
<td>42</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>(a) Annual evaluation report 2007–08</td>
<td>42</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>(b) Independent evaluation of the ILO’s strategy to support member</td>
<td>43</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>States to improve the impact of international labour standards</td>
<td>231</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>(c) Independent evaluation of the ILO’s country programme for</td>
<td>43</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Zambia: 2001–07</td>
<td>232</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>(d) Independent evaluation of the ILO country programme for the</td>
<td>43</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Hashemite Kingdom of Jordan: 2002–07</td>
<td>233</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>(e) Independent evaluation of the ILO’s strategy to improve the</td>
<td>43</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>protection of migrant workers</td>
<td>234</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Report of the Building Subcommittee</td>
<td>43</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Report of the Information and Communications Technology</td>
<td>43</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Subcommittee</td>
<td>236</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Financial questions relating to the International Institute for Labour</td>
<td>44</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Studies: Acceptance of contributions and gifts</td>
<td>237</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>International Training Centre of the ILO, Turin</td>
<td>44</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>(a) Documents submitted to the 70th Session of the Board of the</td>
<td>44</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Centre (Turin, 6 and 7 November 2008)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>(b) Report of the 70th Session of the Board of the Centre</td>
<td>44</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>(c) Follow-up to the Working Party on Funding of the Turin Centre</td>
<td>44</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>and collaboration between Geneva and Turin on technical</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>cooperation programmes</td>
<td>238</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>(d) Membership of the Board of the International Training Centre</td>
<td>44</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Matters relating to the Joint Inspection Unit (JIU): Reports of the</td>
<td>44</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>JIU</td>
<td>239</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Other financial questions</td>
<td>44</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>(a) Urgent repairs</td>
<td>44</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>(b) Independent Oversight Advisory Committee</td>
<td>45</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>(c) Disclosure of internal audit reports</td>
<td>45</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>(d) Financial arrangements for a commission of inquiry concerning</td>
<td>45</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>the non-observance by Zimbabwe of the Freedom of Association</td>
<td>243</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>and Protection of the Right to Organise Convention, 1948</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>(No. 87), and the Right to Organise and Collective Bargaining</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Convention, 1949 (No. 98)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>GB.303/11/2</td>
<td>Second report: Personnel questions</td>
<td>45</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Statement by the Staff Union representative</td>
<td>45</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Human Resources Strategy: Annual report</td>
<td>45</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Amendments to the Staff Regulations</td>
<td>45</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Report of the International Civil Service Commission</td>
<td>46</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Item No.</td>
<td>Document No.</td>
<td>Title</td>
<td>Page</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---------</td>
<td>--------------</td>
<td>----------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>------</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>GB.303/12</td>
<td>Matters relating to the Administrative Tribunal of the ILO</td>
<td>46</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>(a) Statute of the Tribunal</td>
<td>46</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>(b) Recognition of the Tribunal’s jurisdiction by the Global Fund to Fight AIDS, Tuberculosis and Malaria</td>
<td>46</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>(c) Recognition of the Tribunal’s jurisdiction by the ITER International Fusion Energy Organization (ITER Organization)</td>
<td>46</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12</td>
<td>GB.303/12</td>
<td>Report of the Committee on Legal Issues and International Labour Standards</td>
<td>47</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>First part: Legal issues</td>
<td>47</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Legal and practical measures relating to the representation of Employers’ and Workers’ delegates at the International Labour Conference</td>
<td>47</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Revision of the Rules for Regional Meetings: Introductory Note</td>
<td>47</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Second part: International labour standards and human rights</td>
<td>47</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Choice of Conventions and Recommendations on which reports should be requested under article 19 of the Constitution</td>
<td>47</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Improvements in the standards-related activities of the ILO</td>
<td>48</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>(a) Possible implications of the Declaration on Social Justice for a Fair Globalization on the standards strategy and update on the implementation of the interim plan of action</td>
<td>48</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>(b) Improving the coherence, integration and effectiveness of the supervisory system through a better understanding of its dynamics (further study from a substantive and practical standpoint)</td>
<td>49</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Ratification and promotion of fundamental ILO Conventions</td>
<td>49</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13</td>
<td>GB.303/13(Rev.)</td>
<td>Report of the Subcommittee on Multinational Enterprises</td>
<td>50</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14</td>
<td>GB.303/14(Rev.)</td>
<td>Report of the Committee on Employment and Social Policy</td>
<td>50</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15</td>
<td>GB.303/15</td>
<td>Report of the Committee on Sectoral and Technical Meetings and Related Issues</td>
<td>50</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Dates, duration and composition of activities to be undertaken in 2009</td>
<td>50</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Effect to be given to the recommendations of sectoral and technical meetings: Tripartite Meeting of Experts on Labour Statistics: Child Labour Statistics and Measurement of Working Time (Geneva, 1–10 April 2008)</td>
<td>51</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Joint ILO/UNESCO Committee of Experts on the Application of the Recommendations concerning Teaching Personnel (CEART)</td>
<td>51</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Maritime matters</td>
<td>52</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>(a) Adoption of guidelines on the inspection of ships under the Maritime Labour Convention, 2006</td>
<td>52</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>(b) Revision of the ILO/WHO Guidelines for Conducting Pre-Sea and Periodic Medical Fitness Examinations for Seafarers</td>
<td>52</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>(c) Proposal for the convening of the Subcommittee on Wages of Seafarers of the Joint Maritime Commission</td>
<td>52</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Item No.</td>
<td>Document No.</td>
<td>Title</td>
<td>Page</td>
<td>Decision paragraph No.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---------</td>
<td>--------------</td>
<td>----------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>------</td>
<td>------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(d)</td>
<td></td>
<td>Update on the ILO’s participation in the development by the International Maritime Organization (IMO) of safety recommendations for small fishing vessels</td>
<td>52</td>
<td>265</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(e)</td>
<td></td>
<td>Report of the Joint IMO/ILO Ad Hoc Expert Working Group on Liability and Compensation regarding Claims for Death, Personal Injury and Abandonment of Seafarers (Seventh and Eighth Sessions)</td>
<td>53</td>
<td>266</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other questions</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>53</td>
<td>267</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16</td>
<td>GB.303/16(Rev.)</td>
<td>Report of the Committee on Technical Cooperation</td>
<td>54</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Follow-up to the resolution on technical cooperation adopted by the 95th Session (2006) of the International Labour Conference: Mid-term implementation report</td>
<td>54</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Implementation of Decent Work Country Programmes</td>
<td>54</td>
<td>268</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Follow-up to the ILO Declaration on Fundamental Principles and Rights at Work: Technical cooperation priorities and action plans regarding freedom of association and effective recognition of the right to collective bargaining</td>
<td>54</td>
<td>269</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Field structure review to improve the effectiveness of technical cooperation: Oral presentation</td>
<td>54</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Other questions</td>
<td>54</td>
<td>270</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18</td>
<td>GB.303/18</td>
<td>Report of the 50th Session of the Board</td>
<td>65</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19</td>
<td>GB.303/19 and GB.303/19(Add.)</td>
<td>Report of the Director-General</td>
<td>65</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Obituary</td>
<td>65</td>
<td>321</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Membership of the Organization</td>
<td>65</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Progress in international labour legislation</td>
<td>65</td>
<td>322</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Internal administration</td>
<td>65</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>GB.303/19/1</td>
<td>First Supplementary Report: 18th World Congress on Safety and Health at Work and the Safety and Health Summit (Seoul, Republic of Korea) (28 June – 2 July 2008)</td>
<td>65</td>
<td>331</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>GB.303/19/2</td>
<td>Second Supplementary Report: Measures taken by the Government of Belarus to implement the recommendations of the Commission of Inquiry established to examine the observance of the Freedom of Association and Protection of the Right to Organise Convention, 1948 (No. 87), and the Right to Organise and Collective Bargaining Convention, 1949 (No. 98)</td>
<td>67</td>
<td>332</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>GB.303/19/3</td>
<td>Third Supplementary Report: Tripartite Meeting of Experts on the Measurement of Decent Work</td>
<td>67</td>
<td>352</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>GB.303/19/4</td>
<td>Fourth Supplementary Report: Appointment of regional directors</td>
<td>70</td>
<td>353</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>GB.303/19/5</td>
<td>Fifth Supplementary Report: Draft guidelines to improve the functioning of the Governing Body meetings</td>
<td>70</td>
<td>364</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Item No.</td>
<td>Document No.</td>
<td>Title</td>
<td>Page</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---------</td>
<td>--------------</td>
<td>----------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>------</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GB.303/19/6</td>
<td>GB.303/19/6</td>
<td>Sixth Supplementary Report: Report of the committee set up to examine the representation alleging non-observance by Chile of the Forced Labour Convention, 1930 (No. 29), submitted under article 24 of the ILO Constitution by the Colegio de Abogados de Chile, AG</td>
<td>72</td>
<td>365</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GB.303/19/7</td>
<td>GB.303/19/7</td>
<td>Seventh Supplementary Report: Report of the committee set up to examine the representation alleging non-observance by Argentina of the Indigenous and Tribal Peoples Convention, 1989 (No. 169), made under article 24 of the ILO Constitution by the Education Workers’ Union of Río Negro (UNTER), local section affiliated to the Confederation of Education Workers of Argentina (CTERA)</td>
<td>72</td>
<td>366, 367</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GB.303/19/8</td>
<td>GB.303/19/8</td>
<td>Eighth Supplementary Report: Observance by Zimbabwe of the Freedom of Association and Protection of the Right to Organise Convention, 1948 (No. 87), and the Right to Organise and Collective Bargaining Convention, 1949 (No. 98): Appointment by the Governing Body of a Commission of Inquiry in accordance with article 26(4) of the Constitution of the ILO</td>
<td>74</td>
<td>368</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20</td>
<td>GB.303/20/1</td>
<td>Report of the Officers of the Governing Body</td>
<td>74</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GB.303/20/2</td>
<td>GB.303/20/2</td>
<td>Complaints concerning the non-observance by Zimbabwe of the Freedom of Association and Protection of the Right to Organise Convention, 1948 (No. 87), and the Right to Organise and Collective Bargaining Convention, 1949 (No. 98), made by delegates to the 97th Session (2008) of the International Labour Conference under article 26 of the ILO Constitution</td>
<td>74</td>
<td>378</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21</td>
<td>GB.303/21</td>
<td>Invitation of an intergovernmental organization</td>
<td>75</td>
<td>379</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>GB.303/21</td>
<td>Composition and agenda of standing bodies and meetings</td>
<td>75</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>GB.303/21</td>
<td>Committee of Experts on the Application of Conventions and Recommendations</td>
<td>76</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>GB.303/21</td>
<td>Reappointments</td>
<td>76</td>
<td>382</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>GB.303/21</td>
<td>Joint ILO/UNESCO Committee of Experts on the Application of the Recommendations concerning Teaching Personnel (CEART)</td>
<td>76</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>GB.303/21</td>
<td>Reappointments</td>
<td>76</td>
<td>383</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>GB.303/21</td>
<td>New appointments</td>
<td>77</td>
<td>384</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>GB.303/21</td>
<td>Eighth European Regional Meeting (Lisbon, 9–13 February 2009)</td>
<td>77</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>GB.303/21</td>
<td>Agenda and working languages</td>
<td>77</td>
<td>385</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>GB.303/21</td>
<td>Invitation of international non-governmental organizations</td>
<td>77</td>
<td>386</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>GB.303/21</td>
<td>Subcommittee on Wages of Seafarers of the Joint Maritime Commission (Geneva, 12–13 February 2009)</td>
<td>78</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>GB.303/21</td>
<td>Agenda</td>
<td>78</td>
<td>387</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>GB.303/21</td>
<td>Global Dialogue Forum on Decent Work in Local Government Procurement for Infrastructure Provision (Geneva, 17–18 February 2009)</td>
<td>78</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>GB.303/21</td>
<td>Invitation of international non-governmental organizations</td>
<td>78</td>
<td>388</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>GB.303/21</td>
<td>Invitation of international non-governmental organizations</td>
<td>78</td>
<td>389</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GB.303/PV</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-----------------------------------------------</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Business Responses to the Demographic Challenge (Geneva, 28–29 April 2009)</td>
<td>79</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Composition and agenda</td>
<td>79 390</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tripartite Meeting on Promoting Social Dialogue and Good Industrial Relations from Oil and Gas Exploration and Production to Oil and Gas Distribution (Geneva, 11–14 May 2009)</td>
<td>79</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Invitation of intergovernmental organizations</td>
<td>79 391</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Meeting of Experts on the Revision of the List of Occupational Diseases (Recommendation No. 194) (Geneva, 27–30 October 2009)</td>
<td>80</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Composition and agenda</td>
<td>80 392</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Invitation of international non-governmental organizations</td>
<td>80 393</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Appointment of Governing Body representatives on various bodies</td>
<td>80</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tripartite Meeting on Promoting Social Dialogue and Good Industrial Relations from Oil and Gas Exploration and Production to Oil and Gas Distribution (Geneva, 11–14 May 2009)</td>
<td>80 394</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Information notes</td>
<td>81</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GB.303/Inf.1 Programme of meetings for the remainder of 2008 and for 2009</td>
<td>81</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GB.303/Inf.2 Approved symposia, seminars, workshops and similar meetings</td>
<td>81</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GB.303/Inf.3 Requests from international non-governmental organizations wishing to be represented at the 98th Session (2009) of the International Labour Conference</td>
<td>81 395</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
MINUTES OF THE 303RD SESSION OF THE GOVERNING BODY OF THE INTERNATIONAL LABOUR OFFICE

Geneva, Tuesday, 18–Friday, 21 November 2008

First item on the agenda

APPOINTMENT OF THE DIRECTOR-GENERAL
(GB.303/1/1, GB.303/1/1(Add.) and GB.303/1/2)

1. The Chairperson announced that on Friday, 17 October 2008, on the expiry of the date for the presentation of candidatures for the post of Director-General of the ILO, he had received only one candidature, presented by the Government of Chile on behalf of the Governments of Argentina, Brazil, Chile, Colombia, Cuba, El Salvador, Nicaragua, Panama, Peru, Dominican Republic, Uruguay and the Bolivarian Republic of Venezuela, by the Government of South Africa and by the Workers’ group of the Governing Body, namely that of Mr Juan Somavia, the current Director-General. His candidature was also supported by 95 ILO member States, as indicated in document GB.303/1/1(Add.). That document also referred to regional organizations which should not have been mentioned there, which was why their names did not feature in the minutes.

2. The election of the Director-General of the ILO was conducted by secret ballot, pursuant to paragraph 3 of article 6.1 of the Standing Orders of the Governing Body, adopted at its 240th Session (June 1998) and confirmed at its 301st Session (March 2008).

3. On proposals put forward by the three groups, the following polling officers were appointed:

   Government member: Mr A. Razzouk, Lebanon

   Employer member: Mr C. Renique

   Worker member: Mr K. Ahmed

4. Owing to the visit of Mr Jose Luis Rodriguez Zapatero, the Prime Minister of Spain, the Officers of the Governing Body decided to bring the start of the session forward to 2.30 p.m. instead of 3 p.m., as was initially set out in the programme.

5. The results of the secret ballot were as follows: Mr Juan Somavia obtained 43 votes, the majority required being 29 votes. There were 13 abstentions.

Governing Body decision:

6. The Governing Body re-elected Mr Juan Somavia as Director-General of the International Labour Office for a third mandate. In accordance with article 4.6(a) of the Staff Regulations, this appointment will be for a period of five years, beginning on 4 March 2009, at zero hours.

7. The Chairperson congratulated the Director-General on his re-election, which was in his view clear proof of the value that the international community placed on his vision of how decent work and social justice for all could become a reality. The Director-General would...
know how to apply his characteristic determination, creativity and energy in working towards these lofty goals.

8. The Director-General expressed his heartfelt gratitude, particularly towards the Workers’ group, which had first suggested that he should approach the ILO; the Africa Group, with which he had had a close relationship even before his arrival at the ILO; the Group of Latin American and Caribbean States (GRULAC), which represented his cultural roots; the Arab Labor Organization and the Association of Southeast Asian Nations (ASEAN), which had provided him with institutional support; the Employers’ group; and the Governing Body, which he particularly thanked for the guidelines it had provided in its capacity as the tripartite voice of the ILO. He affirmed that he would channel all his energy, dedication and faith into dialogue and tripartism, in order to rise to the challenge of promoting the interests of the institution. The Organization currently had a valuable instrument to facilitate regeneration, in the form of the 2008 ILO Declaration on Social Justice for a Fair Globalization. It also had the Decent Work Agenda, which was an important tool for dealing with the current financial crisis. He acknowledged, however, that the ILO’s great strength lay in its deeply-held belief that progress was possible only if the constituents worked together.

9. The Employer Vice-Chairperson congratulated the Director-General on his election and thanked him for his statement, particularly his closing comments, which referred to the need for joint action. In that regard, he assured the Director-General that he could count on the full cooperation of the Employers’ group, which would be proactive in its approach. The 2008 ILO Declaration marked out a path towards the future and set the agenda for the ILO. The speaker was sure that tripartism and social dialogue had a role to play, as did the institution’s principal decision-making bodies, the International Labour Conference and the Governing Body. That would promote a readiness always to listen to others. He believed that the ILO could provide specific responses not only to the crisis, but also to important problems in the field of labour and the issue of sustainable enterprises. Such solutions would provide proof of the ILO’s effectiveness and relevance. To that end, the Employers would always be committed to joint efforts.

10. The Employers’ group wished to put on record once again the view expressed at the 301st Session (March 2008) by the Governing Body regarding the process of electing the Director-General. On that occasion, in good faith and with confidence in the democratic process, the Employers had asked for a discussion of the election rules in order to ensure a choice of different candidates and programmes, in an institution with such a broad scope as the ILO. They regretted, with respect, that when the rules had been discussed, certain Governments had endorsed a candidature that had been put forward before the relevant regulations had been approved, which had disrupted the process. The rules which had been put forward for approval were general, and aimed to avoid any specific reference to particular individuals or personal circumstances. In the end, the process had seemed more like a vote to confirm a candidature than a genuine election, and the Employers found it unsatisfactory. They reiterated their wish for a guarantee that rules and procedures would be established, as they wanted to discuss the terms of and limits on the Director-General’s term of office. The Employers wanted a permanent, objective framework of regulations which would ensure transparency of the institution’s activities, something which everyone, including the Governments, Workers and the Director-General, undoubtedly wanted. The Employers’ group respected the will of the majority. However, in order to be sure of having such rules, the speaker reiterated the request that had been put forward in March, namely that an item be added on the agenda of the Governing Body session relating to the rules for the election of the Director-General, including the duration of his term.

11. The Worker Vice-Chairperson welcomed the fact that Mr Somavia would remain at the helm of the Organization, having been re-elected by a comfortable majority. The Workers’
group had noted the position adopted by the Employers’ group regarding the election procedure and the permitted number of terms of office, and would be prepared to examine the issue should any change become necessary. On the present occasion, the number of votes obtained by Mr Somavia spoke for itself and was undoubtedly attributable to his successful leadership. There was no doubt that in recent years, the Organization had earned greater international respect, and that tripartism had become a widely accepted principle. The ILO’s constituents needed to be fully aware of the fact that only by working together and on an equal footing could they successfully emerge from the global economic crisis, during which the ILO’s job was to continue to promote social dialogue and work for the welfare of all those in need.

12. A Government representative of Japan, speaking on behalf of the Asia–Pacific Group (ASPAG), thanked Mr Somavia for his continued support for the region. In the age of globalization and in the midst of an economic crisis, it was vital that the ILO continued to promote decent work for all. The Director-General could count on the support of the region to meet the challenges relating to the ILO’s mandate and the achievement of its goals within the framework of the United Nations.

13. A Government representative of Uruguay, speaking on behalf of the governments of GRULAC, acknowledged that the ILO had reinforced its position on the international scene ever since it began in earnest to promote decent work, the real linchpin between economic growth and human development. The ILO was currently the Organization which focused global efforts in the pursuit of a fair globalization. To that end, the ILO had drawn up its 2008 Declaration, and it would need to be creative in order to make the most productive use of so powerful a tool, particularly in view of the fact that the international financial crisis and a global recession threatened the efforts of developing countries to achieve a better standard of living, guarantee employment and protect workers’ rights. As its objectives were full and productive employment, decent work for all and social dialogue, the ILO would henceforth have to operate within a more coherent and integrated framework. To that end, it could count on the active participation and cooperation of GRULAC.

14. A Government representative of Tunisia, speaking on behalf of the Africa group, reiterated the group’s willingness to continue cooperation with Mr Somavia, to whom the Organization owed the concept of decent work and the 2008 ILO Declaration, which was a genuine tool for fostering progress and social justice.

15. A Government representative of France said that the Member States of the European Union, and Norway and Switzerland, on whose behalf he had taken the floor, shared the Director-General’s determination to give new momentum to efforts to implement the 2008 ILO Declaration with the aim of achieving a vision of a globalization combining tripartism and social justice. The Director-General could count on his support.

16. A Government representative of Singapore, taking the floor on behalf of the member States of the ASEAN, commended the Director-General’s efforts to promote dignity at work and improve workers’ living conditions in the face of rapid globalization. At the 20th meeting of the ASEAN Labour Ministers, which had taken place in 2008 in Bangkok, participants had reaffirmed the importance of decent work and committed themselves to improving the welfare and employability of workers. Those objectives had been included in the ASEAN Declaration on the Protection and Promotion of the Rights of Migrant Workers, which had been signed at the 12th ASEAN Summit in 2007. The ASEAN would continue to work with the ILO. Proof of that collaboration was the cooperation agreement signed by the ASEAN secretariat and the ILO on 20 March 2007 in Geneva, which would strengthen cooperation between the two institutions in the implementation of programmes and
projects in fields of common interest, such as occupational safety and health, tripartism and social dialogue.

17. A Government representative of El Salvador, speaking as the President pro tempore of the Council of Labour Ministers of Central America, Panama and the Dominican Republic, acknowledged that, under Mr Somavia’s leadership, labour had once again become an essential and institutional part of development policy, and the pioneering concept of decent work had become the cornerstone and strategic focus of the Organization. The subregion would continue to offer its support in efforts to deal with the worrying economic situation, which required joint and coordinated action, as laid down in the 2008 ILO Declaration, with the aim of creating egalitarian societies in which productive work that ensured respect for freedom, equity, security and human dignity, would be the general rule.

18. A Government representative of Chile welcomed the re-election of Mr Somavia, his distinguished compatriot, whose professional career had included presiding over the United Nations World Summit for Social Development and involvement in negotiations on the agreement signed by the ILO and the World Trade Organization (WTO) with the objective of fostering development policies and strategies based on the concept of decent work. It was also significant that the re-election of the Director-General coincided with the signing, in Santiago, of a tripartite agreement between the Government and the two most representative workers’ and employers’ organizations, namely the Unified Federation of Workers (CUT) and the Confederation for Production and Trade (CPC), with the aim of promoting the Decent Work Country Programme (DWCP). The re-election of the Director-General could be viewed as a call for the ILO to reaffirm its ethical stance, according to which development and measures to overcome the financial crisis would need to respect the principles of human dignity and social justice.

19. A Government representative of Egypt welcomed the work of the Director-General in the field of social justice and in defence of the interests of women workers. The Arab group was convinced that Mr Somavia was the right person to steer the Organization through future problems in the fields of social security and labour in general. The speaker trusted that the special relationship between the Arab group and the ILO would become even more fruitful.

20. A Government representative of Panama, also speaking on behalf of his subregion, said that the vote of confidence in Mr Somavia would allow him to increase the impact of the ILO’s actions, to further strengthen the tripartite system, social dialogue and decent work, and boost the search for new labour cultures. He trusted that, thanks to his proximity to the realities on the ground and to national sectors, the Director-General would consolidate his mandate and thus also the mandates of national leaders.

21. A Government representative of Benin said that Mr Somavia had been re-elected simply because it had made no sense to change a winning team. The Director-General had known how to promote the ILO’s ideals by increasing the scope of its work throughout the world, thanks to which it was now better known than before.

22. A Government representative of Nigeria said that the ILO’s social cooperation programmes on the African continent had made a significant impact because they had improved the labour market and its institutions. The Organization’s activities in the member States currently focused on DWCPs and activities aimed at achieving the ILO’s strategic objectives. The positive results of those efforts would be reinforced by improved coordination with the other organizations in the United Nations system.

23. A Government representative of China supported the view that Mr Somavia’s re-election was the start of a new chapter and proof of the fact that, in recent years, the ILO had
adopted a dynamic approach to dealing with the problems posed by globalization. The decent work concept had been endorsed by the international community, in particular through the adoption of the 2008 ILO Declaration, which was a milestone in the history of the Organization. The speaker trusted that technical cooperation with developing countries would continue to grow, as would the ILO’s capacity to assist its member States in their efforts to achieve the objective of decent work. In the current financial crisis, the Chinese Government would continue to support the Director-General in his efforts to promote employment, alleviate poverty and achieve a fair globalization.

24. A Government representative of Brazil said that Mr Somavia had revolutionized the ILO, to the point where the Organization was currently not only known for its international standards but also for being a political institution dedicated to fostering social inclusion, decent work and investment in production as a way of stimulating employment. In keeping with the determination shown by global leaders at the G-20 Summit to strengthen cooperation and to work together, Brazil was prepared to support the Director-General fully during his forthcoming term in office.

25. A Worker member from Colombia offered the Director-General the support of the workers from Latin America and the Caribbean. He said that, under Mr Somavia’s leadership, the ILO, which was the only tripartite organization in the United Nations system, would continue to defend workers’ rights and the value of labour as decisive factors in the quest for world peace. Mindful of the fact that the Director-General had based his leadership on respect for human rights, freedom of association and the right to collective bargaining, the workers would continue to contribute to social dialogue, tripartism and building consensus, in the hope that they might one day live in a world where justice would bring forth the fruits of peace.

26. A Government representative of Pakistan said that, in the current economic crisis, Mr Somavia would have to try to ensure that the world of work continued to be protected by ILO standards. With the essential elements of the ILO’s mandate integrated into the United Nations Millennium Development Goals (MDGs), the Director-General should now promote international cooperation to confront the economic recession and break the vicious cycle of contracting production and employment which had been brought about by loss of confidence. The ILO should focus its action on what the UN Secretary-General had described as the challenges and sufferings of developing countries and the poorest populations. The speaker was confident that, under Mr Somavia’s direction, the ILO would be able to formulate recovery policies which, in the medium term, would create the right conditions for achieving the goal of social justice for a fair globalization.

27. A Government representative of Argentina welcomed the fact that Mr Somavia would continue to lead the ILO at a time when the Decent Work Agenda had expanded beyond the boundaries of the Organization and become part of the work of the United Nations. She affirmed that the Director-General had succeeded in giving political direction to the will of the constituents. If it had now once again become possible to frame the idea of a working society in a market economy that encouraged the creation of sustainable and socially responsible enterprises, it was due to the Organization’s advocacy of full employment and decent work for all. The ILO’s 2008 Declaration completed the conceptual and operational framework within which, however difficult the coming times might be, the ILO would continue its resolute pursuit of sustainable development, decent work and social justice.

28. A Government representative of India endorsed the statement made on behalf of ASPAG and said that, in the context of the current financial crisis, the leadership shown by Mr Somavia at the helm of the ILO gave her hope and confidence for the future. Progress had been made with respect to DWCPs, which member States had adopted as an important tool, despite the limitations experienced by developing countries in terms of lack of
resources and the capacity to put them successfully into practice. The Asia and Pacific region had received considerable attention during Mr Somavia’s tenure, particularly during the past 12 months, in connection with the Asia–Pacific Regional High-Level Meeting on Socially Inclusive Strategies to Extend Social Security Coverage, and in matters relating to skills development and job creation, which were issues of crucial importance to India. The speaker encouraged the Director-General to intensify collaboration with other organizations within the UN system in order to further strengthen the capacity of developing countries to confront the skills and employment challenges they faced.

29. A Government representative of Burundi, speaking also on behalf of the Central African subregion, praised the Director-General’s humanitarian vision and values, as well as his technical abilities and new ideas, thanks to which the Organization had precisely defined its priorities within the framework of applying the Decent Work Agenda. The speaker urged the Director-General to redouble his efforts to fight social injustice wherever it occurred.

30. A Government representative of the United States said that her country had always encouraged international organizations to improve their management and become more efficient. In that regard, she could not fail to acknowledge the progress made by the ILO under Mr Somavia’s leadership, for example in relation to the fight against child labour. The United States would continue to offer its collaboration to the Director-General and to promote reforms. She expressed the view that all organizations throughout the United Nations system, including the ILO, should limit tenure in the top executive posts to two terms of office.

31. A Government representative of Barbados was confident that Mr Somavia would continue to undertake valuable work for the ILO and its constituents, including the small island States of the Caribbean region. The Government of Barbados had continued its work to promote the concept of social co-participation through social dialogue and the incorporation of DWCPs into the main sectors of the national economy. It was confident that, in the face of global economic challenges, it would be able to count on technical cooperation from the ILO.

32. A Worker member from Sweden said that, having been a member of the Governing Body since Mr Somavia’s appointment, he had seen at close hand the work done by the Director-General and knew that it was thanks to him that the Decent Work Agenda had won political support throughout the world. He was confident that the ILO and its constituents would promote, in a coherent manner, the development of standards, which were the cornerstone of the Organization and used by workers in their legitimate efforts to ensure that the decent work concept and the principles of freedom of association were applied.

33. A Government representative of Uruguay said that his presence in the ILO had allowed him to deepen his knowledge of the decent work concept in order to be able to promote it in his own country. Difficult times lay ahead, and although it was not yet clear how the challenges would be met, it was essential to continue developing the concepts promoted by Mr Somavia and to consolidate the work already done by applying the ILO’s 2008 Declaration.

34. A Government representative of Sudan thanked Mr Somavia for the very valuable projects and activities that had been carried out in Sudan. It could be said that the Decent Work Agenda stood at the pinnacle of the work undertaken by the Director-General. The speaker requested the ILO to keep its attention focused on Africa and, in particular, on Sudan, which needed its support because it currently faced a difficult situation as it emerged from war and made efforts to solve the problems in Darfur.
35. A Government representative of Peru said that Mr Somavia’s reappointment was evidence of the significant progress made by the Organization under his leadership. Decent work had become the main vehicle for translating economic growth into social development. As had already been said in a statement made on behalf of GRULAC, the forthcoming challenges would make the fight to uphold labour rights inevitable. It was therefore urgently necessary for economic growth to be channelled in such a way as to foster job creation and poverty reduction. To that end, the ILO needed to become more effective, ensure its programmes were coherent, provide incentives for collaboration and coordination with other international organizations, and adapt its action to the changing realities of the international environment, the needs of constituents and the enduring ideal of social justice.

36. A Worker member from Guinea, speaking on behalf of the Workers’ group of Africa and the Arab world, thanked the Director-General for the support he had given to the African continent and the Arab world, which were deeply affected by poverty and the disastrous effects of globalization and the food and financial crises. She expressed particular appreciation for the support the Director-General had shown to Guinea in the wake of the tragic events of 2006 and 2007. The speaker assured the Director-General that he could rely on the support of African and Arab workers to continue promoting respect for international labour standards, social justice and social dialogue, in other words, to continue promoting decent work for all.

37. A Government representative of Canada maintained that, in such difficult times, it was important for the ILO to focus its efforts and the attention of the global community on issues that still had a bearing on the world of work. Canada stood ready to continue working with the Director-General and the tripartite constituents in order to strengthen the ILO’s capacity and effectiveness in implementing the Decent Work Agenda to improve people’s lives.

38. A Government representative of the United Kingdom endorsed the statement made on behalf of the European Union and explained that the British vote had been based on two fundamental assumptions. First, it was expected that, at the 304th Session (March 2009) of the Governing Body, the Director-General would facilitate an exhaustive discussion on the length of the ILO Director-General’s term of office. Second, plans to reform the ILO should be undertaken on the basis of zero nominal growth in the ILO’s regular budget.

39. A Government representative of the Islamic Republic of Iran, associating himself with the statement made on behalf of ASPAG, highlighted the excellent leadership shown by Mr Somavia. The extraordinary contribution he had made to defining an integrated body of thematic objectives, such as child labour, employment promotion, non-discrimination, social justice and a fair globalization, together with his notable qualities in developing decent work programmes, had earned international recognition both for him and for the Organization.

40. A Worker member from Pakistan said that, together with his colleagues from the Workers’ group, he had been privileged to present Mr Somavia’s three candidatures. He was confident that, in the face of the current upheavals, the Director-General would use his political skills to guide the Organization towards realizing its lofty principles, according to which universal peace can only be achieved if it based on social justice, and labour is not a commodity. The ILO’s 2008 Declaration emphasized those objectives. The Asia and Pacific region was confident that the Director-General would confront the problems facing workers, in particular with regard to employment and unemployment, in view of the erosion of international labour standards in many parts of the world. In that endeavour, the Director-General could count on the support of Pakistan.
41. *A Government representative of the Bolivarian Republic of Venezuela* endorsed the GRULAC statement and said that the ILO should enhance its efforts in pursuit of decent work and play an important role in the search for inclusive solutions to the current crisis. In order to achieve a fair globalization, multilateralism was essential. The speaker assured the Director-General that he could rely on the support of his country’s Government in implementing all projects aimed at achieving the ILO’s objectives, within the framework of a broadly democratic, participatory and transparent Organization geared towards social dialogue.

42. *A Government representative of Jordan* said that his country maintained a very special relationship with the ILO, one that was based on shared values. He was convinced that the Director-General’s new term of office would encourage new initiatives. The Government of Jordan would continue to work with the Director-General in the task of putting the Organization’s fundamental values into practice in the current economic climate.

43. *A Government representative of Spain* said that the time had come to draw on all the assets the Organization had built up over its almost 90 years of existence, and which had recently been brought to bear in drawing up the 2008 ILO Declaration, in order to adapt established solutions to problems whose evolution was as yet unknown. It was very clear that the tools used to deal with them should include international labour standards, the decent work concept and the framework of social dialogue. The economic principles that currently applied could essentially be subsumed in a single concept, namely the creation of decent work. In that endeavour, the Director-General could rely on the support of the Spanish Government.

44. *A Government representative of the United Republic of Tanzania* recognized that, in the face of the current economic crisis, the Office needed an experienced leader such as Mr Somavia, who had succeeded in transforming the ILO into an Organization endowed with great moral strength and a vision for the future. In recent years, his country had benefited from various activities of international importance, such as the Jobs for Africa programme, the programme on the elimination of child labour, and the DWCP. The last of those, which was integrated into the National Growth and Poverty Reduction Strategy, was a model for many African countries and had facilitated the integration of decent work issues into the national programme established within the framework of the United Nations “Delivering as One” project. Thanks to technical assistance provided by the ILO, it had been possible to begin reforming labour legislation and as a result, the United Republic of Tanzania had ratified the eight fundamental ILO Conventions. It had very much appreciated Mr Somavia’s initiative enabling Mr Benjamin W. Mkapa, the then President of the United Republic of Tanzania, to participate as Co-Chair of the World Commission on the Social Dimension of Globalization. It was to be hoped that ILO instruments could be applied throughout the world to benefit the tripartite constituents and promote national development. The Director-General could be certain that the United Republic of Tanzania would be at his side throughout his new term.

45. *A Worker member from Mexico*, speaking on behalf of the women members of the Governing Body, thanked the Director-General for his efforts to promote gender equality, not only among the staff of the Office, where representation of women had reached 42 per cent, but also in the Governing Body and the delegations sent by member States to ILO meetings. The progress made during the Director-General’s period in office – including the adoption of the Decent Work Agenda, the fight against child labour, the promotion of the Maternity Protection Convention, 2000 (No. 183), the implementation of programmes on HIV/AIDS, and the promotion of activities to address both the current crisis and globalization – were evidence of Director-General’s intensive efforts, both at meetings of ILO bodies and in his visits to member States to encourage the constituents in their struggle. There could be no doubt that the ILO, known for its defence of tripartism, social
dialogue and participation by free men and women, had become a presence in the world’s consciousness.

46. A Government representative of Bangladesh endorsed the statement made on behalf of ASPAG. The great support Mr Somavia had received was proof of the confidence in his leadership and in his vision of what the Organization should be. The speaker hoped that the ILO would further consolidate its role in order to be able to help member States in their efforts to promote decent work, social inclusion and respect for fundamental principles and rights at work, amid the uncertainty created by the global financial crisis and its effects on the world of work. The Government of Bangladesh would offer its full cooperation and support in that important task.

47. A Worker member from the Russian Federation said that the Director-General’s reappointment expressed a recognition of his authority in the world of work. Speaking on behalf of the trade unions of the Russian Federation and his region, including Central Asia, where the development of social dialogue was urgently needed, the speaker wished the Director-General success in the difficult task of establishing social justice and social dialogue. In the Russian Federation, as in other countries, trade unions were fighting for recognition of decent work, as both the concept and its practical application were fundamental when it came to finding solutions to the current crisis, eradicating poverty and inequality throughout the world, and achieving sustainable development.

48. A Worker member from South Africa endorsed the eloquent homage paid to the work of the Director-General in developing the concept of decent work. Mr Somavia had been a friend to workers and to Africa, so he knew how difficult it was to fight poverty, inequality and exclusion there. He had also recognized that freedom of association and collective bargaining formed the main platform from which workers could make their voices heard in dialogue to fashion a collective future. The ILO’s 2008 Declaration was a guide for action that would enable the world to face an economic crisis of enormous proportions, at the same time guaranteeing an equitable globalization and containing a strong social dimension. International labour standards and the ILO monitoring system would be very important when it came to guaranteeing workers’ wages, social security, and the existence of sustainable public and private enterprises. In that endeavour, the Director-General could count on the support of the Congress of South African Trade Unions (COSATU).

Special sitting

VISIT OF HIS EXCELLENCY MR JOSÉ LUIS RODRÍGUEZ ZAPATERO
PRIME MINISTER OF SPAIN

Tuesday, 18 November 2008

49. The Director-General welcomed Mr José Luis Rodríguez Zapatero, Prime Minister of Spain, in whom he recognized a leader who was firmly committed to the defence of the values represented by the ILO, namely tripartism, social dialogue, full employment, rights at work, and social protection. That was clear from the social achievements of his time in office, which included the law against domestic violence, a law on equality between the sexes, the law on dependants, an increase in the minimum wage, measures to protect labour rights, and efforts to regularize the status of immigrants. Thanks to the perspicacity of the Spanish people and the firm resolve of the Executive to address financial, trade, social, labour, environmental and development issues, Spain had grown into a strong and stable democracy with its face turned towards the future. As the ILO acknowledged,
formulating policies independently in response to problems that were interdependent was not an option.

50. At the extended G-20 Summit in Washington on 15 November 2008, Spain, through its international message, was well qualified to speak for all those, including the ILO’s constituents, who were convinced that the current financial crisis required efforts at the global level to strengthen collective action and solidarity. Those words acquired a deeper significance when spoken by the leader of a country which set an international standard in terms of its own development and was acknowledged for its generous development assistance to other peoples and countries.

51. Mr Rodríguez Zapatero, Prime Minister of Spain, congratulated the Director-General of the International Labour Office on his recent re-election and wished him success in carrying out his renewed mandate. He took advantage of the opportunity he now had to set out his own analysis of the current situation, in an organization which defended the notion of the value of labour based on a comprehensive international vision. He said that social consensus building, involving a constant process of dialogue between government and the social partners, was the very foundation of his government policy. It could be said that Spain was setting an example of tripartism in practice given that in the past four years, some 20 agreements had been concluded and incorporated into legislation and had made possible significant advances in immigration laws and equality between men and women, whether in the workplace, in terms of wages, or on company boards, where the number of women had generally been low. The Government remained true to its commitment not to adopt any decision concerning social or labour issues that did not have the support of the unions and the employers’ organizations. That goodwill in Spain was not confined to simply concluding agreements but was reflected in continual social dialogue, which was a strength and formed the basic fabric of the country’s well-being and development. That, in his view, was the right model for Europe and the rest of the world in the age of globalization. That is what he had proposed in the European Union and in the process of discussion and reform that had started at the G-20 Summit, in which he had called on participants, when defining a new economic and financial framework, to institutionalize the representation of employers and workers.

52. Referring to the current financial crisis, which in his view should rather be described as a period of change, the speaker said that unlike what had occurred in previous crises, no voices had been raised to demand cuts in social spending; there was on the contrary a tendency to emphasize the role of governments, public investment in infrastructure, and productive activities and technology, as key factors in bringing about economic recovery. That could provide the impetus needed to restore confidence, boost activity and generate greater dynamism. That perception marked a clear advance in the debate on the value of the public sector and the importance of the social dimension. To overcome the crisis, it was essential to take account of the fact that the interaction and intercommunication between the economy, political decision-making, markets, supply of raw materials, and all the other factors crucial to development, well-being and progress, made it essential to act together in a coordinated way. The underlying imbalances that had led to the present crisis were due to the fact that the saving that had been made possible throughout the world in the past 15 years came from the emerging economies but it had not been possible to channel them to the benefit of those countries because of the lack of productive and cost-effective investment mechanisms. Those savings had been channelled towards developed countries, which had led to an even greater overvaluation of their assets; it was therefore the duty of the international financial institutions to direct those savings towards the emerging economies and developing countries. The problem lay not in a lack of liquidity as such but rather in a lack of mobility affecting liquidity and savings.
53. The social dimension, the maintenance and extension of social entitlements and workers’ rights, was not an obstacle to wealth creation; in fact the opposite was the case. In Spain, the welfare state was now based on four pillars: free and compulsory education to the age of 16 years; a universal free public healthcare system for all citizens, whether from Spain or elsewhere; a public contributory pensions system; and the Act concerning dependency. Mindful of the fact that social investment in education, health and equality between the sexes was a major economic investment, the speaker urged all governments to keep their social policies active. As an example of this, he noted that following the sharp slowdown that had hit the real estate sector, the Spanish Government remained firm in its commitment to maintaining benefits for the unemployed, and the rest of the European Union should do the same.

54. The G-20 Summit in his view marked the beginning of a global awareness on the part of the major economic powers and the emerging economies of the new direction that needed to be followed. He was confident that it would be possible to bring about a climate marked by greater rationality and to make progress in achieving economic and geopolitical equilibrium, if new models of social dialogue could be established, social rights extended, and greater emphasis placed once again on the crucial importance of productive work; those were at the origin of everything that made civilization possible. It was the wish of the ILO to acquire greater capacity to influence governance with regard to the major issues facing the world. In that endeavour it could count on Spain’s unfailing support.

55. The Chairperson assured Mr Rodríguez Zapatero that his clear perception of the importance of integrating social dialogue and decent work into a European and global perspective would inform the discussions of the ILO’s Governing Body.

Special sitting

VISIT OF HIS EXCELLENCY MR BAN KI-MOON,
SECRETARY-GENERAL OF THE UNITED NATIONS

Wednesday, 19 November 2008

56. The Director-General said he was pleased to welcome the Secretary-General of the United Nations. Mr Ban Ki-moon had earned a reputation as someone who sought pragmatic solutions to problems, making the fullest possible use of the potential of the United Nations, and focusing on the human element and actual results. That had marked his approach to the food crisis, the challenge of climate change, and the enormous potential of green jobs. The Director-General commended Mr Ban Ki-moon for the substance of his statement to the leaders of the G-20 countries, in which he had emphasized the seriousness of the threat to incomes and to globalization posed by the crisis, among other things. In his own words, “We need most of all to join forces to take immediate action to prevent the financial crisis from becoming a human tragedy.” That was exactly what the ILO was doing throughout the world through social dialogue and tripartite institutions. Faced with an exceptional economic crisis, the ILO had committed itself, through its Decent Work Agenda, to help with efforts to create a global architecture for fairness to counteract the increasing inequalities in the world. The time had come to bring reason and balance back into the global economy.

57. Mr Ban Ki-moon, Secretary-General of the United Nations, congratulated Mr Somavia on his re-election as Director-General of the International Labour Office. He was confident that the ILO, under his leadership, and thanks to its tripartite composition, would achieve even greater progress than in the past. He noted that, at the G-20 Summit, he had made a
clear statement calling for a stronger and fairer multilateralism. The industrialized
countries would have to meet their commitments to achieve the United Nations
Millennium Development Goals (MDGs), combat climate change and reform financial
institutions. In the final Declaration adopted by the Summit, the leaders undertook to
continue along the path of co-participation, cooperation and multilateralism, and to tackle
the most pressing problems, including energy, food security, the rule of law, and the fight
against terrorism, poverty and sickness. The current crisis provided incentives to promote
development of the green economy, especially renewable sources of energy, in order to
stimulate economic development and generate employment. One possible solution would
be to implement labour-intensive projects that would reduce greenhouse gas emissions.
The transition to a low-carbon economy could generate many millions of jobs.

58. The financial crisis was also an employment crisis. It was possible that, by the end of 2009,
some 20 million jobs would be lost. According to figures provided by the ILO’s
Director-General, another 100 million people could be added to the numbers of workers
living below the poverty line. Just as jobs were at risk, so were homes and pensions. The
Decent Work Agenda focused on what was really essential and fundamental to the
aspirations of people. All those involved needed to join forces in an effective way, as had
been shown by the established ILO practice of bringing together employers, workers and
governments in order to seek solutions based on consensus. Similarly, the various bodies
and specialized institutions, funds, programmes, and the United Nations headquarters,
needed to be “Delivering as One”. In that endeavour, the speaker said he counted on the
ILO’s commitment and leadership.

59. On the other hand, the financial crisis was not the only problem that needed to be tackled.
It was also essential to improve governance to ensure that globalization would produce
fairer outcomes, promote social justice, and become more viable in environmental,
economic, social and political terms. The ILO’s Declaration on Social Justice for a Fair
Globalization was adopted in 2008 and, in February 2009, the first World Day of Social
Justice would be held. The Declaration affirmed, rightly, that the fundamental values of
freedom, human dignity, social justice, security and non-discrimination were essential for
achieving sustainable socio-economic development. Safeguarding the livelihoods of people
was a way of enriching the ground for social justice.

60. The Chairperson said that the presence of the Secretary-General was an example of the
unity of the multilateral system. The ILO was willing to work together with the multilateral
system in order to attain the Millennium Development Goals and achieve further advances
in social justice in a manner that was environmentally, economically and politically
sustainable.

Second item on the agenda

APPROVAL OF THE MINUTES OF THE 302ND SESSION
OF THE GOVERNING BODY
(GB.303/2)

Governing Body decision:

61. The Governing Body approved the minutes of the 302nd Session, as submitted.
(GB.303/2, paragraph 3.)
Third item on the agenda

DATE AND AGENDA OF THE INTERNATIONAL LABOUR CONFERENCE

(a) Agenda of the 99th Session (2010) of the Conference
(GB.303/3/1)

62. The Chairperson recalled that the two technical items on the agenda of the session in question were decent work for domestic workers, with a view to standard setting under the double-discussion procedure, and strengthening national responses to HIV/AIDS in the world of work, which was at the second discussion stage, with a view to the adoption of an autonomous Recommendation. It was suggested that a third technical item be included on the strategic objective of employment for a first discussion of a recurrent item, as part of the follow-up to the 2008 ILO Declaration on Social Justice for a Fair Globalization.

63. The Employer Vice-Chairperson and the Worker Vice-Chairperson supported the inclusion of an item concerning the strategic objective of employment, for a recurrent discussion.

64. A Government representative of India commended the Office’s efforts to place decent work at the heart of socio-economic policies with the aim of achieving full productive employment. She supported a recurrent discussion on the strategic objective of employment and said she hoped that the item would further promote the ILO Decent Work Agenda.

Governing Body decision:

65. The Governing Body decided to include in the agenda of the 99th Session (2010) of the International Labour Conference the following item: a recurrent discussion on the strategic objective of employment (GB.303/3/1, paragraph 12).

(b) Proposals for the agenda of the 100th Session (2011) of the Conference
(GB.303/3/2)

66. The Chairperson said that, following a first discussion on decent work for domestic workers with a view to standard setting, which would take place at the 99th Session (2010) of the International Labour Conference, the item would subsequently be included on the agenda of the 100th Session (2011) for a second discussion. Accordingly, the Governing Body had to select a recurrent discussion item and a third technical item from the following:

(i) a recurrent discussion on labour protection or social security;

(ii) decent work in global supply chains (general discussion);

(iii) social finance: microfinance for decent work (general discussion);

(iv) flexicurity as a tool facilitating adaptation to changes in the globalized economy (general discussion);

(v) youth entrepreneurship: transforming jobseekers into job creators (general discussion); and

(vi) the right to information and consultation in the framework of economic restructuring (general discussion).
The Governing Body would also have to examine the following proposals for the agenda of future sessions of the Conference:

(i) export processing zones: possibility of a general discussion;

(ii) new trends in the prevention and resolution of industrial disputes: possibility of a general discussion (taking into consideration the conclusions of the Working Party on Policy regarding the Revision of Standards); and

(iii) the role of the workplace in providing access to prevention, treatment, care and support for HIV/AIDS.

The Employer Vice-Chairperson expressed his preference, firstly, for the item on microfinance for decent work, the examination of which could lead to an exchange of ideas on the creation of sustainable micro-enterprises and small enterprises, and on the development of entrepreneurship in general, as direct and rapid sources of employment creation. The effect of the financial crisis on small enterprises should also be considered. Secondly, he supported the item on youth entrepreneurship, given that private-sector initiatives were an essential incentive in modern society. Those two major issues, namely the creation of sustainable enterprises and employment creation, should be examined in conjunction with labour protection. Lastly, the speaker supported the item on flexicurity, given that it was a mechanism which, in the context of the financial crisis, could help identify ways of combining labour flexibility with labour protection. The speaker also recalled that the revision of standards was still pending, and that it would be necessary to establish the relevant priorities and determine an appropriate time frame, in collaboration with governments and the Workers’ group.

The Worker Vice-Chairperson reaffirmed his group’s interest in finding a more efficient way of selecting the items to be included on the Conference agenda. He agreed that a recurrent discussion should be held on social security, in keeping with the decisions of previous discussions. The speaker said he did not support the item on youth entrepreneurship, given that the item had already been considered from various viewpoints and there was insufficient information available to hold a fruitful discussion. In view of the importance of social dialogue for devising a strategy to overcome the financial crisis, and the need for guidelines in that area, the right to information and consultation was, in his view, undoubtedly the most appropriate item. Information was essential to social peace, particularly when the social partners were faced with measures such as enterprise restructuring programmes. Second, the speaker supported an item on decent work in global supply chains, the examination of which would involve an assessment of social policies and investment and competition policies, and would, moreover, provide an opportunity to further explore ways of dealing with the financial crisis. Circumstances might make it necessary to discuss other subjects arising from the cyclical reviews. As an example, the speaker referred to the subject of export processing zones, the importance of which had been repeatedly emphasized by workers, especially in developing countries. An agreement could easily be reached on that matter, as had been the case with HIV/AIDS and gender.

A Government representative of the United Kingdom said that he favoured the items concerning social security for a recurrent discussion and an item on youth entrepreneurship. Although it was to be hoped that the worst of the current financial difficulties would have been resolved by 2011, very large numbers of young workers were expected to enter the labour market over the coming decade, and that required an extraordinary response. Six years after the 2005 Conference discussion on the problem of youth employment, a discussion on youth entrepreneurship would help to show young people that working independently as entrepreneurs was part of the solution.
71. A Government representative of Austria said that she favoured the items concerning a recurrent discussion on social security and the right of workers to information and consultation. Given that informing and consulting workers had a positive effect on economic development, the possibility of adopting a standard in that area might be considered in the future. Two other items that should be addressed in the near future were export processing zones and decent work in global supply chains.

72. A Government representative of India said that, because of her country’s demographic profile, she supported an item on youth entrepreneurship. By 2025, India’s active population was expected to represent 64.3 per cent of the total population. Youth entrepreneurship programmes needed to be carefully planned, given the demands and risks all young people faced at work at a vulnerable stage in their lives. With regard to future sessions, the speaker supported the item on new trends in the prevention and resolution of industrial disputes. She pointed out that the unequal distribution of the benefits of globalization had led to social tension, particularly in the workplace. In India, there were currently 14,000 industrial disputes pending under the 1947 Industrial Disputes Act. Grievances concerning labour relations and conditions of employment were resolved through conciliation, arbitration or judicial mechanisms. Furthermore, informal regional procedures had just been successfully implemented to administer justice by resolving disputes swiftly and at no cost to the parties concerned, through discussions and guidance. It was essential to foster consultation and cooperation between employers and workers in the workplace. Equally, it was necessary to promote voluntary arbitration and the trust which came from sharing information at the enterprise level. The speaker referred to two other subjects that should be examined, namely, occupational safety and health and the emerging forms of contract labour in the context of globalization.

73. A representative of the Republic of Korea expressed support for the items concerning social security, for a recurrent discussion. He said that if the strategic objective of employment were discussed only once in a six-year cycle, the 304th Session of the Governing Body (March 2009) would have to examine the topic of employment in greater detail. The speaker said he preferred an item on youth entrepreneurship, given that, faced with the current financial crisis, such a discussion would provide an opportunity to seek ways of reducing youth unemployment and assessing how the policies adopted by the social partners could promote entrepreneurship.

74. A Government representative of China supported a recurrent discussion on social security and the item on youth entrepreneurship. With regard to future sessions, the speaker recommended that an item be included on new trends in the prevention and resolution of industrial disputes.

75. A Government representative of Mexico supported a recurrent discussion on social security, as well as the items on decent work in global supply chains and youth entrepreneurship. With regard to future sessions, his delegation was interested in developing the issue of new trends in the prevention and resolution of industrial disputes.

76. A Government representative of Spain supported a “periodic” or “cyclical” discussion on social security, preferring not to use the word “recurrent”, which he considered ambiguous. To ensure that the issues discussed at the Conference were in step with developments in the world of work, the speaker reiterated the proposal to leave the selection of one agenda item until the Conference session, to allow the inclusion of a highly topical item on the agenda. Alternatively, the item could be selected within a period of six months before the session. Since participants were well-versed in labour- and enterprise-related matters, they would be capable of holding an impromptu general discussion.
77. *A Government representative of the United States* favoured a general discussion on youth entrepreneurship or decent work in global supply chains.

78. *A Government representative of South Africa* supported the item on social security for a recurrent discussion, and hoped for an in-depth discussion on two subjects, namely the right to information and consultation and social finance.

79. *A Government representative of Cuba* supported the items on social security, for a periodic or cyclical discussion, the right to information and consultation, for a general discussion, and, for future sessions, the item on new trends in the prevention and resolution of industrial disputes.

80. *The representatives of the Governments of Germany and Italy* supported a recurrent discussion on social security and general discussions on decent work in global supply chains and the right to information and consultation.

81. *A Government representative of Argentina* said she preferred the item on social security, for a cyclical discussion, and the item on the right to information and consultation. She also proposed that the item on decent work in global supply chains be examined at a future session.

82. *A Government representative of Thailand* supported the item on issues relating to labour protection, for a recurrent discussion, and, given the current global financial crisis, the item on flexicurity, as the third item. He also supported the item on new trends in the prevention and resolution of industrial disputes for a future session.

83. *A Government representative of Belgium* endorsed the European Union’s decision to support the item on social security for a recurrent discussion. The document which would be presented by the Office in March 2009 would need to establish a link between the issues developed and any requests made by member States in connection with their Decent Work Country Programmes. Given that the financial crisis would have widespread repercussions on employment, the speaker supported the item on youth entrepreneurship, and said that the Office would have to acquire the specialized knowledge required for a comprehensive survey of the subject. The speaker regretted that only general discussion items were being proposed, including the item on the right to information and consultation, which he also favoured; he agreed with the Government representative of Austria on the possibility of adopting an instrument in that area. Failing that, he suggested that the debate be widened to cover social planning and other measures that could accompany restructuring, as well as mechanisms for guaranteeing the right to information and consultation. An item on decent work in global supply chains had the advantage of being relevant to all countries. With regard to flexicurity, the speaker hoped that the Office would produce a document illustrating the fact that, although a European flexicurity model did not exist, some common principles had been defined. Indeed, flexicurity was a matter of universal concern and was well advanced in some regions of the world.

84. *A Government representative of the Russian Federation* supported the items on a recurrent discussion on social security and on the right to information and consultation. For future sessions, he advocated items on new trends in the prevention and resolution of industrial disputes and on the role of the workplace in providing access to prevention, treatment, care and support for HIV/AIDS.

85. *A Government representative of Sweden*, speaking on behalf of the Nordic countries Denmark, Finland, Iceland, Norway and Sweden, supported the item on social security for a recurrent discussion, and the item on decent work in global supply chains for a general discussion, and suggested that a future session should consider export processing zones.
86. A Government representative of Burundi supported the item on social security for a recurrent discussion, the item on youth entrepreneurship, and, for a future session, the item on microfinance for decent work.

87. A Government representative of Poland, like the European Union, supported the item on social security for a recurrent discussion. In view of the current economic crisis, the speaker reiterated her country’s support for the item on decent work in global supply chains. She also supported the item on youth entrepreneurship.

88. A Government representative of Canada supported the items concerning a recurrent discussion on social security, decent work in global supply chains for consideration in March 2009, and the items on export processing zones and new trends in the prevention and resolution of industrial disputes, for future sessions. The speaker asked the Office to develop proposals for consolidating and revising Conventions and Recommendations to ensure that ILO instruments remained relevant and up to date. In that regard, the speaker supported the Employer Vice-Chairperson’s proposal that consultations be held and an action plan developed for revising standards.

89. A Government representative of the Islamic Republic of Iran said he preferred the items on social security, for a recurrent discussion, and social finance and youth entrepreneurship.

90. A Government representative of Australia suggested that the item on decent work in global supply chains be discussed.

91. A Government representative of France suggested that the word “recurrent” was ambiguous, and expressed a preference for the item on the right to information and consultation.

92. A representative of the Director-General said that, in the light of the discussions, the recurrent discussion would deal with social security, subject to confirmation in March 2009. With regard to the Office proposals, he noted that various Governments, and the Employers’ and Workers’ groups, had clearly expressed their preference for the following items: decent work in global supply chains; youth entrepreneurship; and the right to information and consultation. The two items with the most support for future sessions were those on export processing zones and new trends in the prevention and resolution of industrial disputes. The Governing Body would have to consider how those proposals would be examined in the light of the items selected for recurrent discussion. As part of continuing discussions on the role of the Governing Body, it would also be possible to consider the possibility of changing the procedure for selecting the items submitted to the Governing Body for consideration.

Governing Body decision:

93. The Governing Body, having examined the proposals presented in the Office document for the agenda of the International Labour Conference decided:

(a) that the proposals to be examined in greater depth at its 304th Session (March 2009), in order to finalize the agenda of the 100th Session (2011) of the International Labour Conference, would be the following:

(i) a recurrent discussion on social security;
(ii) decent work in global supply chains (general discussion);
(iii) youth entrepreneurship: transforming jobseekers into job creators (general discussion); and
(iv) the right to information and consultation in the framework of economic restructuring (general discussion);

(b) that the proposals for which research work and consultation might be accelerated for future Conferences would be the following:

(i) export processing zones (general discussion or standard setting); and
(ii) new trends in the prevention and resolution of industrial disputes: (possibility of a general discussion taking into consideration the conclusions of the Working Party on Policy regarding the Revision of Standards).

(GB.303/3/2, paragraph 14.)

(c) Date of the 98th Session (2009) of the International Labour Conference

(GB.303/3/3)

Governing Body decision:

94. The Governing Body decided that the 98th Session of the International Labour Conference would be held from 3 to 19 June 2009, and to postpone until March 2009 the final decision concerning the date of its 305th Session in June 2009 (GB.303/3/3, paragraph 4).

Fourth item on the agenda


Follow-up to the adoption of the conclusions on skills for improved productivity, employment growth and development

(GB.303/4/1)

Follow-up to the adoption of the conclusions on the promotion of rural employment for poverty reduction

(GB.303/4/2)

Follow-up to the adoption of the resolution concerning the ILO’s and the tripartite constituents’ role in tackling the global food crisis

(GB.303/4/3)

95. The Employer Vice-Chairperson said, in relation to the conclusions on skills for improved productivity, employment growth and development, that the issue was a central and strategic one, especially in the current circumstances. The Employers therefore supported without reservation the follow-up activities set out in paragraph 3 and suggested that the conclusions should be incorporated into technical cooperation and decent work programmes. In addition, they invited Governments to include information on skills development policies in their employment reports, on a voluntary basis.

96. With regard to the second document, on follow-up to the adoption of the conclusions on the promotion of rural employment for poverty reduction, he expressed disappointment at the follow-up given to such a relevant issue, especially taking into account the negative
repercussions that the financial crisis was likely to have on rural areas in developing countries. It was necessary to strengthen coordination and focus on developing entrepreneurship and promoting small enterprises in rural areas. The Decent Work Country Programmes should also place greater emphasis on the issue and cooperation with the International Institute for Labour Studies should be strengthened in order to improve information, in particular with regard to impact assessments, the promotion of rural employment and poverty reduction. Lastly, it was necessary to link the conclusions on the promotion of rural employment for poverty reduction with those concerning the promotion of sustainable enterprises; the Turin Centre could consider the possibility of establishing programmes that took both into account.

97. With regard to the resolution on the role of the ILO and the tripartite constituents in tackling the global food crisis, he recalled that the Committee on Sectoral and Technical Meetings and Related Issues had made some recommendations in that regard.

98. The Worker Vice-Chairperson, with regard to the conclusions on skills for improved productivity, employment growth and development, regretted that the Office gave the impression of having been very selective in its choice of follow-up activities. It seemed, in fact, that a number of areas, such as the informal sector, had not been taken into account in the activities. The economies of many countries in the developing world were, however, heavily dependent on that sector. The Workers would like to receive information on any activities undertaken in that area or in other areas not covered in the document.

99. He commended the Office for the work it had done in follow-up to the conclusions on the promotion of rural employment for poverty reduction and noted with satisfaction that there was a willingness to translate the policy guidance given by the Conference into the Decent Work Country Programmes. He invited the Office to consider not only the fundamental rights of workers but also their rights relating to working time, wages, occupational safety and health and social security.

100. The Workers called for widespread support for the resolution on the food crisis which had been adopted following a discussion that had been held at the initiative of the Workers’ group. It was hoped that the forthcoming meeting would contribute to an informed discussion within the United Nations on the social and employment impact of food prices on decent work.

101. The representative of the Director-General explained that the documents which had been submitted referred only to a few of the many follow-up activities that were being undertaken. The activities being carried out in connection with the conclusions on skills, for example, were merged with the Organization’s activities as a whole in that area. In the case of rural employment, the Office was following an integrated approach and the work being carried out was much more significant than the document suggested. The issue was particularly important in view of the crisis and it was necessary to discuss the expected impact of the Organization’s activities in that regard.

102. The Governing Body took note of the reports.
Fifth item on the agenda

COMPOSITION OF THE GOVERNING BODY

(GB.303/5)

103. The Chairperson recalled that the item was a result of the resolution on Africa’s representation in the ILO Governing Body adopted in April 2007 at the 11th African Regional Meeting. The Office proposed in the document a practical solution which involved amending article 7 of the ILO Constitution to increase the number of non-elective seats from ten to 12, without changing the total number of Government seats. He underscored that, as indicated in the document, any proposal to amend the ILO Constitution had to be included by the Governing Body in the agenda of the Conference at least four months before the opening of the session in question. Therefore, if it wanted the issue to be considered by the Conference in June 2009, the Governing Body would have to take a decision at the current session.

104. The Government representative of South Africa said that his country fully endorsed the proposal made in the document. The criteria for representation among non-elective seats should be determined on a regional basis and take into account developments in the different regions. The Government of South Africa looked forward to the draft instrument of amendment of the Constitution, which should be submitted in March, and supported the process proposed in parts (a), (b) and (c) of paragraph 12 of the report.

105. The Government representative of Nigeria underscored the importance of the issue for the region and called for the question of the amendment of the ILO Constitution to be included in the agenda of the 98th Session of the Conference in 2009. He endorsed the Office’s recommendation in principle and supported the establishment of a working party to pursue a course of action to ensure that the issue would be presented at the next session of the International Labour Conference.

106. The Government representative of Uruguay, speaking on behalf of GRULAC, said that democracy and representativeness in the Governing Body and its committees played an essential role in lending real legitimacy to the decisions adopted. He said that the request of the African group was justified and noted that the presence of non-elected members in the Governing Body was contrary to the principle of equality among all States enshrined in the Charter of the United Nations. The exercise of redefining the composition of the Governing Body should therefore be directed at eliminating that category and should be based on equal rights among States, whether small or large, and regional representativeness.

107. GRULAC considered that the proposal presented by the Office did not give adequate consideration to the 1986 Instrument of Amendment, and that any reform of the ILO Constitution should not be done on an ad hoc basis but, rather, on the basis of sustainable solutions, which were essential to legal stability. In that regard, he expressed concern about the references to transitional provisions in paragraphs 4 and 10 of the document. Given the complexity of the issue, GRULAC proposed the establishment of transparent and participatory consultation and analysis mechanisms for the in-depth examination of the issue and the different factors involved.

108. The Government representative of Austria recalled that her country had ratified the 1986 Instrument of Amendment. Noting that the Czech Republic, Denmark, Finland, the Netherlands, the Republic of Korea, Sweden and Switzerland aligned themselves with her statement, she said that she understood that the African group wanted more geographical balance in the composition of the Governing Body and considered that the current system of non-elective seats was not consistent with that approach. The 1986 constitutional
amendment, which had been ratified by a relatively large number of member States, was
aimed at giving the Governing Body a more representative membership. That amendment
contained many interesting points, and the proposals made in the Office’s document did
not provide much clarity with regard to the future of the amendment.

109. Speaking on behalf of Austria, she recalled that any new amendment to the Constitution
would require many consultations, as had the 1986 amendment. The deadline of summer
2009 was not very realistic and it would be better to try to adapt the 1986 amendment
rather than to introduce a new amendment.

110. The Government representative of India said that she supported the aspirations of African
countries to occupy non-elective seats in the Governing Body. Also, she pointed out that
the 1986 Instrument of Amendment was still in the process of being ratified, and that India
had ratified it primarily because it sought to expand representation in the Governing Body.

111. The Government representative of Spain supported the process to submit a constitutional
amendment to the Conference. He also supported the request by African countries and
underscored that the composition of the Governing Body was a substantive issue and was
not about challenging a particular country or the status of the ten countries currently
considered to be countries of chief industrial importance. It was a privilege to be a
permanent member of the Governing Body. Currently, that status was granted on purely
economic grounds, namely on the basis of chief industrial importance. For his country, that
concept was outdated, as it was based on criteria that were no longer applicable. The
concept of chief industrial importance should be replaced by that of chief social
importance. Africa was entitled to be part of the group of privileged countries on the basis
of the considerable efforts being made by African countries to guarantee justice and social
order in the continent. The social and human indicators of the United Nations or other
indicators, such as the ratification or application of the ILO Conventions, could be used as
basic criteria. Consideration should be given not only to statistical results, but also to the
efforts made to obtain results. Lastly, he indicated that he would like the Employers’ and
Workers’ groups to be involved in the reform process and to participate on a tripartite basis
in the preparation of the amendment in question.

112. The Employer Vice-Chairperson of the Governing Body raised a point of order and
recalled that it had been agreed that the Office would prepare a procedural document but
that the substantive issue concerned the Government group as such. He proposed that the
debate should be postponed until March, to allow the Government group to reach a
consensus; the Employers’ group would approve the procedure once the Governments had
reached agreement.

113. The Worker Vice-Chairperson indicated that he shared the views of his employer
counterpart and recalled that the decision taken one year earlier had been precisely to that
effect. It was up to the Government group to examine the suggestions made by the African
countries.

114. The Government representative of Spain said that he supported the proposal to postpone
the decision until March.

115. The Government representative of Egypt thanked the secretariat, which had looked for
ways to respond to the legitimate ambitions of Africa, which sought fair representation in
the Governing Body. She recalled that her country had ratified the 1986 Instrument of
Amendment which was a step towards fair representation, and was in favour of pursuing
the ratification of the Instrument of Amendment.
116. The Government Representative of Zambia appreciated the work that had been undertaken on the issue and the recommendation contained in the document, which tried to take into account the concerns of all the regions. The Government group should discuss the issue as, although Africa had initially pushed for the inclusion of the item on the agenda, it seemed now that other regions wanted to have a stake in the discussion. It was important to reach a common position that reflected the work undertaken when South Africa had chaired the Governing Body. It was also important to move forward and, even if further consultations were necessary, not to lose the momentum.

117. The Government representative of Tunisia, speaking in his capacity of coordinator of the Africa group, thanked the Office for the proposals for a constitutional amendment which would make it possible to broaden the group of countries of chief industrial importance. For the Africa group, it was a very important step, but the discussions held to date had not made it possible to reach a consensus. In fact, many African countries hoped to give another chance to the 1986 Instrument of Amendment. Accordingly, his group would like the issue to be examined by the Labour and Social Affairs Commission of the African Union, at its April 2009 meeting.

118. The Government representative of the Congo supported the statement of the coordinator of the Africa group and explained that negotiations were under way with a view to reaching a consensus. It had been decided that the issue should be referred to the African bodies concerned with labour issues in order to reach a consensus.

119. The Government representative of China considered the issue to be extremely complicated and said that his Government hoped that a solution would be found; he considered, however, that the Conference should consider the issue only when the Africa group had reached a consensus.

120. The Government representative of Belgium explained that his country supported the African request for greater fairness in the composition of the Governing Body. He said that the modernization of institutions took place as a result of calling their governing bodies to account, and he recalled that his country had ratified the 1986 Instrument of Amendment which was aimed primarily at putting an end to the system of permanent members. He explained that, before planning a new draft amendment, he hoped that the Office would provide some clarity on the status of the 1986 amendment in the light of the new draft instrument, and particularly on whether that instrument would in practice lead to the perpetuation of the existence of permanent members.

121. The Government representative of Benin said that the issue of the composition of the Governing Body was so important that it warranted close scrutiny. Discussions had taken place within the Africa group but consensus had not yet been reached. Benin was therefore of the view that the matter should be referred to the Labour and Social Affairs Commission of the African Union during its next session, in April 2009. That additional time was needed to reach a common position. Furthermore, the speaker was of the opinion that the adoption of the amendment should not prevent the continuation of the process to ratify the 1986 Instrument of Amendment.

122. The Government representative of Cuba attached great importance to the question of the composition of the Governing Body and believed that its current composition did not meet the requirements of the twenty-first century. Modernization was needed. The Africa group was under-represented in the Governing Body and the unsatisfactory representativeness was undermining the legitimacy of the decisions taken, which consequently did not reflect the interests of constituents in the different geographical regions.
123. Cuba shared the legitimate aspirations of the African countries but considered that the Office’s proposal did not take into account the fact that the world had changed and that, far from solving the problem, it reinforced old definitions and concepts and exacerbated the issue of governance. The real solution would be to eliminate the non-elective seats and to base the composition of the Governing Body on the principle of the sovereign equality of States and equitable geographical representation in accordance with the number of countries in each regional group. That was the approach taken in most of the agencies of the United Nations system, and it would allow the Governing Body to carry out effectively the functions entrusted to it.

124. He associated himself with the doubts and questions raised by the representative of Uruguay on behalf of GRULAC. An issue of such importance must be addressed with transparency. All the member States of the Organization should be treated with equality and justice and, to that end, the ILO had adopted the 1986 Instrument of Amendment. A new amendment would create a situation of legal instability, particularly in countries such as Cuba, which had already ratified the 1986 instrument. If that instrument entered into force, it would remove the concept of non-elective seats reserved for members of chief industrial importance; it would therefore be necessary to launch a new campaign for the ratification of that instrument of amendment, taking into account that the required number of ratifications was close to being reached. The Organization should provide technical assistance to countries, including the African countries which had not accepted the instrument, in order to revive the ratification process. The instrument of amendment did not address only the question of the composition of the Governing Body, but other issues relating to various articles of the Constitution, which complicated the ratification process for a number of countries. Consideration should be given to the possibility of proposing a new amendment containing the part of the 1986 Instrument of Amendment which concerned the composition of the Governing Body.

125. In conclusion, the Cuban delegation wished to recall that only one solution, based on the principles of sovereign equality and equitable geographical distribution, would enable the Governing Body to work effectively.

126. The Government representative of South Africa expressed satisfaction with the quality of the discussion, which demonstrated the importance of the issue. With regard to the point for decision, which made reference to a draft instrument of amendment for review at the 304th Session of the Governing Body, he considered that it would be possible to hold discussions before then, but that there should be no expectation of reaching a total consensus on the issue. He endorsed part (a) of the point for decision and accepted the proposed course of action.

127. There were a number of countries that had yet to be persuaded to ratify the 1986 Instrument of Amendment. He recalled that the process had started 22 years previously. Two parallel processes were involved and there was no question of reconsidering the decision taken by the Conference in 1986.

128. The Government representative of Algeria said that, within the Africa group, there were a number of points of convergence. However, there was consensus within the group that Africa was under-represented and that it was necessary to rectify the situation. It was also recognized that the adoption of the 1986 Instrument of Amendment would be the most diplomatic, modern and satisfactory solution. The question was whether or not the instrument of amendment would come into force. However, it was quite possible that the adoption of a second instrument of amendment aimed simply at co-opting two members of the Africa group, while maintaining the status quo, would take a long time and would therefore result in an extremely confusing situation. Given that the entry into force of the
possible amendment was not envisaged before the end of the term of office of the current Governing Body, in other words in 2011, there was time to deliberate.

129. With regard to consensus in the Africa group, it was to be hoped that the meeting of ministers of the African Union would enable progress to be made. Those ministers had reaffirmed the need to promote the representation of all African countries in the Governing Body through an efficient and effective rotation system. The speaker was convinced that African wisdom and the spirit of dialogue would make it possible to reach a solution that had universal support.

130. The ILO’s Legal Adviser, responding to the concerns of the GRULAC representative with regard to paragraph 4 of the Office’s document and, in particular, with regard to the relationship between the possible amendment proposed in the document and the 1986 Instrument of Amendment, explained that the former was not compatible with the part of the 1986 Instrument of Amendment relating to the composition of the Governing Body. He pointed out that the 1986 Instrument of Amendment was broader in scope and covered other issues. With regard to the composition of the Governing Body, the two instruments contradicted each other. The Office’s document left the issue open because different solutions were possible. One solution could be, if the Governing Body decided in favour of a new amendment, for that amendment to supersede the part of the 1986 Instrument of Amendment relating to the composition of the Governing Body. Another solution could be that the new amendment which was proposed would remain in force until the entry into force of the 1986 Instrument of Amendment. The two solutions were legally possible and the choice between them was a political choice.

131. Paragraph 10 of the document, and in particular the transitional aspect, concerned a technical detail and the Office had thought it would be wise, if the new proposed amendment entered into force, not to change the Governing Body that was currently in office. It thus foresaw that the new amendment would enter into force at the end of the term of office of the Governing Body in place, in other words at the end of the three-year mandate.

132. With regard to the question asked by the Government representative of Belgium, on the status of the 1986 amendment, he said that, as had already been recalled, the amendment had received 93 ratifications so far. In order to enter into force, a constitutional amendment required the ratification of two-thirds of the members of the Organization, in other words, 122. Furthermore, at least five of the ten members of chief industrial importance had to be among the 122 member States to have ratified the text; however, to date, only two, namely India and Italy, had done so. The most recent ratification dated back to 1997.

**Governing Body decision:**

133. The Governing Body decided to keep the item on its agenda for future sessions and return to it once the necessary consultations within the Government group had taken place, including, in the light of the outcome of the meeting of the African Union’s Labour and Social Affairs Commission in April 2009.
Sixth item on the agenda

THE ILO AND THE MULTILATERAL SYSTEM

(GB.303/6)

134. The Governing Body discussed the sixth item on its agenda in conjunction with the seventeenth item: Report of the Working Party on the Social Dimension of Globalization. For the report of this discussion, please see under item 17, on pages 54 to 65 below.

Seventh item on the agenda

ENHANCED PROGRAMME OF TECHNICAL COOPERATION FOR THE OCCUPIED ARAB TERRITORIES

(GB.303/7)

135. The Regional Director for the Arab States presented the report with updated information and referred to the mission she had recently led in the occupied Arab territories, which had made it possible to launch the employment promotion programme and to reaffirm the ILO’s support for the Palestinian Authority in the implementation of the Palestinian reform and development plan. The situation in the territories was still marked by socio-economic difficulties, deepening poverty and a sharp deterioration in the employment situation. Against that backdrop, the ILO had designed a technical cooperation programme, which had been endorsed and signed in April 2008. An employment support unit in the Ministry of Labour should make it possible to reposition the employment agenda at the national level and revitalize the Palestinian Fund for Employment; the donors’ working group on job creation should also be revitalized. Those efforts had highlighted the need to strengthen efforts to build the capacities of the constituents across a number of jointly identified priority areas. In that regard, she emphasized the important financial contribution of Italy towards capacity-building for the initiative on local economic development, which would be implemented through the Turin Centre.

136. An important feature of the programme was the consolidation of national ownership and one example was the analysis of the technical and vocational education and training system which had been launched. The programme promoted a partnership strategy that had yielded interesting results, both in terms of financial resources and ensuring the centrality of the ILO’s approaches and tools.

137. A harnessing of efforts within the United Nations system had made it possible to secure resources from the UNDP-Spain Millennium Development Goal Achievement Fund window for gender equality and the empowerment of women in the occupied Arab territories.

138. Similarly, efforts in the area of entrepreneurship culture had resulted in a partnership with the United Nations Development Programme aimed at the integration of the “Know about business” training module in technical and vocational training establishments. The Organization would like to relaunch the national tripartite committee and strengthen its institutional role in transparent and effective labour market governance.

139. Finally, at the operational level, it was worth noting that the overall budget of the programme stood at US$9 million, one third of which came from contributions from Saudi Arabia, Kuwait, Turkey, the Islamic Development Bank, Italy and Spain. The programme would be implemented in two phases. The first phase, scheduled for 2009, would consist of immediate interventions using available regular and extra-budgetary resources, with the
aim of implementing, from 2010–11, a longer-term strategy on the basis of significant resource mobilization efforts.

140. The Worker Vice-Chairperson recalled that his group would like to see more meaningful forms of support for the occupied Arab territories and solidarity in dealing with the region’s problems, including the continuing blockade. The Workers’ group noted that the Palestinian trade unions had developed a comprehensive project to meet the needs of the workers in that area and hoped that such an initiative would help to resolve the problems relating to unemployment, respect for workers’ rights and the uplifting of the informal sector.

141. The Workers welcomed the detailed presentation of the Director and the attitude of the Office, which had redoubled its efforts and found resources. It was hoped that the presentation in March would touch on important sectors such as the cooperative sector and would address the employment promotion programme.

142. The Employer Vice-Chairperson commended the Office for its report and the Regional Director for her presentation. The situation was extremely complex and called for a tangible action plan, as well as follow-up for the measures mentioned in the report. The Employers welcomed the three objectives that had been mentioned, which were consistent with that approach, namely creating an enabling environment for enterprises, employment and dialogue for peace, as well as the implementation of a technical cooperation programme.

143. An Employer member from Saudi Arabia acknowledged the significant efforts that had been made to help both employers and workers in the occupied Arab territories. All such efforts were directed at achieving peace and ensuring the enjoyment by workers and employers of their rights. Many enterprises were unable to operate in the territories, which meant that thousands of people were unemployed, with no access to the outside world. It was necessary to think again about how to help those workers and employers get back to work.

144. He thanked the ILO for its support, which was nevertheless insufficient. Voluntary contributions should be replaced by regular budget resources, which should be increased, indeed doubled, in order to ensure the provision of technical assistance at the highest level.

145. The Government representative of Egypt expressed the satisfaction of the Arab group with regard to the efforts made by the Office to implement the programme of technical cooperation and to provide maximum resources. The people living in the occupied territories were living in very isolated conditions with the highest unemployment rate in the world, especially in the 20–24 year age group. Assistance should be provided to all sectors of the Palestinian population, including both workers and employers.

146. It was hoped that the Office would be able both to develop projects and to implement them on the ground. The member States should be invited to contribute to the Palestinian Employment Fund. Additional resources should be secured from the regular budget, including from the supplementary account, in order to implement the planned projects and follow up the proposals made by member States in the Governing Body with regard to project implementation.

147. The Government representative of the United States thanked the Office for its report and for its technical assistance programme.

148. The Governing Body took note of the report and of the comments made during the discussions.
Eighth item on the agenda

DEVELOPMENTS CONCERNING THE OBSERVANCE BY MYANMAR
OF THE FORCED LABOUR CONVENTION, 1930 (NO. 29)
(GB.303/8/1 and GB.303/8/2)

149. The Ambassador of Myanmar referred to the national referendum that had been held in Myanmar in May 2008 to approve the new State Constitution, thus completing the first step in the seven-step roadmap. The election law and regulations would soon be promulgated. Free and fair multiparty democratic elections would be held in 2010, Parliament would then be convened, followed by the formation of a new government, in accordance with the Constitution. He reiterated that recourse to forced labour was forbidden in Myanmar under Order No. 1/99 of 14 May 1999, supplemented by Order No. 1/99 of 27 October 2000. The establishment of an ILO Liaison Officer in Myanmar had been achieved, and on the basis of the Supplementary Understanding (SU), signed on 26 February 2007, a mechanism had been introduced to deal with complaints of forced labour. This mechanism had produced tangible results in the eradication of forced labour, and had been extended for a further period of one year until February 2009.

150. The Government Working Group for the Prevention of Forced Labour had received 69 cases from the Liaison Officer, 49 of which were already closed; the Working Group had replied to the Liaison Officer regarding a further seven cases; 13 cases were still under investigation. A workshop on the eradication of forced labour had been jointly organized by the Department of Labour and the ILO Liaison Officer in October 2008, and the Liaison Officer had undertaken two joint awareness missions with department of labour officials. Regarding the publication of the booklet *The eradication of the practice of forced labour and its related measures*, the Department had authorized the translation into the language of Myanmar of the Understanding of 2002, and the SU of 2007, together with the minutes of the meetings at which the Understandings were concluded, and those of the meeting at which the extension of the SU was agreed.

151. The sentence handed out under Penal Code section 353 to U Thet Way was not related to his association with the complaints mechanism. The new Constitution, apart from prohibiting forced labour, upheld the rights of all to freedom of expression, to assemble peacefully and form associations. This fundamental law could be seen as a high-level statement by the Government in respect of forced labour. Preparations had been engaged to send a tripartite delegation to the 98th Session of the International Labour Conference (2009). The Working Group had met with the ILO Liaison Officer on 11 September 2008, and following his suggestions, had held coordinating meetings on 4 and 7 November attended by 22 representatives of employers and workers from 11 industrial sectors. A Consultative Committee for the Election of Workers’ Delegates to the 98th Session of the Conference had subsequently been formed.

152. Significant progress had been made in relief and rehabilitation efforts following cyclone Nargis. Myanmar had displayed its willingness and ability to work with the international community by creating a core group composed of the Government of Myanmar, the Association of Southeast Asian Nations (ASEAN) and the United Nations. Rebuilding and replanting had been going ahead, and there had been no complaints of forced labour, as reported by the Liaison Officer. In line with the conclusions of the 97th Session of the Conference, an agreement had been signed between the Ministry of Labour and the ILO Liaison Officer on 27 October 2008 on a workplan for implementing pilot projects to create jobs in the Mawlamyinegyun township region, hard hit by the cyclone. Moreover, the Government had welcomed the visit of Mr Thomas Quintana, UN Special Rapporteur on the situation of human rights in Myanmar, who had been able to meet with the imprisoned Thurein Aung, Kyaw Kyaw and Su Su Nwe.
153. The Government was steadfast in its implementation of measures for ensuring the well-being of children, including the Child Law and the establishment in 1993 of the National Committee on the Rights of the Child. Admission to the armed forces was illegal below the age of 18, and the Government had established a High-level Committee for the Prevention of Military Recruitment of Under-age Children in 2004 to address the issue. Forced recruitment of children was strictly prohibited under the law. The Government was collaborating with the United Nations Children’s Fund (UNICEF) in this matter. In view of these positive developments, the Government requested the Governing Body to review and withdraw the emergency resolution adopted by the 87th Session of the Conference (1999), and the resolution concerning Myanmar adopted by the 98th Session of the Conference (2009). Myanmar was cooperating with the ILO, and would continue to do so in a constructive manner to eradicate the practice of forced labour in the country.

154. The Employer Vice-Chairperson stated his group’s great concern at the situation in Myanmar. Clearly, important steps had been taken with the establishment of the Liaison Office, and the signing of the Understandings, but as the Ambassador had admitted, a problem remained which required a solution. Despite the efforts made in respect of child soldiers, the elections held to introduce full democracy to the country, and the constitutional prohibition of forced labour, no decision to withdraw the resolutions, as called for by the Ambassador, could be taken until the problem had been eliminated. The tragic events caused by the cyclone could not be ignored when assessing the present situation in the country. The Employers remained optimistic, but expected concrete results. The group congratulated the Office on the progress achieved and wished to follow the process closely through the Governing Body reports.

155. The Worker Vice-Chairperson said that he had met with the Ambassador of Burma/Myanmar, and had made a number of suggestions. Firstly, the authorities should refrain from punishing civilians whose only crime was clearly to contact ILO officials. To claim that these persons were being punished for crimes which only became apparent after they had made contact with ILO officials was to insult the intelligence of Governing Body members. Secondly, the authorities should make their own sanctions more credible. The disparity between punishments of 28 days suspension of pay for Myanmar officials, when life imprisonment was being dispensed to members of the public by the judiciary was glaring. The authorities should allow the installation of ILO offices in other cities than Yangon. The distance persons had to travel to make complaints was an additional deterrent to that of fear that submitting a complaint might result in punishment. The authorities should recognize that the Federation of Trade Unions of Burma (FTUB) was a bona fide organization, and that its members were patriots and not terrorists.

156. The Workers’ group supported a renewal of the SU, but under certain conditions. There must be transparency in the Government’s actions, especially regarding its respect for freedom from false arrest. The six imprisoned persons mentioned in the 351st Report of the Committee on Freedom of Association should be released, as should all others in prison simply for having contacted ILO officials.

157. The Workers’ group believed that the Governing Body could do more to encourage Burma/Myanmar towards democracy. It should insist that the above conditions for renewal of the SU should apply. It should speak out more firmly against the arrest and detention of Aung San Suu Kyi. Government members should advise the Governing Body of action that their governments have taken, or planned to take in respect of Burma/Myanmar. The Governing Body had lost esteem by failing to support a small tripartite ASEAN meeting following the cyclone. Burma/Myanmar should not be shielded while it persisted in disregarding the moral authority of the Governing Body.
158. A Government representative of France spoke on behalf of the European Union (EU); of the EU candidate countries Turkey, Croatia and The former Yugoslav Republic of Macedonia; of the countries of the Stabilization and Association Process and potential candidates, Albania, Bosnia and Herzegovina and Montenegro; of the European Free Trade Association (EFTA) countries, Iceland and Norway; of the members of the European Economic Area and Switzerland; while Ukraine and the Republic of Moldova aligned themselves with the statement.

159. It was profoundly regrettable that, more than a year after the violent repression of peaceful demonstrations in the country, the Burma/Myanmar authorities still showed no sign of respect for human rights, despite calls from the UN Security Council and the Human Rights Council (HRC). This had resulted in human tragedy and a disastrous economic situation for the population. While U Win Tin and a few political prisoners had been freed, other human and political rights activists continued to be arrested, tried and sentenced to heavy terms of imprisonment. The excessive sanction passed on Su Su Nwe was particularly worrying. The EU had often expressed grave concern regarding non-observance by Burma/Myanmar of the Forced Labour Convention, 1930 (No. 29), and the Freedom of Association and Protection of the Right to Organise Convention, 1948 (No. 87). The recruiting of child soldiers was especially saddening. Reports were still being made of harassment of persons complaining of forced labour, despite the steps taken by the Government to prevent this, and the EU would continue to monitor individual cases. The EU had again submitted a draft resolution to the UN General Assembly regarding the human rights situation in Burma/Myanmar, and supported the action of the HRC and the UN Special Rapporteur on the situation of human rights in Burma/Myanmar. The common EU position and the restrictive measures imposed were reviewed according to the conduct of the Government. The measures had been renewed in April 2008. The EU welcomed the signing of the SU on 26 February 2007, and had consequently approved the decision to delay requesting an advisory opinion from the International Court of Justice (ICJ). The EU also approved the recommendations of the ILO mission to the country which took place from 25 to 28 February 2008. Active support should be given to the activities of the ILO Liaison Officer, who should have full freedom of movement.

160. Some positive elements had appeared since the SU, which had been prolonged by one year: 121 complaints had been submitted by citizens to the ILO Liaison Officer; 70 had been passed on to the authorities, of which 50 had been dealt with; and 20 were still pending. The SU had enhanced relations between the ILO and Burma/Myanmar, though awareness of rights and engagements had increased insufficiently amongst the local authorities, the military and the general public.

161. A clear workplan was now required to implement the ILO recommendations. The EU regretted that the authorities had made no high-level statement condemning all forms of forced labour and sanctioning transgressions. The authorities should ensure that no political decision should be taken that might encourage recourse to forced labour. The EU was very concerned that the population, particularly outside Yangon, remained unaware of the complaints mechanism, from lack of translations and awareness-raising campaigns, and urgently requested the Government to take steps to remedy this. The Government should cooperate closely with the Liaison Officer in the organization of regular information meetings for the military on the illegality of recruiting children, and should return children in the army to civilian life.

162. The EU voiced concern that recourse to forced labour and child recruitment into the army was increasing in the Irrawaddy region post-cyclone Nargis, and firmly supported the work undertaken jointly by the authorities, UNICEF, the Red Cross and the ILO to design and implement training for trainers for military recruitment officers on the law governing under-age recruitment. This work should continue in order to fulfil Security Council
Resolution No. 1612. Also of concern were reports that civilian porters were being drafted into the army, and suffering death or mutilation due to land mines.

163. The EU deeply deplored that the referendum on the new Constitution had not initiated a process of national reconciliation and democratization. The 2010 multiparty elections would lack credibility if the authorities failed to free all political prisoners, including Aung San Suu Kyi, and engage in dialogue with the opposition and ethnic minorities. This represented the only possible road to national reconciliation. The EU therefore supported the work of UN Special Representative Mr Gambari, and repeated its call for such dialogue with the principal political parties, based on respect for fundamental human rights, including freedom of association and the eradication of all forms of forced labour.

164. A Government representative of Singapore regretted that following the devastation caused by cyclone Nargis, inappropriate language employed by the leaders of certain countries wishing to help by sending assistance and by using their warships as logistical platforms had unfortunately caused the Myanmar authorities to mistrust the intentions of these countries. This had led to a stand-off of several weeks before the aid could be delivered. Finally, ASEAN established a bridge of trust between the international community and Myanmar, and implemented an ASEAN humanitarian taskforce and tripartite group involving the UN, ASEAN and the Myanmar Government, enabling delivery of international aid to all affected areas. Myanmar was continuing to benefit from this, the most extensive international aid the country had ever received, and might be better disposed towards the international community as a result.

165. The Government of Singapore commended the actions of the ILO Liaison Officer under the SU. It was now clear that there was greater awareness that the conscription of children was illegal; all minors about whom substantiated complaints had been made had been released from the army. The punishments for perpetrators were becoming more serious, taking the form of substantial fines and loss of seniority. The authorities in the cyclone-affected areas had been informed that no recourse should be had of forced labour in reconstruction efforts. More awareness-raising workshops should be held in other states and divisions. Support should be given to the working model against the use of forced labour as described in the report. The progress could not have been accomplished without the Government’s cooperation, and it should take steps to continue this beyond the expiry of the SU in February 2009. Reports of the harassment and arrest of complainants of forced labour remained disturbing, and the Government should address this issue, further reinforcing its cooperation with the ILO.

166. A Government representative of Australia, also speaking on behalf of New Zealand, said that the Liaison Officer’s report showed that there had been insufficient change in Myanmar since the last review by the Committee on the Application of Standards at the June 2008 Conference, and that the Government had failed to address the continued use of forced labour, including by the military, in a meaningful way. The demands made, including translation of the SU, were simple tasks, and the Government should urgently accomplish them. It was deeply disappointing that no high-level statement condemning forced labour had been forthcoming. Awareness of the complaints mechanism was very low, and the number of complaints was therefore not a credible basis for the Government’s claims of progress. The Government continued to breach the SU by arresting and harassing persons for making complaints and associating with the ILO. It should implement the recommendations of the 1998 Commission of Inquiry forthwith. The Government should engage in discussion with the Liaison Officer, in order to ensure that its economic policies did not become a driver of forced labour. With the extension of the SU ending shortly, intensified tripartite consultation should be undertaken before the March Governing Body, to allow full assessment of the situation. The speaker commended the work of the Liaison Officer and of the ILO in Myanmar.
167. A Government representative of the United States said that the ILO’s work in Burma/Myanmar had saved many lives, freed prisoners and released children from military conscription; it had also educated the authorities. The Liaison Officer and his staff were to be commended for their action. However, the report noted limited progress and significant forced labour and child conscription problems persisted. The military should develop a permanent mechanism to ensure that there was no child recruitment. The regime should expand its cooperation with the ILO and take steps to address the underlying causes of forced labour. The United States noted that the Government had not implemented the recommendations of the 1998 Commission of Inquiry. On renewal of the SU, specific, measurable benchmarks should be introduced, for example, ensuring the regime applied equitable punishments for civilian and military perpetrators of forced labour; improving the ILO’s ability to conduct awareness-raising projects on labour rights and the complaints mechanism, including translating the SU, Convention No. 29 and the ILO pamphlet on how to file a complaint. The Liaison Officer and his staff must be able to travel freely throughout the country.

168. The ILO should work with the regime to review policies most likely to result in forced labour. Farmers were still forced to grow what the regime told them to grow, and the army used civilians as porters. Local authorities used forced labour to build infrastructure; children still suffered conscription. Those brave enough to make complaints of exactions of forced labour risked repercussions, and the regime continued its efforts to silence all opposition, as attested by Aung San Suu Kyi’s 13 years of house arrest. Pro-democratic political activists received prison sentences of up to 65 years. The regime should release its more than 2,100 political prisoners, including those held for labour-related issues.

169. A Government representative of Thailand said that his Government supported the cooperation between the ILO and the Government of Myanmar, and welcomed the extension of the SU. The two field missions carried out without accompanying officials by the Liaison Officer were encouraging, and more actions of this sort should take place. Achievements depended on the willingness of the parties to cooperate constructively together. The present complaints mechanism should be strengthened further and Myanmar should continue to work with the ILO.

170. A Government representative of Japan welcomed the positive results set out in the report, and appreciated the strenuous efforts made by the Myanmar authorities and by the ILO to implement the SU effectively. He noted that no complaints of forced labour had been lodged in the areas affected by the cyclone. It was worrying that there had been an increase of complaints regarding forced conscription of minors, and the Government should redouble its efforts to eliminate forced labour, including under-age recruitment, through cooperation with the ILO and effective application of the SU.

171. A Government representative of Canada noted that progress was slow despite the best efforts of the Liaison Officer. Dissemination of key documents and a simple brochure had been hampered by the authorities prevaricating. Of greater concern were the very harsh sentences passed on labour activists, including U Thet Way and Su Su Nwe. Canada condemned these sentences and both persons, and all other political prisoners, should be released.

172. The SU was due for renewal in February 2009. Despite the small degree of progress, Canada believed the people of Burma/Myanmar benefited from the ILO’s action in the country, and supported the renewal. The authorities should fulfil their commitment to allow unhindered publication and distribution of ILO informational material, and cease targeting labour activists and complainants because of their association with the ILO.
173. A Government representative of China noted that the Constitution adopted by Myanmar in May 2008 explicitly stated that forced labour was illegal. The complaints mechanism had been established under the SU, and complaints were being dealt with seriously and rapidly. The SU had been translated into local languages and posted on the web site of the Ministry of Labour. Other documents were under negotiation. An ILO labour-intensive employment project had been launched with the cooperation of the Government in an area badly affected by the cyclone. This showed the Government’s political will to eradicate forced labour through cooperation with the international community. China appreciated the technical support provided by the ILO to the Myanmar Government in tackling this issue, and hoped the constructive dialogue would continue, leading to further progress.

174. A Government representative of India noted that the Myanmar Government had sought actively to fulfil its obligations in implementing the SU. The Government had facilitated field visits by the ILO Liaison Officer, who had been able to travel unhindered in Myanmar. Further public awareness-raising programmes, involving UNICEF and the UN Country Team were also under way, and the Government was cooperating in these. It was also satisfying that cases were being dealt with under the complaints mechanism and by the Government subsequently. India welcomed these recent developments and supported ILO action in the country.

175. A Government representative of Cuba said that any action undertaken should be based on technical cooperation, dialogue and good understanding between the ILO and the Union of Myanmar. Cuba noted that the SU had been translated and web-posted on the Government’s web site. Dialogue and cooperation with the Government would provide a solution to the problem.

176. A Government representative of the Russian Federation joined the other countries in commending the ILO in negotiating an extension to the SU. This showed that the approach adopted by the Organization was the correct one. The Russian Federation welcomed the adoption by Myanmar of the new Constitution, containing a clear prohibition of forced labour and upholding freedom of association. The complaints mechanism established under the SU was yielding positive results. It was encouraging that the Defence Ministry was now also involved in the consideration of complaints. The constructive dialogue and cooperation between the ILO and Myanmar must continue.

Governing Body conclusions:

177. The Governing Body stresses once again the urgency of giving full effect to the recommendations of the Commission of Inquiry and to the subsequent decisions of the International Labour Conference. These continue to be the focus for the ILO’s work for the eradication of forced labour in Myanmar.

178. Whilst recognizing a certain degree of cooperation to make the complaints mechanism under the SU function, the Governing Body continues to be concerned at the slow pace of progress and remains convinced that much more needs to be done as a matter of urgency.

179. The Governing Body underlines the urgent need to raise the awareness of both the military and civil authorities as well as the general public concerning Myanmar’s legislation on the prohibition of forced labour and the rights contained in the SU. Translations of the relevant texts must be distributed throughout the country without any further delay and a clearly worded explanatory brochure must be produced. Those guilty of exacting forced labour,
including under-age recruitment into the military, must be prosecuted and meaningfully punished, and victims must be entitled to reparation.

180. The Liaison Officer must be able to carry out his functions effectively throughout the country. People must have access to the ILO unhindered and without fear of reprisals.

181. The Governing Body expresses its condemnation of the severe prison sentences given to Su Su Nway and U Thet Way, which will further discourage the people of Myanmar from exercising their right to complain about the use of forced labour. It calls for an urgent review of their sentences and for their immediate release. The harassment and detention of persons exercising their rights under the SU must cease. The Governing Body also calls for the release of all those who have been imprisoned for their pursuit of their fundamental rights including the right to freedom of association as underlined by the conclusions of the Committee on Freedom of Association.

182. The Governing Body again expresses its concern that an authoritative statement has not been made at the highest level that forced labour, including under-age recruitment, is prohibited and those using it will be prosecuted and meaningfully punished. It urges the Government to issue such a statement without further delay.

183. The Governing Body notes with appreciation the progress made on the post-cyclone relief work that has been started in line with its discussion at its 302nd Session in June 2008, and encourages the Office to continue its efforts within the framework of its mandate. This should include working to ensure that the Government’s policy framework respects core labour standards and does not result in forced labour.

184. The Governing Body further notes that a framework in which the aims of the SU can be guaranteed efficiently in the future has to be negotiated before the next Governing Body session and requests the Office and the Government to take all the necessary steps towards that end, including a work programme. The Office should continue to engage the tripartite constituents on an ongoing basis in this process, in consultation with the Officers of the Governing Body.

Ninth item on the agenda

REPORTS OF THE COMMITTEE ON FREEDOM OF ASSOCIATION

351st Report
(GB.303/9/1)

185. The Chairperson of the Committee on Freedom of Association (CFA) introduced the Report, saying that the CFA had launched urgent appeals to the Governments of Brazil, El Salvador, Comoros and Chile, which had not supplied complete replies to its observations, despite the length of time since submission of the complaints concerned. These Governments should transmit their observations forthwith.

186. The CFA noted that the direct contacts mission that had been sent to Cambodia in relation to serious and urgent Case No. 2318 had concluded that the judiciary was subject to
political interference. The Government was strongly urged to reopen the investigations into the three murders cited in the case, and to make sure that those charged with two of the murders had the right to a full appeal before an impartial and independent judiciary. Trade unionists should be free to exercise their activities in a climate free of intimidation.

187. A direct contacts mission had also gone to Djibouti in relation to serious and urgent Case No. 2450. The Government should follow up promptly on its commitment to the mission to reinstate workers, pay compensation and arrears. The Committee endorsed the conclusions of the Credentials Committee at the 97th Session of the Conference (2008) that the Government was violating trade union rights and interfering in trade union affairs. The Government should safeguard freedom of association and facilitate sustainable and transparent social dialogue.

188. Serious and urgent Cases Nos 2445 and 2540 both concerned murder, threats and acts of violence against trade unionists in Guatemala. The Government should keep the CFA informed regarding the inquiries under way and take steps to remedy the situation of impunity caused by the absence of judgements against guilty parties. The rights of workers’ and employers’ organizations could only be exercised in a climate free from violence and pressure of any kind, in which fundamental human rights were respected. The Government should ensure the safety of the threatened members of the union executive committee and that of the wife and children of one of the murdered trade unionists, also under threat. Regarding the allegations of anti-union dismissals and harassment, the CFA noted the Government’s acceptance of ILO technical assistance and trusted that this would redress the prevailing situation.

189. Serious and urgent Case No. 2566 concerned the Islamic Republic of Iran. The trade union climate in the country continued to be very difficult, and the CFA requested, as it had in June 2008, that the Government accept a direct contacts mission. The Government should immediately drop the charges made against teachers that had participated in the spring 2007 protests, annul their sentences and compensate them for any damages suffered. The death sentence passed against Mr Farzad Kamangar should be quashed, his conviction annulled and he should be released. The CFA noted that many cases pending against the Islamic Republic of Iran arose because there was no legislative framework permitting trade union pluralism. The Government should adjust the legislation accordingly.

190. Serious and urgent Cases Nos 2268 and 2591, concerned Myanmar. The first contained long-standing allegations of the complete absence of a legislative framework for freedom of association and systematic repression of labour organization by the public authorities. The CFA again called on the Government to legislate to ensure freedom of association to all workers, including seafarers, and to employers. Civil and public agents should be instructed to refrain from any act preventing labour organization engaged to promote their economic and social interests by workers, including seafarers. The Committee deplored the Government’s failure to release Myo Aung Thant. In Case No. 2591, the CFA expressed deep concern at the extreme gravity of the issues raised, and the violation in law and practice of freedom of association principles. The Government should immediately release Thurein Aung, Wai Lin, Nyi Nyi Zaw, Kyaw Kyaw, Kyaw Win and Myo Min.

191. Serious and urgent Case No. 2528, on the Philippines, concerned summary killings, abductions and enforced disappearances of trade unionists. The Government should keep the Committee informed of steps taken to amend the Witness Protection, Security and Benefit Act and generally to strengthen the Witness Protection Program. The Committee hoped that the recommendations of the Melo Commission, the National Consultative Summit on Extrajudicial Killings and Enforced Disappearances and of the UN Special Rapporteur on extrajudicial, summary or arbitrary executions, would be taken into account. The Government should ensure that the police and military forces and other officials
forbade those under their responsibility from committing extrajudicial killings and receive
instructions and training to promote respect of law.

192. In serious and urgent Case No. 2581, on Chad, the storming by the security forces of the
Labour Exchange, occupation of union premises, confiscation of the passport of the
Secretary-General of the Union of Trade Unions of Chad and the adoption of anti-strike
legislation were alleged. There was no Government response to these allegations. The
Government should remedy the situation immediately, and initiate an investigation into the
occupation of the union premises forthwith.

193. With regard to the 352nd report of the CFA, on Belarus, the Committee noted some
positive steps taken by the Government, but regretted that there remained a long way to go
before full respect for freedom of association was obtained in Belarus. The Government
should continue to cooperate with the ILO and engage in dialogue with all partners,
including trade unions outside the Federation of Trade Unions of Belarus (FPB), to
implement the outstanding recommendations of the Commission of Inquiry, and in
particular ensure the immediate registration of the primary level organizations that were
the subject of the complaint and review the non-registration of the Belarusian Free Trade
Union (BFTU) organizations in Mogilev and Baranovichi. The Government should amend
its legislation such that the legal address requirement no longer hindered the practice of
freedom of association. An independent inquiry should be mounted into all new allegations
of interference.

194. The Employer spokesperson of the CFA pointed out that the cases broke down to 25 from
Latin America, one from North America, seven from Africa, three from Europe, five from
Asia, and the case concerning Belarus. Some principles important to the Employers had
been debated, including the definition of essential services, the naming of companies and
the fact that trade unions could only be protected when their action fell within the law. One
area of disappointment was the unacceptable failure of many governments to respond to
allegations made against them. This was true of Cases Nos 2582 (Bolivia) and 2607
(Congo); it complicated the Committee’s work and disadvantaged companies, unable to
defend themselves against allegations.

195. Cases Nos 2355 (Colombia) and 2581 (Chad) concerned the definition of essential
services. The Employers continued to uphold that the definition was not absolute and could
vary in specific instances. In Case No. 2356 (Colombia), while accepting that the
Government needed to review its law on work stoppages, the Employers could in no way
condone action that was beyond what might be considered as peaceful and lawful. Further
discussion on this Case would take place at the CFA’s next session.

196. Case No. 2595 (Colombia) focused on the naming of companies and, after long debate,
was postponed pending further information. In Case No. 2569 (Republic of Korea), there
was an acknowledgement that general principles of government education required a
broader public policy approach than could be provided by collective bargaining.

197. Several cases concerned Guatemala, including serious and urgent Case No. 2540. The
Committee nevertheless noted that some progress had been made. The Employers were
very concerned at Case No. 2566 (Islamic Republic of Iran), in which the Government
continued to prevent organizations from regulating freely their internal affairs and was also
refusing a stay of execution on a trade union leader. The special attention of the Governing
Body was drawn to this case. In this connection, the group wished to recall Case No. 2567
(Islamic Republic of Iran), which also concerned serious interference in the affairs of an
employers’ organization and which had been examined at the last session of the CFA.
198. In Case No. 2616 (Mauritius) the Committee discussed the principle that governments needed to ensure the proper rules and laws were in place in conformity with the Conventions, but must also uphold the independence of the judiciary. In Case No. 2668 (Myanmar), the Government’s reply simply displayed its disdain for freedom of association. Case No. 2528 (Philippines) concerned murders and abductions which the Government suggested had occurred in the context of an internal military conflict between armed forces and the militia. The case showed the Committee’s difficulty in concluding whether people were conducting lawful or unlawful activities. Conventions Nos 87 and 98 protected only those engaged in legitimate activities.

199. Regarding the 325th Report of the Committee, on Belarus, the Employer spokesperson stressed that the Government should act on its good intentions, which far exceeded the progress made so far.

200. The Worker spokesperson of the CFA noted that the Committee had urged the Government of Myanmar, in relation to Case No. 2268, to enact legislation guaranteeing freedom of association to both workers, including seafarers, and to employers. In Case No. 2591, also on Myanmar, the Government accused the ILO of interfering in the internal affairs of the country in demanding respect for freedom of association. The Workers’ group called for the release of the six persons mentioned above by the Chairperson of the CFA, and for the recognition of the Free Trade Union of Burma (FTUB).

201. In Case No. 2528 (Philippines), the CFA referred to reports by the Melo Commission and the UN Special Rapporteur, stressing that the army needed to be aware of workers’ trade union rights. Those responsible for killing seven trade union leaders and injuring 70 others, with military involvement, should be identified and punished.

202. Cases Nos 2445 and 2540, on Guatemala, were of growing concern to the Workers. Pedro Zamora, a murdered unionist, had been involved in a campaign against the privatization of a port. His family had been threatened and his child injured. The Government should provide protection for the threatened members of the executive committee of the trade union.

203. Regarding serious and urgent Case No. 2450 (Djibouti), the Workers thanked the direct contacts mission and endorsed its conclusions. The Government should honour its commitments to the mission, amend the legislation and cease interfering in union affairs, and respect ILO principles when nominating Workers’ representatives to the International Labour Conference.

204. Case No. 2566 (Islamic Republic of Iran) was also serious and urgent. There were frequent violations of trade union freedoms, and the legislation should be changed to ensure the independence of both workers’ and employers’ organizations. The Government should accept the Committee’s offer of a direct contacts mission. In serious and urgent Case No. 2318 (Cambodia), the absence of any independent judiciary meant trade union rights could not be secured; those accused of murdering Chea Vichea, Ros Sovannareth and Hy Vuthy might be innocent scapegoats of the Government. Regarding serious and urgent Case No. 2581 (Chad), no reply had come from the Government regarding its unacceptable reaction to strike action, as described by the CFA Chairperson above. The confiscation of the passport of Mr Djibrine Assali, Secretary-General of the Union of Trade Unions of Chad, had moreover prevented him from attending the June Conference, despite the efforts of the Credentials Committee.

205. In Case No. 2355 (Colombia), the Committee reiterated its request that strikes should be allowed in the petroleum sector, with possible negotiation of minimum services. The CFA was concerned at the fate of 104 workers dismissed for participating in a 2004 strike
declared illegal on the basis of legislation contrary to ILO principles. In Case No. 2600, also on Colombia, the CFA requested that trade union rights be accorded to temporary workers.

206. The Workers’ group noted with regret the failure of the Government of Bahrain to follow the Committee’s recommendations regarding Case No. 2433. It should cooperate in good faith in future. The group also expected, in relation to Case No. 2050 on Ukraine, that employers’ organizations would be able to establish their constitutions and register without obstruction. In Cases Nos 2611 and 2632, on Romania, the Committee requested the Government to amend its legislation to allow public employees, including teachers, the right to bargain collectively on basic salaries, pay increases and conditions of work. The CFA regretted that the Government of Greece, in Case No. 2502, had not amended the legislation to enable supplementary pension schemes to be a subject of collective bargaining. In Case No. 2477, the Committee was obliged to repeat its request to the Government of Malta to amend the legislation passed contrary to collective agreements already in place. In respect of Case No. 2569 (Republic of Korea), the Government should change the legislation to allow teachers to take part in demonstrations, public meetings and strikes, and refrain from issuing penal sanctions to trade unionists for peaceful collective action.

207. Case No. 2571 (El Salvador) contained very disturbing allegations of the use of force to apply pressure on workers to prevent them joining the complainant union, and promotion by the company of a new collective agreement signed with a trade union of chosen membership. The Government should investigate this matter forthwith. In respect of Case No. 2511 (Costa Rica), the Workers’ group regretted that the Committee was again obliged to explain to the Government that its procedure in dealing with complaints did not require the exhaustion of national procedures, which could be very lengthy. The group was encouraged by progress made in Cases Nos 2491 and 2570 (Benin), and Case No. 1210 (Colombia).

208. With regard to the 352nd report on Belarus, the group welcomed the measures taken, but noted that the situation was still critical. The CFA had made ten specific requests in view of the lack of progress in implementing the major recommendations of the Commission of Inquiry, in particular, the establishment and registration of trade unions remained difficult. Effective instructions from the Government for managers in enterprises to refrain from anti-union discrimination were still not forthcoming, as were investigations into cases of such. The Government should immediately redress the situation of workers penalized for cooperating with the Commission of Inquiry; amend the law on mass activities and allow trade unions to hold meetings and pickets; and amend Decree No. 24 so that employers’ and workers’ organizations can receive assistance from international organizations for their activities, including strikes.

209. The Governing Body took note of the introduction to the report of the Committee, contained in paragraphs 1–180, and adopted the recommendations made in paragraphs 203 (Case No. 2593: Argentina); 231 (Case No. 2603: Argentina); 241 (Case No. 2582: Bolivia); 254 (Case No. 2318: Cambodia); 294 (Case No. 2622: Cape Verde); 380 (Case No. 2355: Colombia); 425 (Case No. 2356: Colombia); 472 (Case No. 2573: Colombia); 503 (Case No. 2574: Colombia); 547 (Case No. 2599: Colombia); 574 (Case No. 2600: Colombia); 591 (Case No. 2607: Democratic Republic of the Congo); 646 (Case No. 2569: Republic of Korea); 671 (Case No. 2490: Costa Rica); 774 (Case No. 2604: Costa Rica); 798 (Case No. 2450: Djibouti); 835 (Case No. 2571: El Salvador); 848 (Case No. 2538: Ecuador); 860 (Case No. 2203: Guatemala); 872 (Case No. 2295: Guatemala); 884 (Case No. 2445: Guatemala); 897 (Case No. 2540: Guatemala);
909 (Case No. 2568: Guatemala); 989 (Case No. 2566: Islamic Republic of Iran); 1015 (Case No. 2616: Mauritius); 1050 (Case No. 2268: Myanmar); 1098 (Case No. 2613: Nicaragua); 1134 (Case No. 2576: Panama); 1161 (Case No. 2628: Netherlands); 1179 (Case No. 2594: Peru); 1240 (Case No. 2528: Philippines); 1283 (Cases Nos 2611 and 2632: Romania); 1312 (Case No. 2618: Rwanda); 1338 (Case No. 2581: Chad); 1358 (Case No. 2598: Togo); 1373 (Case No. 2605: Ukraine).


211. A Government representative of Belarus said that the Government of the Republic of Belarus had, together with the social partners, been working systematically to implement the recommendations of the Commission of Inquiry. The outcome of that work had been examined in detail by the Committee on the Application of Standards of the International Labour Conference at its 97th Session (2008), and for the first time since 2001 the conclusions on Belarus did not contain a special paragraph. The Government, the unions and the employers’ organizations were in agreement that legislation needed to be improved, in accordance with the Freedom of Association and Protection of the Right to Organise Convention, 1948 (No. 87), and the Right to Organise and Collective Bargaining Convention, 1949 (No. 98). A consensus was forming that the problems could be solved in a way that took into account the interests of all the parties concerned. For example, the Government had settled the issue of rent payments for the public premises used by unions. All unions would henceforth benefit from the same favourable conditions, whether they were affiliated to the Federation of Trade Unions of Belarus (FPB) or to the Congress of Democratic Trade Unions of Belarus (CDTU). The trade union movement in the country had stabilized and the social partners had set about preparing a new general agreement for 2009–10. The Government of Belarus wished to express its appreciation to the ILO for the assistance it had provided with regard to improving national legislation and finding ways to facilitate constructive collaboration in the social partnership system. Further to a seminar on anti-union discrimination, held in June 2008 and attended by a broad range of participants, a tripartite seminar was expected to be held on 21 January 2009 to identify the measures that would be taken by the Government, the social partners and the ILO to implement the recommendations of the Commission of Inquiry.

212. The spokesperson for the Workers’ group said that he welcomed the measures that had been taken concerning the rent payments for trade union premises and expected that independent trade unions would be invited to send representatives to the seminar to be held in January 2009.

213. The spokesperson for the Employers’ group said he was pleased to hear that issues were being addressed on a tripartite basis, that a timetable had been set and that the Government had accepted the ILO recommendations and was working with the Office. Although the comments that had been made were encouraging, what mattered was the implementation of the recommendations.

214. A Government representative of France spoke on behalf of the European Union; the candidate countries Turkey, Croatia and The former Yugoslav Republic of Macedonia; the stabilization process and potential candidate countries Albania, Bosnia and Herzegovina, and Montenegro; Iceland and Norway, European Free Trade Association countries and members of the European Economic Area; the Republic of Moldova; Switzerland; and Ukraine. The European Union welcomed the fact that a seminar had been held on anti-
union discrimination and that a tripartite seminar was to be held in 2009 on the implementation of the recommendations of the Commission of Inquiry. The European Union took note of the statement by the authorities of Belarus that the new draft law on trade unions would be compatible with Conventions Nos 87 and 98. However, it also noted that, contrary to what had been said, violations of trade union rights continued to occur; the discussion of the draft law on trade unions in the National Council on Labour and Social Issues had not been fruitful; and the latest version of the draft law had not been brought before Parliament. Under the circumstances, the European Union is bound to express its deep concern with regard to the continued failure to implement international labour standards and the absence of action by the Belarusian authorities to address the challenges to freedom of association.

215. The European Union once again called on the Government of Belarus to review its legislation without delay, in collaboration with the social partners (including independent unions) and the ILO, in order to safeguard the rights to freedom of association and collective bargaining provided for in Conventions Nos 87 and 98. The European Union trusted that the Belarusian authorities would conduct an investigation into alleged interference in the activities of independent unions, and emphasized the importance which it attached to the work of the ILO supervisory mechanisms. The European Union would continue to monitor very closely all matters relating to the implementation of the ILO recommendations in Belarus and looked forward to receiving information from the Committee of Experts on the Application of Conventions and Recommendations and the Conference Committee on the Application of Standards on the progress made in that regard.

216. A Government representative of the United States said that, although the Committee on Freedom of Association had noted some positive steps by the Government of Belarus, his delegation was concerned that allegations of anti-union discrimination and interference in union matters continued to be presented to the Committee. At the current stage, the Governing Body was not required to adopt a decision. However, the discussion showed that the situation with regard to freedom of association in Belarus was very serious and would remain so unless the Government of Belarus cooperated with its social partners to implement the recommendations of the Commission of Inquiry. He hoped that the Governing Body in March 2009 would be in a position to take note of specific and meaningful developments in both law and practice.

217. A Government representative of the Russian Federation pointed out that the Conference Committee on the Application of Standards had taken note of the progress made by the Government of Belarus in implementing the recommendations of the Commission of Inquiry. The Government of Belarus was in the process of preparing new trade union legislation, taking into account the ILO recommendations and the views of the social partners. The concept of the new legislation and the preliminary draft text had been considered more than once by the National Council on Labour and Social Issues with the participation of representatives of the independent unions. Rather than submitting the draft law to Parliament at that stage, a decision had been taken to continue to improve the text on the basis of Conventions Nos 87 and 98, in accordance with the principles set out in the Tripartite Consultation (International Labour Standards) Convention, 1976 (No. 144). The regular attendance of Belarusian delegations at ILO meetings, the manifest willingness of the national authorities to hold high-level consultations with the ILO, and the organization of seminars, all indicated that Belarus was serious in its intentions to pursue a policy of close partnership with the ILO. Given that situation, it was no longer necessary to include the matter on the agenda of Governing Body meetings.

218. The Employer Vice-Chairperson said he firmly believed that the item should continue to appear on the agenda of Governing Body meetings. Belarus had shown its willingness to
cooperate with the ILO, but it was important that efforts should be continued and tangible results achieved. The draft law should be brought before Parliament for approval and implementation, in order to ensure respect for the rights contained in Conventions Nos 87 and 98. The Employers’ group hoped for tangible results that would eventually make it possible to set aside the agenda item.

219. The Worker Vice-Chairperson said that he endorsed the statements made by the Employer Vice-Chairperson and the Government representatives of France and the United States, but did not agree with the representative of the Russian Federation. It was not enough to make promises. The situation in Belarus was moving in the right direction, but the Workers’ group hoped that the tripartite seminar to be held in January 2009 would produce tangible results and in particular wanted there to be sufficient freedom of association to ensure that any group that chose to form a union would be treated with the dignity and respect that was provided for by Conventions Nos 87 and 98.

Governing Body decision:

220. The Governing Body adopted the recommendations of the Committee on Freedom of Association contained in paragraph 75 of the report and adopted the 352nd Report of the Committee in its entirety.

Tenth item on the agenda

REPORT OF THE STEERING GROUP ON THE FOLLOW-UP TO THE DECLARATION (2008)

Oral report by the Chairperson of the Steering Group, Mr Z. Rapacki (Poland) (GB.303/10)

221. The Employer Vice-Chairperson emphasized that the ILO Declaration on Social Justice for a Fair Globalization and its accompanying resolution were fundamental instruments which would allow the ILO to improve its capacity and update its internal methods of work, especially in view of the financial crisis. It was therefore necessary to preserve fully the letter and spirit of those texts, the substantive content of which was beyond question. The Employers’ group approved the order of recurrent discussion items, namely employment and social security, and supported the proposal of the Workers’ group for a seven-year cycle. He welcomed the scheduling of informal consultations with a view to facilitating the finalization of the implementation plan to be presented in March 2009.

222. The Worker Vice-Chairperson expressed satisfaction at the standard of the debate in the Steering Group, and said that he supported the conclusions drawn and trusted that the momentum would be sustained so that, through the effective implementation of the 2008 Declaration, the ILO would continue along its course in the interests of workers around the world.

223. A Government representative of Uruguay, speaking on behalf of the governments of the Group of Latin American and Caribbean States (GRULAC), expressed his firm interest in the Steering Group being transparent and involving the participation of all. In that regard, he pointed out that the report presented by the Office did not include the requests made by the countries of the region in a document which had been submitted in good time. GRULAC understood that, in accordance with the agreement, the Steering Group would be composed of 16 Government members, four from each regional group, and eight Employer members and eight Worker members; that all members would have the right to participate and take the floor with the Chairperson’s permission; that all Governing Body members
would have the right to express their views; and that observers would also be able to participate.

224. *A Government representative of the United Kingdom* spoke on behalf of the group of Industrialized Market Economy Countries (IMEC). Referring to the implementation of the 2008 Declaration, he emphasized the importance of coherence within the Office in this regard; of ensuring that those responsible for the implementation of the Declaration had sufficient capacity and a clear mandate to act; and, as the Employers and Workers had also indicated, of scrupulously following the exact text of the Declaration and the resolution, since they were the result of very careful negotiations. Like the social partners, the IMEC group asked what was really new in the implementation plan, and stressed the need for joint implementation of the Declaration and the resolution. It welcomed a further meeting of the Steering Group and informal consultations in early 2009, in which the implementation plan should be analysed to address seriously all aspects relating to ILO capacity and governance. The speaker asked for the detailed agenda of the consultations to be published in advance, so as to facilitate useful debate both within the groups and in the consultations themselves.

225. *A Government representative of France*, speaking on behalf of the European Union, expressed support for the statement made on behalf of the IMEC group. The European Union welcomed the suggestion that the Office would prepare a paper setting out various options for review of the follow-up to the 1998 Declaration in the light of the 2008 Declaration. That paper should be examined in the Committee on the Application of Standards. With regard to the recurrent discussions, the European Union was in favour of a six-year cycle and trusted that the matter would be examined in greater depth in the document which would arise from the informal consultations. With regard to the recurrent discussions, the European Union had selected issues relating to employment and social security for the 2010 and 2011 sessions of the International Labour Conference, respectively.

226. The European Union approved the decisions adopted by the Committee on the Application of Standards concerning the option selected for the General Survey on employment and the questionnaire. It considered, however, that even if the Governing Body adopted those practical and immediate decisions at the current meeting, they would not reflect the essential components of the 2008 Declaration or its accompanying resolution. The aim of the recurrent discussions was to assist the Organization in meeting the needs of member States by making the necessary adjustments in its priorities and action programmes. Efficiency was fundamental in times of meagre resources. The Declaration established the principles that should govern ILO action, particularly in the difficult current climate. Above all, it conveyed the message that the ILO’s strategic objectives must play a decisive role in the governance of globalization. The goal was to promote social justice, and it should not be forgotten that the process was a step towards achieving that goal, not an end in itself. The European Union considered that the Organization, its constituents and the Office, could and should demonstrate that the Organization was in a position to provide social solutions to the current imbalance in global governance.

227. *A Government representative of the United States* expressed support for the statement made on behalf of the IMEC group, and said that the main objective of the Declaration follow-up was to strengthen the ILO’s capacity to assist its Members and that, to that end, it was necessary to develop and implement clear and concrete measures. Her Government was concerned about the potential adverse effects of changes to the questionnaires under article 19 of the ILO Constitution; the workload created by the submission of reports for governments, the Office and the Committee of Experts on the Application of Conventions and Recommendations; and the quality and usefulness of the general surveys both for their traditional purpose and as a source of information for recurrent discussions. The
Government of the United States attached particular importance to the decision adopted by the Committee on Legal Issues and International Labour Standards to urge the Office to begin work immediately on the proposed questionnaire so that the Governing Body members would have sufficient time to consider the proposals and adopt an approach that took into account the interests and concerns expressed. The recurrent discussions should focus on the work carried out by the ILO to meet the needs of constituents more effectively and to evaluate the results of ILO activities. The Office had given assurances that the recurrent discussions would not only entail no additional costs, but would also allow savings in the long run. However, given that the preparation of the reports for the recurrent discussion on employment had been entrusted to the relevant departments at headquarters and to the entire field structure, the speaker asked what the cost would be in terms of staff resources and what work would be set aside to enable the specialists to dedicate themselves fully to preparing such reports.

228. The Steering Group was an advisory body, not a decision-making one. The Governing Body and its committees were responsible for adopting the final decisions on the implementation of the Declaration and its accompanying resolution. It was essential that, at its 304th Session (March 2009), the Governing Body should have before it, for decision, concrete and specific points on the issues which were currently under discussion.

229. **The Governing Body took note of the report and of the comments made during its discussion.**

Eleventh item on the agenda

**REPORTS OF THE PROGRAMME, FINANCIAL AND ADMINISTRATIVE COMMITTEE**

*First report: Financial questions*  
(GB.303/11/1(Rev.))

*Programme and Budget for 2008–09:*  
Regular budget account and Working Capital Fund

*Strategic Policy Framework 2010–15 and preview of the Programme and Budget proposals for 2010–11*

230. **The Governing Body took note of these parts of the report.** (GB.303/11/1(Rev.), paragraphs 4–57.)

*Evaluation*

*(a) Annual evaluation report 2007–08*

Governing Body decision:

231. **The Governing Body:**

*(i) requested the Director-General to continue to strengthen the evaluation function in accordance with the findings of the annual report, taking into account the deliberations of the Committee;*

*(ii) noted the Committee’s agreement regarding the implementation priorities for 2009;*
(iii) requested that this implementation contain provisions for analysis of Decent Work Country Programmes in light of the Declaration on Social Justice for a Fair Globalization.

(GB.303/11/1(Rev.), paragraph 73.)

(b) Independent evaluation of the ILO’s strategy to support member States to improve the impact of international labour standards

Governing Body decision:

232. The Governing Body requested the Director-General to take into consideration the findings and recommendations set out in document GB.303/PFA/3/2, together with the deliberations of the Committee, for continuing support to international labour standards. (GB.303/11/1(Rev.), paragraph 94.)

(c) Independent evaluation of the ILO’s country programme for Zambia: 2001–07

Governing Body decision:

233. The Governing Body requested the Director-General to take into consideration the findings and recommendations set out in document GB.303/PFA/3/3, together with the deliberations of the Committee, for continuing support to Zambia through the ILO’s Decent Work Country Programme. (GB.303/11/1(Rev.), paragraph 107.)

(d) Independent evaluation of the ILO country programme for the Hashemite Kingdom of Jordan: 2002–07

Governing Body decision:

234. The Governing Body requested the Director-General to take into consideration the findings and recommendations set out in document GB.303/PFA/3/4, as well as any observations by the Committee, for continuing support to Jordan through the Decent Work Country Programme. (GB.303/11/1(Rev.), paragraph 114.)

(e) Independent evaluation of the ILO’s strategy to improve the protection of migrant workers

Governing Body decision:

235. The Governing Body requested the Director-General to take into consideration the findings and recommendations set out in document GB.303/PFA/3/5, together with the deliberations of the Committee, to continue supporting efforts to streamline activities aimed at protecting migrant workers’ rights and access to decent work. (GB.303/11/1(Rev.), paragraph 134.)

Report of the Building Subcommittee

Report of the Information and Communications Technology Subcommittee

236. The Governing Body took note of these parts of the report. (GB.303/11/1(Rev.), paragraphs 135–160.)
Financial questions relating to the International Institute for Labour Studies:  
Acceptance of contributions and gifts

237. The Governing Body took note of this part of the report. (GB.303/11/1(Rev.), paragraphs 161 and 162.)

International Training Centre of the ILO, Turin

(a) Documents submitted to the 70th Session of the Board of the Centre  
(Turin, 6 and 7 November 2008)

(b) Report of the 70th Session of the Board of the Centre

(c) Follow-up to the Working Party on Funding of the Turin Centre  
and collaboration between Geneva and Turin on technical cooperation programmes

238. The Governing Body took note of these parts of the report. (GB.303/11/1(Rev.), paragraphs 163–184.)

(d) Membership of the Board of the International Training Centre

Governing Body decision:

239. The Governing Body appointed a representative of the Government of Spain as a member of the Board of the Turin Centre for the period 2008–11. (GB.303/11(Rev.), paragraph 185.)

Matters relating to the Joint Inspection Unit (JIU):  
Reports of the JIU

240. The Governing Body took note of this part of the report. (GB.303/11/1(Rev.), paragraphs 186–192.)

Other financial questions

(a) Urgent repairs

Governing Body decision:

241. The Governing Body:

(a) decided to earmark an amount of CHF500,000 in the Building and Accommodation Fund to be used for urgent repairs and maintenance of ILO-owned buildings;

(b) authorized the Director-General to use these funds on an as-needed basis and to report to the Building Subcommittee on any such use.

(GB.303/11/1(Rev.), paragraph 196.)
(b) Independent Oversight Advisory Committee

c) Disclosure of internal audit reports

242. The Governing Body took note of these parts of the report. (GB.303/11/1(Rev.), paragraphs 197–206.)

(d) Financial arrangements for a commission of inquiry concerning the non-observance by Zimbabwe of the Freedom of Association and Protection of the Right to Organise Convention, 1948 (No. 87), and the Right to Organise and Collective Bargaining Convention, 1949 (No. 98)

Governing Body decision:

243. The Governing Body decided that the financial arrangements for the commission of inquiry concerning Zimbabwe should be the following:

(a) an honorarium at the rate of US$300 per day be paid to each member of the commission of inquiry;

(b) the cost of the commission in 2008–09, estimated at US$660,000, would be financed in the first instance from savings in Part I of the budget or, failing that, through Part II, on the understanding that, should this subsequently prove impossible, the Director-General would propose alternative methods of financing at a later stage in the biennium.

(GB.303/11/1(Rev.), paragraph 211.)

Second report: Personnel questions

(GB.303/11/2)

Statement by the Staff Union representative

Human Resources Strategy: Annual report

244. The Governing Body took note of these parts of the report. (GB.303/11/2, paragraphs 1–29.)

Amendments to the Staff Regulations

Governing Body decision:

245. The Governing Body approved the amendments to the Staff Regulations concerning performance management, as set out in the appendix to document GB.303/PFA/11, and concerning adoption leave, as set out in paragraph 6 of the paper. (GB.303/11/2, paragraph 35.)
Governing Body decision:

246. The Governing Body:

(a) accepted the recommendations of the ICSC, subject to their approval by the United Nations General Assembly, on the following entitlements:

(i) an increase of 2.33 per cent in the base/floor salary;

(ii) consequential increases in separation payments for staff in the Professional and higher categories;

(iii) revised levels of the children’s and secondary dependants’ allowances, with the accompanying transitional measures as required;

(iv) an increase of 5 per cent in the mobility, hardship and non-removal allowances;

(b) authorized the Director-General to give effect in the ILO, through amendments to the Staff Regulations (as necessary), to the measures referred to in subparagraph (a), subject to their approval by the General Assembly.

(GB.303/11/2, paragraph 40.)

Matters relating to the Administrative Tribunal of the ILO

(a) Statute of the Tribunal

247. The Governing Body took note of this part of the report. (GB.303/11/2, paragraphs 41–44.)

(b) Recognition of the Tribunal’s jurisdiction by the Global Fund to Fight AIDS, Tuberculosis and Malaria

Governing Body decision:

248. The Governing Body approved the recognition of the Tribunal’s jurisdiction by the Global Fund to Fight AIDS, Tuberculosis and Malaria, with immediate effect. (GB.303/11/2, paragraph 48.)

(c) Recognition of the Tribunal’s jurisdiction by the ITER International Fusion Energy Organization (ITER Organization)

Governing Body decision:

249. The Governing Body approved the recognition of the Tribunal’s jurisdiction by the ITER International Fusion Energy Organization (ITER Organization), with immediate effect. (GB.303/11/2, paragraph 53.)
Twelfth item on the agenda

REPORT OF THE COMMITTEE ON LEGAL ISSUES AND INTERNATIONAL LABOUR STANDARDS
(GB.303/12)

First part: Legal issues

Legal and practical measures relating to the representation of Employers’ and Workers’ delegates at the International Labour Conference

Governning Body decision:

250. The Governing Body:

(a) supported the Recommendation and measures indicated in paragraph 9 of the reference document GB.303/LILS/1(Rev.) to restrict the practice of allowing permanent missions to collect Conference badges for the whole delegation and to request them not to collect badges for the Employers’ and Workers’ delegations unless they have been specifically authorized in writing by the employers and workers concerned;

(b) encouraged the Office to continue the practice indicated in paragraph 12 of the reference document GB.303/LILS/1(Rev.) to make publicly available, at the end of the second week of the Conference, an electronic version of the list of all delegates and their substitutes who are attending the Conference and entitled to vote;

(c) requested the Office to prepare, in light of the guidance provided during the debate of the Committee, a document for the next session of the Governing Body reflecting specific proposals as formulated in paragraphs 16, 17 and 18 of the reference document GB.303/LILS/1(Rev.) to address situations in which Employers’ or Workers’ delegates are prevented by member State authorities from attending the Conference.

(GB.303/12, paragraph 15.)

Revision of the Rules for Regional Meetings: Introductory Note

Governning Body decision:

251. The Governing Body approved the revised Introductory Note, as contained in the appendix to document GB.303/12, and decided to publish it together with the Rules for Regional Meetings (2008). (GB.303/12, paragraph 17.)

Second part: International labour standards and human rights

Choice of Conventions and Recommendations on which reports should be requested under article 19 of the Constitution

Governning Body decision:

252. The Governing Body, having decided to place on the agenda of the 2010 Conference a recurrent item on the strategic objective of employment:
(i) decided to postpone the request of the article 19 reports on the application of the Labour Relations (Public Service) Convention, 1978 (No. 151), the Labour Relations (Public Service) Recommendation, 1978 (No. 159), the Collective Bargaining Convention, 1981 (No. 154), and the Collective Bargaining Recommendation, 1981 (No. 163), including the sending of the questionnaire, and consider it later in the context of a relevant recurrent item (for example on social dialogue);

(ii) decided to request governments to submit reports under article 19 of the Constitution concerning employment instruments for 2009;

(iii) approved the report form concerning employment instruments, as revised by the Committee (referred to in Appendix I), concerning the Employment Service Convention, 1948 (No. 88), the Employment Policy Convention, 1964 (No. 122), the Human Resources Development Convention, 1975 (No. 142), the Private Employment Agencies Convention, 1997 (No. 181), the Job Creation in Small and Medium-Sized Enterprises Recommendation, 1998 (No. 189), and the Promotion of Cooperatives Recommendation, 2002 (No. 193);

(iv) invited the Office to prepare a new proposal early in advance for the March 2009 Governing Body concerning the new questionnaire on instruments related to the next recurrent discussion in 2011 on social protection, subject to Governing Body approval, in light of the discussion in the Committee, and to make arrangements for tripartite consultations on this questionnaire.

(GB.303/12, paragraph 70.)

Improvements in the standards-related activities of the ILO

(a) Possible implications of the Declaration on Social Justice for a Fair Globalization on the standards strategy and update on the implementation of the interim plan of action

Governing Body decision:

253. The Governing Body invited the Office to:

(i) launch a promotional campaign for the ratification and effective implementation of standards that are the most significant from the viewpoint of governance (the four priority Conventions: Conventions Nos 81, 122, 129 and 144), and submit a report annually to the LILS Committee on the progress achieved, together with the report on the fundamental Conventions;

(ii) prepare an evaluation of the grouping of Conventions by subject for reporting purposes that was introduced in 2003, and proposals for new options for a global approach to streamlining reports, taking into account the decisions taken at its current session and the March 2009 session relating to the follow-up to the 2008 Declaration, to be submitted at the 306th Session of the Governing Body (November 2009), and present a progress report on this matter at its 304th Session (March 2009);
(iii) report on the consultations concerning Convention No. 158 and Recommendation No. 166 at its next session and provide for the continuation of consultations on this matter, if necessary;

(iv) make arrangements with a view to holding consultations on standards policy not later than March 2009;

(v) submit a progress report on the review of the article 22 report forms at its 306th Session (November 2009);

(vi) invite the Office to continue to implement the interim plan of action approved at its 300th Session (November 2007), in the light of the LILS Committee’s discussions and the consultations on the matter, and to report on the next steps taken for its implementation, as regards the four components of the standards strategy, at the 304th Session of the Governing Body (March 2009).

(GB.303/12, paragraph 99.)

(b) Improving the coherence, integration and effectiveness of the supervisory system through a better understanding of its dynamics (further study from a substantive and practical standpoint)

Governing Body decision:

254. **The Governing Body invited the Office to prepare a study on the interpretation of international labour Conventions in 2009.** (GB.303/12, paragraph 111.)

Ratification and promotion of fundamental ILO Conventions

255. **The Governing Body took note of this part of the report.** (GB.303/12, paragraphs 112–118.)


Governing Body decision:

256. **The Governing Body:**


   (b) authorized the Director-General to communicate the report to the Governments of Australia, Ethiopia and Japan and to the National Tertiary Education Union of Australia, the Ethiopian Teachers’ Association, Education International and teachers’ organizations in Japan that participated in meetings with the CEART fact-finding mission in April 2008,
and to invite them to take the necessary follow-up action as recommended in the report.

(GB.303/12, paragraph 123.)

Thirteenth item on the agenda

REPORT OF THE SUBCOMMITTEE ON MULTINATIONAL ENTERPRISES
(GB.303/13(REV.))

257. The Governing Body took note of the report.

Fourteenth item on the agenda

REPORT OF THE COMMITTEE ON EMPLOYMENT AND SOCIAL POLICY
(GB.303/14(REV.))

258. The Governing Body took note of the report.

Fifteenth item on the agenda

REPORT OF THE COMMITTEE ON SECTORAL AND TECHNICAL MEETINGS AND RELATED ISSUES
(GB.303/15)

Dates, duration and composition of activities to be undertaken in 2009

Governing Body decision:

259. The Governing Body:

(a) endorsed the Committee’s recommendation, in relation to the Meeting of Experts to Adopt a Code of Practice on Safety and Health in Agriculture:

– to appoint, after consultation with the Employers’ and Workers’ groups of the Governing Body, a knowledgeable chairperson from outside the Meeting;

– to invite the Governments of Costa Rica, Kenya, South Africa, Sweden, Thailand, United Kingdom, Uruguay and Viet Nam to appoint an expert;

– to include Argentina, Australia, Fiji, Finland, Guatemala, Kyrgyzstan, Luxembourg, Republic of Moldova, Netherlands, New Zealand, Sao Tome and Principe, Slovakia or Zambia on a reserve list of countries;

(b) authorized the holding, in the first quarter of 2009, of a two-day tripartite technical workshop on the impact of the food price crisis on decent work:

– in order to take account of the work of the High-level Task Force on the Global Food Security Crisis, to share with other United Nations
agencies the expertise of the ILO tripartite partners on rural employment and poverty reduction; and to contribute to an informed discussion within the United Nations on the social and employment impact of food prices on decent work;

– to be composed of eight Employer and eight Worker participants;

– to be open to representatives of all interested governments and to representatives of the organizations participating in the United Nations High-level Task Force on the Global Food Security Crisis;

(c) authorized the holding, in the week of 23–27 February 2009, of a two-day tripartite global dialogue forum on the impact of the financial crisis on financial sector workers:

– in order to propose and assess ways of alleviating and mitigating the impact of the crisis on workers in the financial services sector;

– to be composed of ten Employer and ten Worker participants;

– to be open to representatives of all interested governments, other interested Employer and Worker participants and representatives of international, governmental and non-governmental organizations.

(GB.303/15, paragraph 27.)

Effect to be given to the recommendations of sectoral and technical meetings:


(Geneva, 1–10 April 2008)

Governing Body decision:

260. The Governing Body took note of the report of the Tripartite Meeting of Experts and its expert advice concerning the preparation of draft resolutions relating to child labour statistics and the measurement of working time, to be submitted for approval to the 18th International Conference of Labour Statisticians (ICLS) to be held in Geneva from 24 November to 5 December 2008. (GB.303/15, paragraph 39.)

Joint ILO/UNESCO Committee of Experts on the Application of the Recommendations concerning Teaching Personnel (CEART)

261. The Governing Body took note of this part of the report. (GB.303/15, paragraphs 40–41.)
Maritime matters

(a) Adoption of guidelines on the inspection of ships under the Maritime Labour Convention, 2006

Governing Body decision:

262. The Governing Body:

(a) took note of the points mentioned in paragraph 4 of document GB.303/STM/4/1;

(b) requested the Director-General to publish the guidelines as soon as possible and to promote them together with the Maritime Labour Convention, 2006.

(GB.303/15, paragraph 46.)

(b) Revision of the ILO/WHO Guidelines for Conducting Pre-Sea and Periodic Medical Fitness Examinations for Seafarers

Governing Body decision:

263. The Governing Body:

(a) requested the Office to pursue the necessary arrangements with the International Maritime Organization (IMO) and the World Health Organization (WHO) for the preparation of draft guidelines on the medical fitness examinations of seafarers, with the assistance of the International Maritime Health Association (IMHA);

(b) decided to convene an ILO/IMO/WHO tripartite meeting of experts to be held with no additional budgetary allocation from the ILO.

(GB.303/15, paragraph 51.)

(c) Proposal for the convening of the Subcommittee on Wages of Seafarers of the Joint Maritime Commission

Governing Body decision:

264. The Governing Body approved the convening of the Subcommittee on Wages of Seafarers of the Joint Maritime Commission at ILO headquarters in Geneva on 12 and 13 February 2009, at no cost to the ILO. (GB.303/15, paragraph 54.)

(d) Update on the ILO’s participation in the development by the International Maritime Organization (IMO) of safety recommendations for small fishing vessels

Governing Body decision:

265. The Governing Body:

(a) authorized the continued participation of the ILO in the development of safety recommendations for decked fishing vessels of less than 12 metres in
length and undecked fishing vessels, and the participation by an ILO tripartite delegation, at no cost to the Office, in the next (52nd) Session of the IMO’s Subcommittee on Stability and Load Lines and on Fishing Vessels’ Safety, with the aim, inter alia, of placing the final document before the Governing Body for approval as a joint FAO/ILO/IMO publication;

(b) invited the Governments, Employers and Workers to nominate one representative each to participate, at no cost to the ILO, in the work of the correspondence group and in the ILO delegation to the 52nd Session of the IMO’s Subcommittee on Stability and Load Lines and on Fishing Vessels’ Safety;

(c) authorized participation by the ILO in the further development of draft guidelines to assist competent authorities in the implementation of Part B of the Fishing Vessel Safety Code, the Voluntary Guidelines and the Safety Recommendations.

(GB.303/15, paragraph 58.)


Governing Body decision:

266. The Governing Body approved:

(a) the revised terms of reference for the Joint Working Group, as contained in paragraph 6 of document GB.303/STM/4/5;

(b) the holding of a Ninth Session of the Joint Working Group at ILO headquarters in Geneva from 2 to 6 March 2009, with the participation of eight ILO representatives (three Shipowners, one fishing vessel owner and four Seafarers), at no cost to the ILO.

(GB.303/15, paragraph 63.)


Other questions

267. The Governing Body took note of these parts of the report. (GB.303/15, paragraphs 64–71.)
Sixteenth item on the agenda

REPORT OF THE COMMITTEE ON TECHNICAL COOPERATION
(GB.303/16(Rev.))

Follow-up to the resolution on technical cooperation adopted by the 95th Session (2006) of the International Labour Conference: Mid-term implementation report

Implementation of Decent Work Country Programmes

268. The Governing Body took note of these parts of the report. (GB.303/16(Rev.), paragraphs 4–52.)

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

Governing Body decision:

269. The Governing Body endorsed the plan of action, contained in document GB.303/TC/3, to promote freedom of association and the effective recognition of the right to collective bargaining, and requested that it be kept informed, through the Committee on Technical Cooperation, of the implementation of the activities proposed. (GB.303/16(Rev.), paragraph 83.)

Field structure review to improve the effectiveness of technical cooperation: Oral presentation

Other questions

270. The Governing Body took note of these parts of the report. (GB.303/16(Rev.), paragraphs 84–94.)

Seventeenth item on the agenda

REPORT OF THE WORKING PARTY ON THE SOCIAL DIMENSION OF GLOBALIZATION
(GB.303/17(Rev.))

Sixth item on the agenda

THE ILO AND THE MULTILATERAL SYSTEM
(GB.303/6)

271. The Chairperson proposed that the Governing Body consider the report of the Working Party on the Social Dimension of Globalization (WPSDG) in conjunction with item six on the agenda, the ILO and the multilateral system, since the ILO’s response to the financial crisis, on which the Working Party had held in-depth discussions, was closely linked to its role within the multilateral system. He recalled that the President of the Government of Spain, José Luis Rodríguez Zapatero, United Nations (UN) Secretary-General Ban Ki-moon, and OECD Secretary-General Angel Gurria, had all highlighted the importance of the ILO’s role in the multilateral response. In addition to the two reports, a room paper
on the likely impact of the crisis and possible responses was in the room at the disposal of participants. He also drew the Governing Body’s attention to a document containing a statement of the Officers on the global financial crisis. This text was not submitted for adoption by the Governing Body, but intended to serve constituents in their ongoing discussions on national and international responses to the crisis.

272. The Employer Vice-Chairperson said the Employers’ group had already commented on the room paper, indicating the points that it considered as having priority, as well as those it believed did not justify being dealt with at present. The statement of the Officers was not presented as an authoritative document, the six suggestions were to be seen as a means of provoking both reflection and stimulating action. These suggestions took account of the flows of credit necessary to maintain and encourage demand, as well as the accompanying fiscal and wage policies. They also covered the question of protection of persons most exposed to the crisis, not only through policies to regulate the financial system, but also active policies of two sorts. Firstly, policies to protect socially the sectors most affected by the crisis and, secondly, to provide support to enterprises, especially small enterprises, to enable them to withstand the impact of the crisis and preserve an environment propitious to investment and growth. It was essential both to limit the effects of the crisis and to make it as short as possible.

273. The employers had highlighted two dimensions to the crisis, requiring joint analysis: the regional and the sectoral. The group also stressed that the crisis, or its consequences, should in no way be used as justification to reduce or affect fundamental rights at work and reaffirmed the 1998 Declaration on Fundamental Principles and Rights at Work. Social dialogue should be strongly promoted. The crisis, was to a large degree, one of credibility and confidence, which must be restored before the situation could improve. Thus there was a great need to reinforce understanding between the real-economy actors and governments.

274. The employers believed that the ILO had a very important role to play, operating as the “Red Cross” of the multilateral system in helping to restore employment, provide experience in social protection, in promoting training and retraining for affected workers to assist the development of new areas of productivity and thus help exit the crisis. The Organization must promote protection for the worst affected workers. Other questions also required consideration within this context: the informal economy and migrant workers; training and retraining; education and vocational training; the promotion of small enterprises, which provided work for 90 per cent of the global workforce. These areas should be the focus of the Governing Body’s attention and it should “get to work” immediately.

275. The Worker Vice-Chairperson noted that there was a wide degree of understanding between the three groups as to what should be done to palliate the effects of the crisis. However, the crisis that some were starting to experience now was a crisis that many had been living through during their entire lives. For these, the crisis was worsened by the prescriptions of the International Monetary Fund (IMF) and of the World Bank, which had discouraged schooling and health care and made poverty into the inevitable inheritance of the poor. Even in countries containing the richest resources of the world, the worker digging the mine from which the wealth came remained poverty stricken. To prevent the economic and financial crisis becoming an acute social crisis, social dialogue must be used as a tool. If not, populations would build their own informal economies, drug cultures would develop and the situation could become violent. The building exercise must now be different and not based on a system where the rich became richer and the poor became poorer. The founders of the ILO in 1919 had understood that poverty was a threat to the well-being of all.
276. The Employer Vice-Chairperson had earlier referred to the ILO constituency’s direct connection to the real economy and the Workers’ group agreed that this gave the ILO a unique credibility in dealing with the crisis. For the Workers, the real economy was one that created employment and employment that generated decent wages that permitted people to live dignified lives, to develop and realize themselves in a society which enabled them to play a role. For this, workers must be free to join organizations, to form associations. Ensuring decent wages would create demand and stimulate markets by allowing workers to purchase products. The ILO should take the lead in this direction, by encouraging its Members to build a wage economy. The group was not arguing for a global minimum wage, but for a wage floor that took account of regional or national context, on the basis of guidance from the authorities as to which areas of development would most benefit their countries.

277. Employment also implied social protection and freedom to enjoy the fundamental principles and rights at work. Protection must also be afforded to those most exposed to the crisis, not only in the underdeveloped world, but also in the developed world, where in some countries, where the richest of the rich were to be found, there were also the poorest of the poor. Such people should be protected from a crisis for which they were not responsible. There should be greater levels of cooperation between countries and within countries. The ILO should deepen its work on the different dimensions of, and responses to, the labour and social consequences of the crisis, including through reprioritization of the Organization’s means of action. The Workers’ group also supported engagement by the ILO constituents with the G20 process and with international financial institutions.

278. A Government representative of France, speaking on behalf of the European Union (EU), said that the crisis revealed serious dysfunction in the international economy and in the supervisory and regulatory mechanisms that controlled international finance. The dangers had been concealed and disseminated willy-nilly throughout the international financial system. International financial and economic governance had been shown to be lacking. Financial stability was today a global public property requiring responsible and coordinated action by the controlling, supervisory and regulatory authorities. The EU had responded to the crisis by consolidating the European financial sector and strengthening the transparency, responsibility and supervision of its actors. It was eager to work with all its partners to achieve a real and complete reform of the international financial system based on these principles. The EU was following closely the consequences of the crisis on sustainable development in the poorest and most vulnerable countries and continued to attach great importance to the Millennium Development Goals (MDGs); it reaffirmed its development aid commitments to developing countries.

279. The UN General Assembly had called for close multilateral coordination to face the challenges of the crisis, as well as ambitious reform of international economic governance adapted to the present century, as the institutions and instruments of the past century no longer sufficed. The EU believed in reviving authentic market economy values, which should be inclusive, promote business and saving and support the real economy and human development.

280. The G20 Summit held in Washington (14–15 November 2008), with the participation of the UN Secretary-General, marked the beginning of a process. The present huge financial upheaval went beyond the sphere of finance. It concerned relations between States, regions, between developing and developed countries, between economic and social actors. It concerned a vision of the world and of values. The crisis had freed the energy required to reform current institutions and adapt them to new demands. The EU called for significant improvements in world governance, greater coherence and coordination of programmes. The ILO had an important role to play in this.
281. The EU felt that the measures proposed in the WPSDG’s room paper could be a basis of a response to the crisis. In particular the need to assess the employment and social situations and the impact of political measures proposed; to improve social security and the protection of workers and extend basic social security to all; and to promote social dialogue and collective bargaining as a means of implementing short- and medium-term action.

282. The ILO’s role in this action should be based on the four strategic objectives of the Decent Work Agenda, within the limits of existing resources, taking full advantage of its tripartite structure and in coordination with other international institutions. The ILO should supply direct assistance to the most affected member States, as well as to Employers’ and Workers’ organizations; adapt its policies and actions to the needs generated by the crisis and thus help towards achievement of the MDGs; promote appropriate labour market policies; and other measures to implement the Decent Work Agenda. Moreover the ILO, as the representative of the world of work, should participate in the debate initiated by the G20 Summit.

283. Regarding the statement on the crisis by the Officers of the Governing Body, the EU appreciated the rapidity of the reaction in producing the document and agreed that the ILO had an important role to play in responding to the crisis. The text was rich, detailed and extremely interesting. The EU would respond to it in detail during the discussions of the WPSDG at the 304th Session of the Governing Body.

284. A Government representative of Egypt endorsed the statement made by the Worker Vice-Chairperson. The crisis would result in declining rates of growth, the implementation of recession policies and a reduction in development aid. The poorest workers of the world would suffer harshly as a result of these developments and would lose recent social and economic gains. Global unemployment had been predicted to rise sharply. The Government of Egypt was determined to protect the social and economic gains achieved and was exploring possibilities of protecting the most vulnerable populations and to ensure that the active population was not too hard hit. The social partners participated in the formulation of Egypt’s social and economic policies, together with civil society organizations, scientific and university institutions; care was taken that these policies should include the poorest members of the population so they continued to benefit from health care and education.

285. The conclusions of the first Euro-Mediterranean Ministerial Conference on Employment and Labour (Marrakech, 9–10 November 2008) stressed the importance of coordinating economic and fiscal policies with social and environmental policies; of investing in human resources and of creating new jobs; the Conference also reaffirmed its support for the Decent Work Agenda. The Arab Forum on Development and Employment (Doha, 15–16 November 2008) had adopted the Doha Declaration, which called for greater development to combat poverty and unemployment. Egypt shared the concern that the crisis would impact severely on labour conditions and employment and was convinced that unity of action was important. To this end, the Government would willingly work with all its partners in promoting the Decent Work Agenda, taking account of particular local and regional characteristics.

286. A Government representative of India said that in today’s interdependent world, the crisis would have far-reaching social consequences. Innovative approaches were called for that would be fair to all constituents and stakeholders. The UN Secretary-General had called for initiatives and measures characterized by “inclusive multilateralism”; national strategies should promote inclusive governance centred on human beings. Globally, a new, reinforced institutional architecture was required, with a regulatory system to prevent imprudent lending, overvaluation of assets and speculative investment. Greater coherence
was needed at all levels and employment should be at the heart of global social and economic policy frameworks. National implementation of the ILO Global Employment Agenda (GEA) should be reinforced. Investment in infrastructure could help counter the downturn and governments should promote multi-skilling and skill upgrading, taking care to keep abreast of the global job requirement profile. Protectionism and trade restrictions were counter-productive and should be jettisoned. All countries should introduce basic social security and health care, especially for the most vulnerable sections of society. Mr Manmohan Singh, Prime Minister of India, speaking at the G20 Summit in Washington, had stated that concerted action in expanding export credit on reasonable terms could help development in developing countries. To this end, the World Bank, the International Finance Corporation (IFC) and the Asian Development Bank (ADB), should aim at making an additional US$15 billion per year available to support infrastructure development in public and private sectors. Industry had social obligations and should work with government to meet the challenges.

287. A Government representative of Jordan agreed with Mr Zapatero that the crisis could present an opportunity to address the reforms that were clearly required. The funds available in the Arab States should be channelled to the countries of the region. The ILO should work in close coordination with the Arab Labour Organization to ensure coherence in their initiatives.

288. A Government representative of Belgium said that the ILO could make at least two essential contributions. The first was to throw light on possible solutions; the second was to help States implement these. The Decent Work Agenda and the goal of social security for all were powerful tools with which to confront the crisis, in coordination with the appropriate economic and financial measures. The Government of Belgium called on the ILO to initiate research and study into each element of Decent Work and social protection to demonstrate how these might be used to combat the crisis. Technical cooperation could then be used to implement these tools within the socio-economic realities of each State. The ILO should thus offer solutions to member States founded on its strategy and not seek to occupy the same terrain as financial and economic institutions. The Organization should, however, deal with these institutions on a basis of equality.

289. A Government representative of Sudan stressed the need to stay focused on the Decent Work Agenda. The IMF and the World Bank had prescribed the wrong solutions in Africa and this had resulted in many problems. A new approach was now called for from these institutions. Africa had also had to face unfair competition for its resources. A more equitable partnership should prevail, allowing a sharing of resources. Sudan would continue to promote social dialogue, which had proved successful in encouraging development and social protection in the country. The social protection net would be extended to cover the neediest. The Government would refrain from imposing direct taxes, but would promote employment as a means to eradicate poverty. The ILO would play an important role in the social dimension of globalization and could count on the support of Sudan. The Government supported the many programmes started by the ILO in Sudan and hoped that, with the help of the international community, peace would come to the region of Darfur.

290. A Government representative of France read out a letter addressed to the Director-General from President Sarkozy of France. The President stressed that the unprecedented financial crisis showed that a new global governance was required. The Washington G20 Summit had opened discussions on reforming the financial system to avoid recurrences of the present destabilization. When defining the new global governance, account must also be taken of the social dimension. The promotion of Decent Work was an integral part of the new regulations to be established. The tripartite constituents of the ILO had, for many years, insisted on the social dimension of globalization to ensure that international
commerce should not be carried out to the detriment of workers and that the strengthening of social rights should improve economic performance. France also believed that economic and social progress went hand in hand. The voice of the ILO should be heard in the international debate on the new global governance and it should put forward firm proposals to ensure that Decent Work should be included as a part of the new world order.

291. A Government representative of Uruguay pointed out that crisis affected some adversely while benefitting others. In Uruguay, crisis had always resulted in a greater concentration of wealth in fewer hands, with those who struggled to survive during the crisis obliged to sell their lands or close small businesses to pay off debt. The policies put forward by the IMF and the World Bank had been shown to make things worse, but the rules for obtaining credit imposed by those institutions remained unchanged. It appeared that the one essential condition for obtaining credit was not to need it. Previous governments in Uruguay had upheld anti-cyclical policies, defending the need to save to be prepared for the downturn. The present Government had introduced increased productive investment, the development of infrastructure, of social policies, education and health and improved salaries, while the opposition argued for cutbacks. From 2005, growth had been above the regional average and it was hoped that the economic effects of the crisis would be below the regional average. The Government of Uruguay supported extending social security, developing training policies and skill certification, as well as investment in infrastructure. The ILO should encourage governments to develop and implement these policies.

292. A Government representative of Austria supported the statement of the Officers on the financial crisis and appreciated the speed of the ILO’s reaction to the crisis. The discussion on the crisis did not require a separate high-level meeting, but could be dealt with by the Working Party on the Social Dimension of Globalization.

293. A Government representative of the Islamic Republic of Iran said the time had come to reform multilateral structures which were, at present, based on the realities of the mid-twentieth century, making them more inclusive and, if possible, all embracing. Mr Robert B. Zoellick, President of the World Bank, in his speech at the annual meeting of the IMF and the World Bank, had also stressed the need for a new multilateral network for a new global economy, along with a reinforcement of the World Bank’s early warning system. The Washington G20 Summit had identified the cause of the crisis as the search by global growth market participants for higher yields without adequate appreciation of the risk involved. The entire system led by Wall Street, had been oriented towards short-term risk taking to generate maximum profit. However, as Prime Minister Manmohan Singh of India had said, emerging market-economy countries were not the cause of the crisis, but were amongst the worst affected; a slowing down of growth in developing countries would push millions of people back into poverty, with adverse effects on nutrition, health and education levels. The World Bank and the IMF had failed to alert the world to the danger of financial crisis. The ILO should establish a monitoring system to follow the crisis and its effects, with a view to increasing the Organization’s capacity to detect future crises and to better manage negative impacts.

294. A Government representative of Germany said that the financial crisis would inevitably bring a social crisis in its wake. Therefore, as the Government representative of France had said, it was necessary to think in terms of both a new financial order and a new social order, which should be based on the Decent Work Agenda. The Officers of the Governing Body had done well to issue their statement, which would ensure that the momentum generated by the debate in the WPSDG would be maintained. The Governing Body should make it clear that the ILO would speak out loud and clear on the social implications of this global crisis. Implementation of the ILO Declaration on Social Justice for a Fair Globalization was also important. Very valuable discussion had taken place earlier in the Committee on Employment and Social Policy, regarding the forthcoming publication of
the Global Wage Report, which would provide a useful tool for devising good wage and salary strategies for countries affected by the crisis.

295. The Government of Germany supported the Officers’ statement, but it should be more ambitious in developing an ILO strategy. Thus, the proposal to organize a high-level tripartite meeting during the March 2009 session of the Governing Body was especially welcome. It was vital that this meeting should lead to results that could be made operational through adoption by the Governing Body. The ILO must make a strong and committed statement in March.

296. A Government representative of Spain was grateful for the repeated expressions of support for Mr Zapatero’s speech to the Governing Body and reiterated his Government’s support for the collaboration of the employers and workers in the G20 process. He also supported the holding of a high-level tripartite meeting on the financial crisis in March 2009.

297. A Government representative of Argentina said it was essential to reinforce measures to promote employment and social protection. Developing countries would be the hardest hit. ILO assistance was indispensable in Latin America to ensure appropriate measures were implemented in line with regional and local requirements. Assistance should be directed at the most exposed and enterprises should also be supported. The social partners should make a real commitment to protecting jobs. In Argentina, certain sectors of the economy had been very profitable over the past six years. These should now make a social gesture to protect workers from the effects of the crisis. Heed should be paid to Mr Zapatero’s call for strengthened social dialogue to find the best solutions to overcome the crisis. The Government of Argentina was implementing policies defending employment and economic policies, to ensure internal market solvency, with investment in labour-intensive activities. ILO cooperation would be fundamental to building responsible social dialogue. The Government supported the Officers’ statement and the holding of a high-level tripartite meeting on the crisis.

298. A Government representative of Singapore said his Government was working closely with the social partners to counter the sharp downturn in the Singapore economy, which had already been in technical recession for two quarters. Apart from taking counter-cyclical measures, the Government was working with employers and unions in exploring measures to reduce manpower costs, including sending surplus workers for skills upgrading, thereby saving jobs and increasing their employability. The tripartite partners had issued a set of guidelines strongly encouraging companies to manage excess manpower through training, redeployment, shorter working weeks, flexible rate systems or by temporary layoffs, and to consider retrenchment as a last resort. Where retrenchment was inevitable, it should be carried out responsibly. Non-unionized workers could seek advice from the Government, which would monitor the process closely. Sacked workers would be helped to find suitable employment, or retrained to upgrade their skills. Various government institutions were in place to provide career counselling, training support and job placement and the Government would shortly be announcing a further programme to strengthen the measures already in place. This response would not have been possible without the strong tripartite partnership established in Singapore over the past four decades.

299. A Government representative of South Africa said his Government supported the Officers’ statement and the proposed high-level tripartite meeting. The poor were always likely to be the hardest hit in a crisis; it was essential steps should be taken to avoid that in this instance.

300. A Government representative of Peru said that decisions taken at national level to counter the effects of the crisis must be the product of tripartite dialogue and agreement. The ILO had an important role to play in fortifying social dialogue, above all in developing
countries. Internationally, decisions should also be taken on the basis of cooperation and dialogue and the ILO should ensure that Decent Work was a part of all decisions and measures adopted. For this reason, the Government also supported the proposed high-level tripartite meeting. Care should be taken that the measures should be adapted to the different realities in each country and general, overall remedies should be avoided, especially in respect of macroeconomic measures. Indeed, in making recommendations regarding macroeconomic measures, the statement went beyond the mandate of the ILO.

301. A Government representative of Nigeria associated his Government with the interventions made by all earlier speakers. The ILO must focus on its core mandate in its responses to the crisis and the 2008 Declaration provided an excellent basis for this response. Anti-cyclical measures were necessary and, to this end, a very solid statistical basis for policy analysis was required. Appropriate banking regulations should be introduced to help contain the crisis and the ILO should continue to promote re-skilling, multi-skilling, human resources development, matching pay to performance through productivity, enterprise development and encouraging social protection strategies, adaptable to national situations. Labour-intensive jobs should also be encouraged, particularly in agriculture and, in some cases, in the textile industries. Policy coherence at the national level and within the multilateral system would also be beneficial. Nigeria was pursuing a policy of fostering greater administrative transparency, promotion of employment, implementation of international labour standards and mainstreaming Decent Work strategies through the Decent Work Country Programmes. The Government supported the holding of a high-level tripartite meeting in March 2009.

302. A Government representative of Japan welcomed the statement presented by the Officers, but felt that the document should be more flexible to take account of the different situations prevailing in each country. The ILO should focus its efforts on its core mandate of promoting labour and employment on the basis of the four strategic objectives of the Decent Work Agenda.

303. A Government representative of Mexico wished to highlight the ILO’s strategic advantage in that it was the only international organization in which those directly connected with the process of production participated: the employers and workers. On a positive note, the crisis could provide an opportunity to make the fundamental changes that were needed. The discussions taking place in the enlarged framework of the G20 Summits, in which emerging economies were able to participate, had raised the question of the more active participation of these countries in the decision making process of the IMF. The introduction of counter-cyclical policies, a taboo only a few years ago, was also being discussed. The Government of Mexico fully supported the holding of a high-level tripartite meeting on the crisis and requested more details on the form and mandate of this meeting.

304. A Government representative of Brazil endorsed the comments made by the Governments of Argentina and Uruguay regarding the statement of the Officers and also supported the holding of a high-level tripartite meeting on the crisis. The documents prepared for this meeting should evaluate the specific regional characteristics in respect of social development and integration processes, together with the implementation of Decent Work Country Programmes.

305. A Government representative of the United Republic of Tanzania delivered a statement, already made at meetings of many other UN agencies, on behalf of the Governments of Malawi, Mozambique, Netherlands, Norway and the United Kingdom in respect of item 6 on the agenda, the ILO and the Multilateral System and the UN Secretary-General’s call to “Delivering as One”. A recent Netherlands/Norway/United Kingdom mission to Malawi, Mozambique and the United Republic of Tanzania revealed a wide convergence of views on “Delivering as One” among the six countries. “Delivering as One” had great potential to
ensure that the UN became more than the sum of its parts. Greater multilateral coherence was key to meeting the MDGs by 2015 and, consequently, the six countries were working together to make the initiative a success. UN headquarters should give priority to six areas. Firstly, the exercise was not one of budget-cutting; savings realized in administrative costs, already apparent in pilot countries, should be transferred to programme activities. Under the present regulations, this was problematical. Secondly, different rules, regulations, planning periods and reporting requirements were hampering progress in unifying multilateral action. The UN should quickly resolve these problems. Thirdly, a harmonized UN, “Delivering as One” at country level, clearly required an empowered and strengthened Resident Coordinator. Fourthly, one size could not fit all; UN headquarters should decentralize decision-making powers to country level to ensure programmes were adapted to national and regional needs. Fifthly, the UN was in a good position to build national capacities in certain areas. It should to a much larger extent and, wherever possible, align with, and utilize, national budgetary systems for issues such as resource reporting and procurement. Sixthly, the UN neither could, nor should, do everything and would be most effective when it concentrated its efforts where it had the most to offer. The UN and its agencies should urgently address the issue of overlapping instructions to their country teams. Priority setting aligned to government needs should be pursued with vigour, complemented by untied, unconditional and predictable funding from donors.

306. A Government representative of France made a statement concerning item six, the ILO and the multilateral system, on behalf of the EU, the EU candidate countries: Croatia, The former Yugoslav Republic of Macedonia and Turkey; the stabilization and association countries and potential candidates, Albania, Bosnia and Herzegovina, Montenegro and Serbia; and Armenia, the Republic of Moldova and Ukraine endorsed the statement. The EU noted the intergovernmental and inter-agency developments that concerned the ILO, such as policy coherence regarding the Decent Work Agenda and UN reform. Moreover, the EU was pleased that several important UN General Assembly resolutions took account of two fundamental ILO principles: full productive employment and decent work for all, including for women and the young. The EU welcomed the adoption by the UN General Assembly of the resolution on the Triennial comprehensive policy review and implementation plan (A/RES/62/208) and the adoption, in June 2008, by the Operational Activities Segment of the Economic and Social Council (ECOSOC) of a resolution on operational activities for development and looked forward to the ILO report on measures taken and foreseen by the Organization to implement resolution No. 62/208. This should deal particularly with reinforcing ILO participation in, and support for, the Resident Coordinator system on the ground, as well as on progress in simplification and harmonization. The EU believed the Chief Executives Board (CEB) Toolkit for Mainstreaming Employment and Decent Work could generate greater coherence in multilateral action and focus capacity on those two ILO fundamental objectives. The ILO should continue its active participation in the UN reform and further promote the Decent Work Agenda on the basis of inter-agency cooperation.

307. A Government representative of the Bolivarian Republic of Venezuela stressed that the Decent Work Agenda was the best way out of poverty and of the current crisis. It should be accompanied by appropriate policies which took account, not only of general working conditions of the workers, but also of their social well-being in terms of health protection, education and basic social security paid for by the salary obtained from decent work. The Government supported the Officers’ suggestion of a high-level tripartite meeting.

308. The Employer Vice-Chairperson thanked the President of France for his communication to the Governing Body. He stressed the importance of the regional aspect in applying measures to alleviate the effects of the crisis. Nor should priority be given to the short term, without heed to the medium and long term, when focusing on the objectives of enterprise creation, job creation and protection of decent work. The 2008 Declaration on
Social Justice for a Fair Globalization, the Global Employment Agenda and the 2007 resolution on sustainable employment should be the basis for ILO action. Mr Gurria, Mr Zapatero and Mr Ban Ki-moon all spoke of a range of permanent or temporary measures to reinvigorate the market, which the employers considered essential. These measures included active market policies, staff retention, labour-intensive projects, especially in infrastructure in developing countries, the preservation of free trade, aid to small enterprises to allow them to survive in the current difficult context, given their importance in creating jobs and setting frameworks for financial institutions so that they provided credit for real-economy enterprises.

309. He alluded to several meetings of importance that were mentioned in the report on the ILO and the multilateral system, including the 63rd Session of the UN General Assembly which would focus on child labour, and the MDG review summit to be held in 2010. The “Delivering as One” initiatives were also significant. He also referred to the section of the report covering the World Bank’s Doing Business report, recalling that while all things could be improved, the employers were basically in favour of this publication. These events and initiatives were of close concern to the ILO and the Organization should be present, not just represented by the Office, but by tripartite delegations; this would demonstrate agreement on the statement by the Officers as a contribution to the debate on how to overcome the financial crisis, as well as showing the power of social dialogue.

310. A Government representative of Uruguay, speaking on behalf of the Group of Latin American and Caribbean States (GRULAC), referred to the question of the ILO and the multilateral system. Within the context of promoting greater coherence in the multilateral system, it should be recalled that the fundamental aim of the ILO was to promote decent and productive work for all women and men in conditions of liberty, equality, security and human dignity. To fulfil this, the ILO should have an agenda that allowed it to participate in the activities of other UN organizations. The participation by the ILO in the 62nd UN General Assembly was therefore welcomed by GRULAC, as was the reaffirmation of the role of full and productive employment and decent work for all as key elements of economic growth and sustainable development of all nations and that decent work should be a prime objective of national and international policy. GRULAC also highlighted the resolution on violence against migrant women workers, which called on member States to consider ratifying the most relevant ILO Conventions. These activities showed the degree of international consensus that the ILO had obtained regarding its fundamental objectives. GRULAC considered it important that the paper highlighted the need to make greater efforts to increase understanding of the tripartite nature of the ILO, especially in view of UN reform. This was even more necessary in countries in which there was no ILO Office. GRULAC noted the World Bank had included in its most recent Doing Business report an express reference to the need to measure the flexibility of the regulations concerning contracts, hours of work and sacking, in line with ILO Conventions.

311. The Worker Vice-Chairperson thanked all Government representatives who had contributed to the debate, either themselves or by aligning their governments with group statements. He referred also to the honour of receiving a letter from the President of France. He commended the Employers’ group for the importance they attached to the discussion of the issue. However, the Workers’ group believed that the matter was of the utmost urgency. ILO staff should be empowered to take action immediately. The high-level meeting should not be held on the last Monday of the March Governing Body, but perhaps the previous week, which would allow more time for Government representatives to confer with their national administrations and thus ensure that firm decisions were taken. Moreover, the meeting should involve specialists in the fields under discussion and not only the Governing Body members present.
312. With regard to “Delivering as One”, the Workers’ group believed that all governments and international agencies should be made aware of the CEB Toolkit. It was worrying that the evaluators of the pilot programme in the United Republic of Tanzania had been implemented without consulting the workers or the employers. Today, the Governing Body had been unanimous in the role to be played by the ILO as part of “One UN”; as such, it was important that the other members of the system understood the special structure of the ILO, its functions and objectives and that it could provide the most precious tool of tripartite social dialogue.

313. The Director-General noted that the central idea emerging from the discussions was that the Decent Work Agenda was an appropriate instrument with which to confront the crisis. The Officers’ statement, although not a Governing Body document, would also provide a means of moving forward. The distinguished guests who had addressed the Governing Body this session, Mr Gurría, Mr Zapatero and Mr Ban Ki-moon had all stressed the role of the ILO and tripartism in facing up to the crisis. Mr Zapatero had said that the employers and workers should be part of the G20 process. The Worker Vice-Chairperson had made a very important point about the United Nations Development Assistance Programme (UNDAF) in the United Republic of Tanzania and Mr Ban Ki-moon’s speech would be useful in remedying the situation there. The Director-General stressed that the assembly of UNDAFs was a collective task and urged Governing Body members to go and discuss the matter with the local United Nations Development Programme (UNDP) representatives in the United Republic of Tanzania, armed with Mr Ban Ki-moon’s speech. Besides the words of the three guests, there had also been the very strong statement of support from President Sarkozy of France, who stated that he “could not conceive of a new global governance without the participation and presence of the ILO and its tripartism”.

314. The discussion showed that there was a desire for more precision regarding regional situations. The Director-General had already given instructions to regional directors in this sense. He also informed the Governing Body that President Compaoré of Burkina Faso had agreed to host a meeting on the implications of the crisis for Africa.

315. The room paper that had been rapidly prepared listed a number of policy areas and appeared to have been generally well received. The Office would set about deepening the approaches in that paper and possibly a statement by the Governing Body itself would be useful in charting the way ahead. Requests for examination into specific sectors affected by the crisis, such as a request from the Government of Barbados to study its effect on the tourism sector, would be carried out by ILO regional and subregional Offices.

316. Regarding closer links with the international financial institutions, it was very important that Governing Body members should use the Officers’ statement so that their governments’ delegates to the international financial institutions were aware of the ILO’s standpoint. Once again, the speeches given by the distinguished Governing Body guests, and President Sarkozy’s letter, could be used to show financial institution delegates that there was wide support for making the ILO’s tripartite voice more audible still. In respect of the G20 process, 16 of the 20 Governments were present in the Governing Body. Consequently, it was not for the Office alone to establish a tripartite presence within the G20, but for those governments to do so, as well, in their own countries and, indeed, for the employers and workers of the G20 also to do within the countries, thus representing the ILO fully.

317. The Governing Body had expressed an urgent desire for a high-level tripartite meeting on the financial crisis. Certain actions were definitely possible on a regional basis, but the Office would attempt to put such a global meeting together as soon as possible and would consult with the constituents as to what was the best way forward in this respect.
Governing Body decision:

318. The Governing Body took note of the report submitted regarding the ILO and the multilateral system (item six), and also of the report presented orally by the Chairperson of the Working Party on the Social Dimension of Globalization.

Eighteenth item on the agenda

INTERNATIONAL INSTITUTE FOR LABOUR STUDIES

Report of the 50th Session of the Board
(GB.303/18)

319. The Governing Body took note of the report.

Nineteenth item on the agenda

REPORT OF THE DIRECTOR-GENERAL
(GB.303/19 AND GB.303/19(ADD.))

Obituary

320. The Governing Body paid tribute to the memory of two figures who had close ties with the work of the International Labour Organization.

Governing Body decision:

321. The Governing Body requested the Director-General to convey its condolences to the family of Mr Semyon Aleksandrovich Ivanov, who had been a member of the Government group of the International Labour Conference and a member of the Committee of Experts on the Application of Conventions and Recommendations, and to the Government of the Russian Federation; to the family of Mr Madia Diop, who had been President of the African Regional Organisation of the International Confederation of Free Trade Unions (ICFTU-AFRO) and member of the Governing Body, and to the National Confederation of Workers of Senegal (CNTS). (GB.303/19, paragraph 7, and GB.303/19(Add.), paragraph 6.)

Membership of the Organization

Progress in international labour legislation

Internal administration

322. The Governing Body took note of these parts of the report. (GB.303/19, paragraphs 8–14.)

First Supplementary Report: 18th World Congress on Safety and Health at Work and the Safety and Health Summit (Seoul, Republic of Korea) (29 June–2 July 2008) (GB.303/19/1)

323. An Employer member from Japan, representative of the Governing Body Employers’ group at both the Congress and the Summit, said he was pleased to have had the
opportunity to participate in those two events. The Summit and the Congress had been exceptionally well organized and implemented and had enabled employers to show that prevention forms an integral part of their activities. The Declaration adopted was important in enabling employers to devise management policies and workplace programmes which took into account the global financial crisis and the related economic difficulties. Workers and their representatives should also be consulted and involved in all measures relating to occupational safety and health. Finally, the results of that meeting should be communicated to the highest authorities to enable them to put in place coherent occupational safety and health measures.

324. The Worker Vice-Chairperson, on behalf of his group, thanked the Government and the people of the Republic of Korea for their hospitality, and congratulated them on the successful organization of such a large-scale meeting.

325. He noted that the issues that had been addressed were extremely important but, unfortunately, the lack of time, combined with the large number of activities taking place in different rooms, had not allowed ILO staff and experts to play their rightful parts. That situation was particularly regrettable given that the ILO was one of the meeting co-organizers and should have been as present as the others, such as the International Social Security Association (ISSA).

326. A Government representative of the Republic of Korea thanked the ILO and the ISSA for their excellent work in organizing the 18th World Congress on Safety and Health at Work and the Safety and Health Summit. The adoption of the Seoul Declaration on Safety and Health at Work was a great success and was testimony to the work accomplished by all participants.

327. A Government representative of India recalled that she had represented the Government group of the Governing Body at the Congress and the Summit, and said she was extremely pleased to have had the opportunity to participate in the events and in the drafting of the Seoul Declaration. She recalled that her country had already ratified the Labour Inspection Convention, 1947 (No. 81), and the Radiation Protection Convention, 1960 (No. 115), and that the Promotional Framework for Occupational Safety and Health Convention, 2006 (No. 187), had been submitted to Parliament as required under the ILO Constitution. India had also ratified the Prevention of Major Industrial Accidents Convention, 1993 (No. 174), which was testimony to its commitment to put in place high occupational safety and health standards in order to protect its workers. Furthermore, 2008 had been declared Occupational Safety and Health Year and, following consultations with all stakeholders, a comprehensive policy on safety had been devised and would be communicated shortly. In conclusion, the speaker thanked the organizers for their work in organizing such a large-scale event.

328. The Government representative of Japan thanked the Office for the document, and the organizers of the Congress and the Summit. He recalled that occupational safety and health were key issues in achieving decent work for all.

329. The Employer Vice-Chairperson considered that the Declaration that had been adopted was a fundamental instrument which would have an impact on the culture of prevention and occupational safety and health and merited attention from all, including workers, employers and governments. In that context, he invited the Office to put in place a follow-up mechanism which would allow the Declaration to be used, alongside the instruments already available.

330. A representative of the Director-General said that it was the first time that a congress and summit had been organized at the same time, which explained the very heavy agenda and
the impressive number of activities carried out in a very large complex. Any time lost as a result of that should not cause participants to lose sight of what was most important, namely the outcome, particularly the adoption of the Declaration. The Office was fully aware of the need to ensure follow-up of the text and had undertaken to provide States and employers’ and workers’ organizations with any assistance they might require to that end, so that the progress made could be measured at the next congress.

331. The Governing Body took note of the report.

Second Supplementary Report: Measures taken by the Government of Belarus to implement the recommendations of the Commission of Inquiry established to examine the observance of the Freedom of Association and Protection of the Right to Organise Convention, 1948 (No. 87), and the Right to Organise and Collective Bargaining Convention, 1949 (No. 98)

(GB.303/19/2)

332. The Governing Body took note of the report.

Third Supplementary Report: Tripartite Meeting of Experts on the Measurement of Decent Work

(GB.303/19/3)

333. The Employer Vice-Chairperson explained that the discussions on the measurement of decent work should lead to the preparation of a guide to interpreting the agreed statistical indicators in order to enable countries to interpret and manage the information obtained at the national level. What the Employers wanted above all was a statistical indicator and a method that would help them to understand statistics from the decent work viewpoint. The Employers invited the governments to examine the document submitted, which focused on the development of a methodology for measuring decent work. Finally, the Employers welcomed the fact that, in March 2009, the Governing Body would be called on to review the results of the International Conference of Labour Statisticians, to be held the following week, and the Employers hoped to be involved in that process.

334. The Worker Vice-Chairperson welcomed the outcome of the meeting and the establishment of a list of indicators, which would be reviewed in greater detail by the International Conference of Labour Statisticians. The Workers recalled that the decent work indicators in question were part of the follow-up to the Declaration on Social Justice for a Fair Globalization, which clearly indicated that such indicators or statistics would allow monitoring and evaluation of the progress made in the area of decent work. It was a key step towards making decent work a reality, and the indicators were very important for governments and social partners.

335. A Government representative of India said that promoting the Decent Work Agenda was an integral component of national development, and countries needed to be able to measure their own progress. The measurement of decent work was particularly important for evaluating successes and deciding on future strategies in the light of experience. The Declaration on Social Justice for a Fair Globalization emphasized even more the need to monitor the progress made in implementing the Decent Work Agenda. The indicators developed by the Office and refined by the Meeting of Experts were comprehensive and covered the four strategic objectives. The speaker welcomed the fact that the document allowed a certain flexibility with regard to adapting the indicators to national circumstances and priorities, and did not put forward a composite index, which generally involved ranking of countries.
336. To arrive at standards that were universally and nationally acceptable, it was important to carefully review the selected indicators, and a certain number of observations had to be made. First, it was necessary to guarantee that the indicators were extremely clear and did not allow for any ambiguity. Second, the informal sector was very important in developing countries, and measures had to be adopted to assess progress in that sector.

337. Third, the ratification status of core Conventions and the observations made on individual countries by the ILO supervisory bodies should not be used to measure labour rights. That information should be considered in conjunction with a national legal and institutional mechanism. It was essential to be able to interpret the results provided by the different indicators in order to assess the progress made in the specific context of the countries concerned. In India, it would be necessary to prepare statistical indicators, and collect and compile statistics, which would require consultations with all stakeholders. The Government of India was collaborating with the ILO Subregional Office in New Delhi to develop decent work indicators for India.

338. A Government representative of Mexico said that the document prepared by the Office appeared to give an accurate summary of the meeting, and he particularly endorsed the comments made by the experts in paragraph 5 of the document. He emphasized that country profiles should be voluntary, the indicators had to be determined and reviewed by the constituents, and should not be made public, in order to avoid misuse by third parties.

339. A Government representative of the United Kingdom, speaking on behalf of the industrialized market economy countries (IMEC), recalled that he had already stated at the previous session of the Governing Body that the aim was to assess the progress made in achieving full employment and decent work at the national level, and there was no question of ranking countries. He emphasized that the indicators should be focused, not too numerous or detailed, and should include qualitative as well as quantitative aspects. They should cover the four strategic objectives of the Decent Work Agenda, take account of national circumstances in order to enable countries to assess their own situation, take into consideration gender equality, and cover all workers, including those in the informal economy. The speaker emphasized the issue of universality, because all countries had to have the necessary data, or at least the resources needed to collect those data. The IMEC group had already suggested the possibility of a discussion between the ILO and other relevant organizations, and was concerned about the promotion of a global template. The IMEC group emphasized that in the view of the experts, the revised indicators were only a starting point to enable the Office to test the framework by compiling decent work profiles for a limited number of pilot countries. The group believed that the choice of indicators would require further examination and discussion, particularly in the light of the experience of the pilot countries, before it would be possible to establish a common set of indicators.

340. In conclusion, the speaker requested that the full report of the Tripartite Meeting of Experts should be made available to the Governing Body, and that the Governing Body should discuss the matter in detail at its next Session, for instance in the Committee on Employment and Social Policy.

341. A Government representative of the Republic of Korea, also speaking on behalf of the Governments of Canada and the United States, supported the IMEC statement. He believed that the development of indicators for assessing compliance with the fundamental principles and rights at work, taking account of the complicated legal framework and specific circumstances of each country, was a real challenge. Furthermore, as indicated in the document submitted to the Tripartite Meeting, ratification alone was not necessarily a good indicator. Moreover, there would inevitably be some overlap with the work of the ILO’s supervisory bodies. The speaker therefore requested the Office to focus its efforts
and resources on developing a limited number of indicators that would genuinely help
member States to evaluate their progress with regard to decent work and working
conditions.

342. A Government representative of Argentina supported the objective of developing a global
template for the measurement of decent work, but believed that efforts had to be redoubled
to ensure that the indicators in the template were compatible and took account of national
situations. He highlighted the fact that an information system based on indicators specific
to each country must take into account the historical progression of decent work at the
national level. Country-specific methodological difficulties could arise. It was essential
that actors in the world of work and statistical bodies participated in the development of
the system of indicators.

343. A Government representative of Belgium highlighted the difficulty of developing
indicators that would be acceptable to all parties. The indicators had to be universal,
qualitative and quantitative, but it would be difficult to combine those very different
elements. He also drew attention to the question of legal, economic and social indicators,
which necessitated specific competencies.

344. With regard to adapting indicators to national circumstances, that legitimate concern was
tricky from a methodological point of view because the concept of decent work was
universal. Instead of referring to indicators adjusted to reflect national circumstances, it
could be useful to consider them in terms of different levels. The question of the transition
from an informal to a formal economy should also be taken into account, and decent work
should not seem too distant a goal. The speaker highlighted the importance of indicators
that took account of gender equality, and rejected the idea of ranking countries. Finally, he
invited the Office to cooperate closely with the regional institutions or foundations that had
worked on the statistical indicators.

345. A Government representative of Brazil drew attention to the experience of his country,
which was collaborating with the ILO Office in Brazil and the national statistical
institutions in order to define clearly the indicators. Many difficulties had been
encountered during this process. It was important that the indicators made it possible to
assess the development of decent work in each country. In Brazil, there were regional
decent work agendas and, given the specificities of the different states, it was difficult to
arrive at a consensus on indicators at the national level.

346. The speaker mentioned an initiative of the Economic Commission for Latin America and
the Caribbean, the United Nations Development Programme and the ILO Office in
Brasilia, which had analysed, on the basis of 28 indicators, the progress made in Brazil
between 1995 and 2006. Finally, the speaker emphasized that the indicators must be
defined very clearly and that any ranking of countries should be avoided.

347. A Government representative of Egypt thanked the Office for its efforts to define decent
work indicators and stressed that the indicators should be flexible and take into account
national circumstances. Like the Government representative of India, he was worried about
the cost of collecting information and highlighted the need for the Organization to help
member States in that regard.

348. A Government representative of Nigeria said that decent work should be considered a
universal goal. He recalled that the strategic framework should give effect to the 2008
Declaration on Social Justice for a Fair Globalization and would incorporate some of the
key components of the fundamental principles; it was therefore essential to have statistical
indicators. It was also necessary to have credible statistical data profiles for each of the
four regions in order to have a clear indication of the indicators used. In the African region,
the informal economy was predominant and work carried out at home was not quantified in statistical terms.

349. **The Worker Vice-Chairperson** explained that he had understood that the exercise was aimed particularly at developing countries and that the object was to help governments to make better progress towards decent work, and not to blacklist governments or rank countries. The experts had agreed on the approach and the indicators, and things were now at the experimental stage. As that was the case, it was clear that some countries should volunteer in order to allow the results to be evaluated. It was therefore not necessary to submit the matter to the Committee on Employment and Social Policy in March 2009, and the Office should instead move on from the theory and test some of its ideas in practice in certain countries.

350. **The Employer Vice-Chairperson** returned to the question of defining the conceptual framework that would allow an exercise like the one envisaged to be carried out. It was a political decision on the part of the Governing Body, and it would be better to have appropriate instruments in place before launching the initiative. The speaker was convinced that it would be possible to reach a consensus on the conceptual framework.

351. A representative of the **Director-General** was pleased with the work that had been done during the discussion. A number of very sensitive questions linked to the conceptual framework had been addressed. All opportunities to move forward should be taken; the International Conference of Labour Statisticians the following week, as well as the pilot studies that had been proposed, would provide an opportunity to progress. The report of the International Conference of Labour Statisticians should be submitted to the March Session of the Governing Body, and the Office should be able to submit a detailed report on decent work profiles in the pilot countries by the end of 2009.

352. **The Governing Body took note of the report.**

*Fourth Supplementary Report: Appointment of regional directors*  
(GB.303/19/4)

353. **The Governing Body noted that, having duly consulted with the Officers of the Governing Body, the Director-General appointed Mr Charles Dan as Regional Director of the Regional Office for Africa with the rank of Assistant Director-General, with effect from 1 July 2008.** (GB.303/19/4.)

*Fifth Supplementary Report: Draft guidelines to improve the functioning of the Governing Body meetings*  
(GB.303/19/5)

354. **The Chairperson** recalled that the members of the Governing Body had been invited to make comments and suggestions concerning this document via the Internet.

355. **The Employer Vice-Chairperson** requested that a working group be set up, based on the Working Group on the International Labour Conference, which would bring together workers, employers and governments responsible for making suggestions as to how to improve the dynamics of the Governing Body and strengthen its role in terms of governance.

356. **The Worker Vice-Chairperson** expressed his support for the Employer Vice-Chairperson’s proposal to reconstitute the Working Group. The Office document was part of the ongoing discussion on ways of improving the functioning of the Governing Body, and the Workers wanted the discussion to cover not only methods, but also substantive issues and the
institution’s fundamental objectives. He invited the Office to prepare a discussion paper for the March 2009 session, in collaboration with ACTRAV and ACT/EMP. He emphasized the importance of transparency and the sharing of information from one session to another, in order that members who had been unable to attend one Governing Body session should not be disadvantaged at the following session. Finally, the document to be presented would have to take into account information and contributions concerning both headquarters and external activities.

357. A Government representative of the Bolivarian Republic of Venezuela welcomed this document, which had been prepared pursuant to the discussion which took place during the March 2008 session, at which time the Governing Body approved a Government group statement initially presented by the delegation of Canada. The speaker expressed support for the draft guidelines presented in the document and hoped that they would allow for the better functioning of meetings.

358. A Government representative of Australia, speaking on behalf of the group of Industrialized Market Economy Countries (IMEC), drew attention to the issue of a report that had been presented orally to a Governing Body committee without any accompanying documentation. Under such circumstances, the groups were not in any position to prepare in a coordinated manner a statement concerning a report of which they had no prior knowledge. When the committee’s report was presented to the Governing Body, the groups did not even have the chance to make a statement on the issues involved. That was the situation which had arisen the previous day, with the oral presentation on the field structure review given to the Committee on Technical Cooperation. The speaker asked whether groups could be given the opportunity to voice their opinions once an oral report had been made to the Committee. If the aim was to avoid a debate, then IMEC would in future find it difficult to accept such reports, although they lent a certain level of flexibility to the workings of the Governing Body.

359. With regard specifically to the field structure review, the IMEC countries hoped that consultations would be held before the March 2009 session of the Governing Body, given the complex nature of the issues at stake, as well as the fact that the process involved was of critical importance to the work of the Organization.

360. A Government representative of Cuba took note of the document presented and made several observations, without prejudice to the comments that he would then send to the Office concerning the draft guidelines. He supported the initiatives aimed at providing information in a clear and precise manner and ensuring that documents were distributed early enough to facilitate consultations between the different groups. As to time management, the speaker emphasized that, although controls should be put in place regarding the length of statements, the freedom of expression of States should never be infringed, as that would contravene the principle of equality with regard to debate and would constitute a serious obstacle to the proper functioning of the Governing Body.

361. A representative of the Director-General, replying to the question raised by IMEC, explained that the current procedure was the result of a previous initiative to improve the functioning of the Governing Body. The Office had discouraged the practice of giving oral presentations of reports, but such presentations were sometimes inevitable. The issue brought up by IMEC should be linked to that of agenda setting, addressed in the document presented to the Governing Body, because it seemed that certain questions tended to pass from one committee to another.

362. At the present stage, the question was noted and, should a discussion on the functioning of the Governing Body take place, it would be examined in that context.
363. The Clerk of the Governing Body explained that, by the end of the year, it would be possible to access a discussion forum on the guidelines presented in document GB.303/19/5 on the Governing Body web site. She added that a Really Simple Syndication (RSS) feed system would enable Governing Body members who subscribed to the system to be informed regularly of the publication of new documents.

364. Noting that the Governing Body would come back to this issue in the context of a discussion on improvements in the functioning of the Governing Body, it encouraged Members to submit their comments and proposals to the Office through the online consultation procedure.

Sixth Supplementary Report: Report of the committee set up to examine the representation alleging non-observance by Chile of the Forced Labour Convention, 1930 (No. 29), submitted under article 24 of the ILO Constitution by the Colegio de Abogados de Chile, AG

(GB.303/19/6)

Governing Body decision:

365. The Governing Body:

(a) approved the report;

(b) in the light of the conclusions contained in paragraphs 27 to 38 of the report, and in order to ensure that Chilean lawyers enjoy the protection against forced labour afforded by the Convention, agreed to request the Government of Chile:

(i) to review the overall functioning of the duty lawyer roster system in order to ensure that the system does not prejudice the free exercise of the profession of lawyer;

(ii) to take the necessary measures to ensure that such a review takes into account the volume of work imposed, the frequency of assignments, the financial losses incurred and the excessive nature of the sanction that is currently envisaged;

(c) invited the Government, in its next reports under article 22 of the ILO Constitution, to provide detailed information on the measures adopted to give effect to the recommendations made above so that the Committee of Experts on the Application of Conventions and Recommendations can continue the examination of the issues raised with regard to the application of the Convention;

(d) declared closed the procedure initiated before the Governing Body as a result of the representation presented by the Colegio de Abogados de Chile, AG, alleging non-observance by Chile of Convention No. 29.

(GB.303/19/6, paragraph 39.)
Seventh Supplementary Report: Report of the committee set up to examine the representation alleging non-observance by Argentina of the Indigenous and Tribal Peoples Convention, 1989 (No. 169), made under article 24 of the ILO Constitution by the Education Workers’ Union of Rio Negro (UNTER), local section affiliated to the Confederation of Education Workers of Argentina (CTERA) (GB.303/19/7)

Governing Body decision:

366. The Governing Body approved the report contained in document GB.303/19/7 and, in the light of the conclusions contained in paragraphs 60 to 99:

(a) requested the Government to continue making efforts to strengthen the CPI and ensure that, when elections of indigenous representatives are held in all the provinces, all the indigenous communities and all institutions considered by the communities themselves to be representative are invited to participate;

(b) requested the Government to carry out consultations with regard to the bills referred to in paragraphs 12 and 64 of this report and to establish mechanisms to ensure that consultations with indigenous peoples take place whenever legislative or administrative measures that may directly affect them are being considered. The consultations should be carried out sufficiently early so as to be effective and meaningful;

(c) requested the Government to ensure that, in implementing Act No. 26.160, all communities and truly representative institutions of the indigenous peoples likely to be directly affected are consulted and able to participate;

(d) requested the Government to ensure that, in accordance with the principle of concurrent powers of national and provincial authorities, effective consultation and participation mechanisms are established involving all the truly representative organizations of the indigenous peoples, as set out in paragraphs 75, 76 and 80 of this report, in particular in the process of implementing national Act No. 26.160;

(e) requested the Government in implementing Act No. 26.160 to make substantial efforts, in consultation with and with the participation of the indigenous people of Rio Negro Province, to clarify: (1) the difficulties in the procedures for regularizing land, with a view to developing a rapid and accessible procedure that meets the requirements of Article 14, paragraph 3, of the Convention; (2) the question of the levy for land use referred to in paragraph 92 of the representation; (3) any problems in obtaining legal personality; and (4) the issue of dispersed communities and their land rights;

(f) requested the Government to make efforts to ensure that measures are adopted in Rio Negro Province, including interim measures, with the participation of the indigenous people involved, to ensure that indigenous stockbreeders have easy access to marks and signs certificates and carry on their activities in conditions of equality, and to strengthen that activity in accordance with the terms of Article 23 of the Convention;
(g) invited the Government to provide information to the Office regarding the implementation of the issues raised above for examination by the Committee of Experts on the Application of Conventions and Recommendations.

367. The Governing Body adopted the report, in particular paragraph 100, and declared the proceedings closed. (GB.303/19/7, paragraphs 100 and 101.)

Eighth Supplementary Report: Observance by Zimbabwe of the Freedom of Association and Protection of the Right to Organise Convention, 1948 (No. 87), and the Right to Organise and Collective Bargaining Convention, 1949 (No. 98): Appointment by the Governing Body of a Commission of Inquiry in accordance with article 26(4) of the Constitution of the ILO

Composition of the Commission of Inquiry
(GB.303/19/8)

Governing Body decision:

368. The Governing Body appointed the persons to serve on the Commission of Inquiry established to examine this question. (GB.303/19/8, paragraph 3.)

369. Moving to another issue, the Worker Vice-Chairperson drew attention to the fact that certain members of the Governing Body might face problems of personal safety on returning to their countries. He referred more specifically to the case of the Worker member of Swaziland.

370. The Employer Vice-Chairperson and the Government representatives of Argentina, France, Germany, Italy, South Africa and Sweden supported the previous statement.

371. The Director-General explained that he believed it was his responsibility to monitor the safety of trade unionists who had received threats, and that he would follow the situation closely.

372. The Employer Vice-President expressed the concern of his group at the increase in the number of acts of maritime piracy on the Red Sea and in the Indian Ocean, which constituted a threat to trade, to the security of workers aboard vessels and to all those whose jobs depended on maritime trade.

373. The Worker Vice-Chairperson and the Government representative of the Islamic Republic of Iran associated themselves with this statement.

Twentieth item on the agenda

REPORT OF THE OFFICERS OF THE GOVERNING BODY

Complaints concerning the non-observance by Zimbabwe of the Freedom of Association and Protection of the Right to Organise Convention, 1948 (No. 87), and the Right to Organise and Collective Bargaining Convention, 1949 (No. 98), made by delegates to the 97th Session (2008) of the International Labour Conference under article 26 of the ILO Constitution
(GB.303/20/1)

374. The Worker Vice-Chairperson recalled that the issue had already been considered on several occasions by the Committee on the Application of Standards and that the
Committee on Freedom of Association had also made a number of observations. Under the circumstances, it was necessary not only to establish a commission of inquiry, as indicated in paragraph 12 (a) of the point for decision, but also to act swiftly.

375. The Employer Vice-Chairperson said that he shared the views of the Worker Vice-Chairperson and supported paragraph 12(a) which called for the appointment of a commission of inquiry in accordance with the procedure provided for in article 26 of the Constitution.

376. The Government representative of France said that he was speaking on behalf of the European Union; the candidate countries Turkey, Croatia and The former Yugoslav Republic of Macedonia; the stabilization process and potential candidate countries Albania, Bosnia and Herzegovina, and Montenegro; Iceland and Norway, European Free Trade Association countries and members of the European Economic Area; and Switzerland; as well as the Republic of Moldova and Ukraine, which aligned themselves with his statement. He expressed his concern about the obstructionist attitude of the Government of Zimbabwe, which refused to cooperate at all, despite high-level technical assistance proposals, and was hampering the work of the Organization’s supervisory mechanisms. Furthermore, the catastrophic economic and humanitarian situation in that country called for a swift and credible political response, and the European Union therefore encouraged the institution of the procedure provided for in article 26 of the Constitution and the appointment of a commission of inquiry to consider the allegations.

377. The Government representative of the United States recalled that the Committee on Freedom of Association, the Committee of Experts and the Committee on the Application of Standards of the Conference had deemed the situation in Zimbabwe to be of great concern. Given the gravity of the situation, he called for the appointment of a commission of inquiry and considered that the procedure should be instituted at the present session of the Governing Body, with immediate effect.

Governing Body decision:

378. The Governing Body decided to institute the procedure provided for in article 26, paragraph 4, of the Constitution and consequently to proceed to appoint a Commission of Inquiry to consider the allegations referred to in paragraphs 1 and 2 of document GB.303/20/1. (GB.303/20/1, paragraph 12.)

*Invitation of an intergovernmental organization* (GB.303/20/2)

Governing Body decision:

379. The Governing Body decided to invite MERCOSUR to attend its 303rd (November 2008) and 304th (March 2009) Sessions. (GB.303/20/2, paragraph 4.)

Twenty-first item on the agenda

*Composition and agenda of standing bodies and meetings* (GB.303/21)

380. During the discussion, the Government representative of France took the floor on behalf of the European Union, and noted that the candidate countries (Turkey, Croatia, and The former Yugoslav Republic of Macedonia), the countries of the Stabilisation and Association Process and potential candidates (Albania, Bosnia and Herzegovina,
Montenegro and Serbia), the member countries of the European Free Trade Association (EFTA) countries and the European Economic Area (EEA), Switzerland, as well as Ukraine, the Republic of Moldova and Armenia, also aligned themselves with his statement. He requested that the issue of limiting the terms of office of the Director-General of the ILO be included at the next session of the Governing Body in March 2009.

381. A Government representative of Canada, also speaking on behalf of Australia, Japan, the Republic of Korea and the United States, a Government representative of Mexico and the Employer Vice-Chairperson, supported this decision.

Committee of Experts on the Application of Conventions and Recommendations

Reappointments

Governing Body decision:

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

– Mr Lelio Bentes Correa (Brazil);
– Mr Abdul G. Koroma (Sierra Leone);
– Ms Ruma Pal (India);
– Mr Yozo Yokota (Japan).

(GB.303/21, paragraph 1.)

Joint ILO/UNESCO Committee of Experts on the Application of the Recommendations concerning Teaching Personnel (CEART)

Reappointments

Governing Body decision:

383. The Governing Body, on the recommendation of its Officers, reappointed until 31 December 2012 according to its mandate, the following ILO 1 nominated members of the Joint ILO/UNESCO Committee of Experts on the Application of the Recommendations concerning Teaching Personnel (CEART):

– Ms Maria A.T. Gallart (Argentina);
– Ms Anne-Lise Hostmark Tarrou (Norway);
– Mr Mark Thompson (Canada).

(GB.303/21, paragraph 2.)

1 The Director-General of UNESCO has taken parallel action for the reappointment or appointment of six additional members of the Joint ILO/UNESCO Committee of Experts.
New appointments

Governing Body decision:

384. In order to fill the vacancies left by the resignations of Ms Eddah W. Gachukia (Kenya), Ms Lilia S. Garcia (Philippines), and the Hon. Justice L.T. Olsson (Australia), the Governing Body, on the recommendation of its Officers, appointed the following persons as members of the Joint Committee for a period until 31 December 2012:

– Ms Beatrice Avalos Bevan (Chile), Associate Researcher, Centro de Investigación Avanzada en Educación, University of Chile, and former National Coordinator of the Programme for Improvement of Teacher Education, Chile;

– Ms Linda McNeil Chisholm (South Africa), Director, Education, Science and Skills Development, Human Sciences Research Council;

– Mr Masaaki Katsuno (Japan), Associate Professor, School of Development and Policy Studies, Graduate School of Education, University of Tokyo.

(GB.303/21, paragraph 3.)

Eighth European Regional Meeting
(Lisbon, 9–13 February 2009)

Agenda and working languages

Governing Body decision:

385. The Governing Body approved:

(a) the proposed agenda for this Regional Meeting;

(b) that simultaneous interpreting services be provided in English, French, Spanish, German and Russian, and also in Portuguese;

(c) that the report of the Director-General that would serve as a basis for the discussion be published in English, French, Spanish, German, Russian and Portuguese;

(d) that the report of the Meeting, the report of the Credentials Committee and the conclusions and the resolutions which might be adopted, would be published at the Meeting itself only in English, French and Spanish.

(GB.303/21, paragraph 5, and the Chairperson’s proposal.)

Invitation of international non-governmental organizations

Governing Body decision:

386. The Governing Body, on the recommendation of its Officers, authorized the Director-General to invite the following international non-governmental organizations to be represented at the Meeting as observers:
– Business Europe;
– European Trade Union Confederation;
– General Confederation of Trade Unions;
– Global March Against Child Labour;
– SOLIDAR.

(GB.303/21, paragraph 9.)

Subcommittee on Wages of Seafarers of the Joint Maritime Commission
(Geneva, 12–13 February 2009)

Agenda

Governing Body decision:

387. The Governing Body, on the recommendation of its Officers, approved the proposed agenda for this Meeting of the Subcommittee. (GB.303/21, paragraph 13.)

Global Dialogue Forum on Decent Work in Local Government Procurement for Infrastructure Provision
(Geneva, 17–18 February 2009)

Invitation of international non-governmental organizations

Governing Body decision:

388. The Governing Body, on the recommendation of its Officers, authorized the Director-General to invite the following international non-governmental organizations to be represented at the Meeting as observers:

– Building and Wood Workers’ International (BWI);
– Confederation of International Contractors’ Associations (CICA).

(GB.303/21, paragraph 15.)

Ninth Session of the Joint ILO/IMO Ad Hoc Expert Working Group on Liability and Compensation regarding Claims for Death, Personal Injury and Abandonment of Seafarers
(Geneva, 2–6 March 2009)

Invitation of international non-governmental organizations

Governing Body decision:

389. The Governing Body, on the recommendation of its Officers, agreed that the following international non-governmental organizations also be invited to be represented as observers at the Ninth Session of the Joint Working Group:
– **International Christian Maritime Association**;

– **International Collective in Support of Fish Workers**;

– **International Committee on Seafarers’ Welfare**;

– **International Maritime Committee**;

– **Mission to Seamen**.

(GB.303/21, paragraph 20.)

*Business Responses to the Demographic Challenge*

*Geneva, 28–29 April 2009*

**Composition and agenda**

390. **The Governing Body, on the recommendation of its Officers, approved the proposed composition formula and agenda for this Meeting.** (GB.303/21, paragraphs 22 and 24.)

*Tripartite Meeting on Promoting Social Dialogue and Good Industrial Relations from Oil and Gas Exploration and Production to Oil and Gas Distribution*

*Geneva, 11–14 May 2009*

**Invitation of intergovernmental organizations**

**Governing Body decision:**

391. **The Governing Body, on the recommendation of its Officers, authorized the Director-General to invite the following organizations to be represented at the Meeting as observers:**

– **International Association of Oil and Gas Producers (OGP)**;

– **International Chemical Employers’ Labour Relations Committee (LRC)**;

– **International Federation of Chemical, Energy, Mine and General Workers’ Unions (ICEM)**;

– **International Petroleum Industry Environmental Conservation Association (IPIECA)**;

– **International Transport Workers’ Federation (ITF)**;

– **The oil companies’ European association for environment, health and safety in refining and distribution (CONCAWE)**;

– **Society of Petroleum Engineers (SPE)**.

(GB.3030/21, paragraphs 26 to 27.)
Meeting of Experts on the Revision of the List of Occupational Diseases
(Recommendation No. 194)
(Geneva, 27–30 October 2009)

Composition and agenda

Governing Body decision:

392. The Governing Body, on the recommendation of its Officers, approved the proposed composition formula and agenda for this Meeting. (GB.303/21, paragraphs 31 and 33.)

Invitation of international non-governmental organizations

Governing Body decision:

393. The Governing Body, on the recommendation of its Officers, authorized the Director-General to invite the following non-governmental organizations to be represented at the Meeting as observers:

– International Association for Agricultural Medicine and Rural Health (IAAMRH);
– International Commission on Occupational Health (ICOH);
– International Council of Nurses (ICN);
– International Ergonomics Association (IEA);
– International Federation of Chemical, Energy, Mine and General Workers’ Union (ICEM);
– International Maritime Health Association (IMHA);
– International Occupational Hygiene Association (IOHA);
– International Social Security Association (ISSA).

(GB.303/21, paragraphs 35 and 36.)

Appointment of Governing Body representatives on various bodies

Tripartite Meeting on Promoting Social Dialogue and Good Industrial Relations from Oil and Gas Exploration and Production to Oil and Gas Distribution
(Geneva, 11–14 May 2009)

Governing Body decision:

394. The Governing Body appointed Mr Goran Trogen, Employer member, as its representative and as Chairperson at the Meeting. (GB.303/21, paragraph 37.)
Information notes

PROGRAMME OF MEETINGS FOR THE REMAINDER OF 2008 AND FOR 2009
(GB.303/Inf.1)

APPROVED SYMPOSIA, SEMINARS, WORKSHOPS AND SIMILAR MEETINGS
(GB.303/Inf.2)

REQUESTS FROM INTERNATIONAL NON-GOVERNMENTAL ORGANIZATIONS
WISHING TO BE REPRESENTED AT THE 98TH SESSION (2009) OF
THE INTERNATIONAL LABOUR CONFERENCE
(GB.303/Inf.3)

395. The Governing Body took note of the information presented.
Annexe/Appendix/Anexo

303e session – Genève – novembre 2008
303rd session – Geneva – November 2008
303.ª reunión – Ginebra – noviembre de 2008

Liste définitive des personnes assistant à la session
Final list of persons attending the session
Lista final de las personas presentes en la reunión

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Category</th>
<th>Number</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Membres gouvernementaux titulaires</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Membres gouvernementaux adjoints</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Membres employeurs titulaires</td>
<td>16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Membres employeurs adjoints</td>
<td>17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Membres travailleurs titulaires</td>
<td>19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Membres travailleurs adjoints</td>
<td>20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Représentants d’autres Etats Membres</td>
<td>21</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Représentants d’organisations internationales gouvernementales</td>
<td>26</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Représentants d’organisations internationales non gouvernementales</td>
<td>28</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mouvements de libération</td>
<td>30</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Regular Government members</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Membres gouvernementaux titulaires</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Miembros gubernamentales titulares</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Président du Conseil d’administration:</th>
<th>H.E. Mr Z. Rapacki (Poland)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Chairperson of the Governing Body:</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Presidente del Consejo de Administración:</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Afrique du Sud  South Africa  Sudáfrica**

Mr M. MDLADLANA, Minister of Labour.  
*substitute(s):*

Ms G. MTSHALI, Ambassador, Permanent Mission, Geneva.  
Mr M. SKHOSANA, Director International Relations, Ministry of Labour.  
Mr S. NDEBELE, Minister Counsellor, Ministry of Labour.  
*accompanied by:*

Ms N. NONJOJO, Chief of Staff, Ministry of Labour.

**Allemagne  Germany  Alemania**

Mr K. BRANDNER, Permanent Secretary, Federal Ministry of Labour and Social Affairs.  
*substitute(s):*

Mr W. KOBERSKI, Director, European and International Employment and Social Policy, Federal Ministry of Labour and Social Affairs.  
Ms S. HOFFMANN, Director, International Employment and Social Policy, Federal Ministry of Labour and Social Affairs.  
Mr L. VOGT, Head of Division for ILO and UN Affairs, Federal Ministry of Labour and Social Affairs.  
Ms F. FITTING, Counsellor, Permanent Mission, Geneva.  
*accompanied by:*

Mr A. OTTING, Officer, ILO (United Nations) Section, Federal Ministry of Labour and Social Affairs.

**Argentine  Argentina**

Sr. C. TOMADA, Ministro de Trabajo, Empleo y Seguridad Social.  
*suplente(s):*

Sra. N. RIAL, Secretaria de Trabajo, Ministerio de Trabajo, Empleo y Seguridad Social.  
Sr. A. DUMONT, Embajador, Misión Permanente, Ginebra.  
*acompañado(s) de:*

Sr. J. ROSALES, Director de Asuntos Internacionales, Ministerio de Trabajo, Empleo y Seguridad Social.  
Sr. G. CORRES, Subcoordinador de Asuntos Internacionales, Ministerio de Trabajo, Empleo y Seguridad Social.  
Sr. D. CELAYA ÁLVAREZ, Consejero, Misión Permanente, Ginebra.  
Sra. N. NEER, Asesora del Sr. Ministro, Ministerio de Trabajo, Empleo y Seguridad Social.
Sr. A. NEGRO, Director de Ceremonial y Relaciones Institucionales.
Sra. M. ARES, Secretaria del Sr. Ministro.
Sr. E. MARTÍNEZ GONDRA, Ministro, Representante Permanente Alterno, Misión Permanente, Ginebra.

Australie  Austria

Mr J. SMYTHE, Minister (Labour), Permanent Mission, Geneva.

substitute(s):
Mr D. YARDLEY, Director A/g, International Relations Branch, Dept. of Education, Employment and Workplace Relations.
Mr S. THOM, First Secretary, Permanent Mission, Geneva.

Autriche  Austria

Ms I. DEMBSHER, Head of International Social Policy Unit, Federal Ministry of Economic Affairs and Labour.

substitute(s):
Ms E. FEHRINGER, Deputy Director European Labour Law, Federal Ministry of Economic Affairs and Labour.
Mr M. WEIDINGER, First Secretary, Permanent Mission, Geneva.

accompanied by:
Mr R. JELLASITZ, International Labour Market Policy, Federal Ministry of Economic Affairs and Labour.
Mr M. REICHARD, Federal Ministry of International and European Affairs.

Bangladesh

Mr D. BHATTACHARYA, Ambassador and Permanent Representative, Permanent Mission, Geneva.

accompanied by:
Mr M. HAQUE, Secretary, Ministry of Labour and Employment.
Mr M. MOWLA, Counsellor, Permanent Mission, Geneva.
Mr F. KAZI, First Secretary, Permanent Mission, Geneva.

Barbade  Barbados

Mr A. WALTERS, Minister of Labour and Civil Service.

substitute(s):
Mr C. SIMMONS, Permanent Secretary (Labour), Ministry of Labour and Civil Service.

accompanied by:
Mr T. CLARKE, Ambassador, Permanent Mission, Geneva.
Ms E. MARCUS-BURNETT, Counsellor, Permanent Mission, Geneva.
Ms C. BABB-SCHAEFER, Counsellor, Permanent Mission, Geneva.

Brésil  Brazil

Ms M. FARANI AZEVÊDO, Ambassador, Permanent Mission, Geneva.

substitute(s):
Mr A. PAROLA, Minister Counsellor, Permanent Mission, Geneva.

accompanied by:
Mr M. DOS SANTOS BARBOSA, Asesor Especial, Ministerio de Trabajo y Empleo.
Mr S. PAIXÃO PARDO, Coordinador de Asuntos Internacionales, Ministerio de Trabajo y Empleo.
Ms B. DE SOUZA E SILVA, Primer Secretario, Permanent Mission, Geneva.

Burundi

Mme C. NIRAGIRA, ministre de la Fonction publique, du Travail et de la Sécurité sociale.
suppléant(s):
M. P. BARUSASIYEKO, Ambassadeur, Mission permanente, Genève.

accompagné(s) de:
M. A. NYAMITWE, premier conseiller, Mission permanente, Genève.
M. E. NDABISHURIYE, deuxième conseiller, Mission permanente, Genève.

Chine     China

Mr Z. YANG, Vice Minister of Human Resources and Social Security.
Mr B. LI, Ambassador, Permanent Mission, Geneva.

substitute(s):
Mr M. JIANG, Deputy Director-General, Department of International Cooperation, Ministry of Human Resources and Social Security.
Ms X. LU, Counsellor, Permanent Mission, Geneva.

accompanied by:
Mr X. QIU, Director-General, Department of Labour Relations, Ministry of Human Resources and Social Security.
Mr Y. LIU, Director-General, Guangdong Provincial Bureau, Ministry of Labour and Social Security.
Ms J. GUAN, Director, Department of International Cooperation, Ministry of Labour and Social Security.
Mr S. RONG, First Secretary, Permanent Mission, Geneva.
Ms C. ZHANG, Official, Department of International Cooperation, Ministry of Human Resources and Social Security.
Mr Z. SUN, Official, General Office, Ministry of Human Resources and Social Security.

Etats-Unis     United States

Mr W. TICHENOR, Permanent Representative, Permanent Mission, Geneva.

Ms C. PONTICELLI, Deputy Undersecretary for International Affairs and US Representative on the ILO Governing Body, Department of Labor.

substitute(s):
Mr R. SHEPARD, Director, Office of International Relations and United States Substitute Representative on the GB, Bureau of International Labor Affairs, Department of Labor.

accompagné(s) de:
Ms J. BARRETT, International Relations Officer, Bureau of International Labor Affairs, Department of Labor.
Ms A. CHICK, Political Officer, Permanent Mission, Geneva.
Ms J. MISNER, Senior Adviser for International Labor Standards, Bureau of International Labor Affairs, Department of Labor.
Ms C. NEVILLE, Foreign Affairs Officer, Office of Specialized Technical Agencies, Department of State.

France     Francia

M. G. de ROBIEN, délégué gouvernemental de la France au Conseil d’administration du BIT.
M. J. MATTEI, Ambassadeur, Représentant permanent, Mission permanente, Genève.

suppléant(s):
M. M. BOISNEL, Délégation aux affaires européennes et internationales (DAEI), ministère du Travail, des Relations sociales, de la Famille et de la Solidarité.

accompagné(s) de:
M. C. GUILHOU, Représentant permanent adjoint, Mission permanente, Genève.
Mme B. de LAVALETTE, chargée de mission auprès du délégué gouvernemental, Mission permanente, Genève.
M. M. THIERRY, Inspecteur général des affaires sociales, ministère du Travail, des Relations sociales, de la Famille et de la Solidarité.
M. L. de WILLIENCOURT, sous-directeur des affaires économiques, ministère des Affaires étrangères et européennes.
M. H. MARTIN, conseiller pour les affaires sociales, Mission permanente, Genève.
M. A. ALLO, conseiller, Mission permanente, Genève.
Mme L. BERNARDI, sous-direction des affaires économiques, ministère des Affaires étrangères et européennes.
Mme M. COENT, délégation aux affaires européennes et internationales, ministère du Travail, des Relations sociales, de la Famille et de la Solidarité.
Mme C. PARRA, délégation aux affaires européennes et internationales, ministère du Travail, des Relations sociales, de la Famille et de la Solidarité.
M. M. TAHERI, délégation aux affaires européennes et internationales, ministère du Travail, des Relations sociales, de la Famille et de la Solidarité.
Mme C. FURTADE, chargée de mission, Mission permanente, Genève.
M. A. SAILHAN, chargé de mission, Mission permanente, Genève.
Mme D. TISSIER, secrétaire, Mission permanente, Genève.

Ms S. PILLAI, Secretary, Ministry of Labour and Employment.

accompanied by:
Mr S. SINGH, Ambassador, Permanent Mission, Geneva.
Mr R. CHANDER, Deputy Permanent Representative, Permanent Mission, Geneva.
Mr S.K. SRIVASTAVA, Joint Secretary, Ministry of Labour and Employment.
Mr V. TRIVEDI, Counsellor, Permanent Mission, Geneva.
Mr VIKAS, Director, Ministry of Labour and Employment.
Ms I. GUPTA, Undersecretary, Ministry of Labour and Employment.

Italie Italy Italia

Mr G. CARACCILO, Ambassador, Permanent Mission, Geneva.

accompanied by:
Ms M. ZAPPIA, First Counsellor, Permanent Mission, Geneva.
Mr L. FANTINI, Deputy Government Delegate, Ministry of Labour and Social Policy.
Mr L. TRENTO, General Director for Working Conditions.
Ms M. BERGER, Government Vice Delegate, Ministry of Labour and Social Policy.
Ms V. RUSSO, Expert, Ministry of Foreign Affairs.
Ms G. CRAGNOLINI, Stagiaire, Permanent Mission, Geneva.
Ms V. REMIDA, Stagiaire, Permanent Mission, Geneva.

Inde India

Ms S. PILLAI, Secretary, Ministry of Labour and Employment.

accompanied by:
Mr S. SINGH, Ambassador, Permanent Mission, Geneva.
Mr R. CHANDER, Deputy Permanent Representative, Permanent Mission, Geneva.
Mr S.K. SRIVASTAVA, Joint Secretary, Ministry of Labour and Employment.
Mr V. TRIVEDI, Counsellor, Permanent Mission, Geneva.
Mr VIKAS, Director, Ministry of Labour and Employment.
Ms I. GUPTA, Undersecretary, Ministry of Labour and Employment.

accompanied by:
Mr M. MIYAGAWA, Ambassador, Deputy Permanent Representative, Permanent Mission, Geneva.
Mr T. MURAKI, Assistant Minister for International Affairs, Minister’s Secretariat, Ministry of Health, Labour and Welfare.
Mr A. ISOMATA, Minister, Permanent Mission, Geneva.
Mr N. TAGAYA, Vice-Director for Industrial Relations, Ministry of Health, Labour and Welfare.
Mr A. MIKAMI, Counsellor, Permanent Mission, Geneva.

accompany by:
Mr T. TERAMOTO, Adviser, International Affairs Division, Minister’s Secretariat, Ministry of Health, Labour and Welfare.
Mr J. HOSHIDA, Deputy Director, International Affairs Division, Minister’s Secretariat, Ministry of Health, Labour and Welfare.
Mr N. SAITO, Section Chief, International Affairs Division, Ministry’s Secretariat, Ministry of Health, Labour and Welfare.
Mr K. SAITO, First Secretary, Permanent Mission, Geneva.
Mr O. YAMANAKA, Counsellor, Permanent Mission, Geneva.
Mr S. HORINO, Deputy Director, Elementary and Secondary Education Planning Division, Ministry of Education, Culture, Sports, Science and Technology.

suppléant(s):
Mᵐᵉ F. RODRIGUES, Ambassadrice, Mission permanente, Genève.
M. J. DENGO, premier secrétaire, Mission permanente, Genève.

accompagné(s) de:
M. E. MAVILA, chef département, INEFP.
Mᵐᵉ H. ERNESTO, déléguée INSS.
M. J. BUANA, assistant au ministre, Mission permanente, Genève.

Jordanie    Jordan    Jordania

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

substitute(s):
Mr S. DAJANI, Special Counsellor for ILO Affairs, Permanent Mission, Geneva.

accompanied by:
Mr M. HINDAWI, Third Secretary, Permanent Mission, Geneva.

Mexique    Mexico    México

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

suplente(s):
Sra. M. GÓMEZ OLIVER, Embajadora, Representante Alterna, Misión Permanente, Ginebra.

acompañado(s) de:
Sr. J. MORALES GAUZÍN, Director para la OIT, Secretaria del Trabajo y Previsión Social.
Sr. J. LORENZO DOMÍNGUEZ, Primer Secretario, Misión Permanente, Ginebra.
Sr. A. ROSAS RODRÍGUEZ, Subdirector para la OIT, Secretaría del Trabajo y Previsión Social.

Nigéria    Nigeria

Mr H. LAWAL, Minister of Labour and Productivity.

substitute(s):
Mr S. KASSIM, Permanent Secretary, Ministry of Labour and Productivity.
Mr P. AJUZIE, Labour Attaché, Permanent Mission, Geneva.
Mr V. TUKURA, Special Assistant to the Minister, Federal Ministry of Employment, Labour and Productivity.

accompanied by:
Ms V. EGHOBAMIEN, Director, TUSIR.
Mr E. IZUEGBU, Director, PAR&S.
Ms O. AJAYI, Director, E&W.
Mr P. OKWULEHIE, Director, Federal Ministry of Labour.
Mr N. SADA, Deputy Director, Procurement.
Mr O.C. ILLOH, Deputy Director, Federal Ministry of Labour.
Ms T. BRAIMAH, Assistant Director, Federal Ministry of Labour.
Mr G. MAMMAN, Assistant Director, Federal Ministry of Labour.
Mr J. AGÓHA, Principal Labour Officer, Ministry of Labour and Productivity.
Mr A. ABUBAKAR MOHAMMED, Director-General (NDE), Ministry of Labour and Productivity.
Mr P. BDLIYA, Director-General, NPC, Federal Ministry of Employment, Labour and Productivity.
Mr J. OLANREWAJU, Director, MINILS, Federal Ministry of Employment, Labour and Productivity.

Mᵐᵉ M. TAIPÓ, ministre du Travail.
M. J. MAHOQUE, directeur général, Institut pour l’emploi et la formation professionnelle.

Mozambique
**Panama  Panamá**

Sr. E. SALAMÍN JAÉN, Ministro de Trabajo y Desarrollo Laboral, Ministerio de Trabajo y Desarrollo Laboral.

*suplente(s):*

Sr. J. CASTILLERO CORREA, Embajador, Misión Permanente, Ginebra.


*acompañado(s) de:*

Sr. R. AGUILAR JAÉN, Asesor de Asuntos Internacionales, Ministerio de Trabajo y Desarrollo Laboral.

Sr. S. SANFORD, Secretario General del MITRADEL.

Sr. J. EPIFANIO HERRERA, Asistente, Ministerio de Trabajo y Desarrollo Laboral.

Sr. A. MENDOZA, Consejero, Misión Permanente, Ginebra.

Sr. J. CORRALES, Consejero, Misión Permanente, Ginebra.

Sr. E. GARCÍA DE PAREDES, Pasante, Misión Permanente, Ginebra.

---

**Pologne  Poland  Polonia**

Mr R. MLECZKO, Undersecretary of State, Ministry of Labour and Social Policy.

*substitute(s):*

Ms R. LEMIESZEWSKA, Adviser to the Minister, Social Dialogue and Social Partnership Department, Ministry of Labour and Social Policy.

*accompanied by:*

Ms M. WYSOCKA-MADEJ, Chief Expert, Social Dialogue and Social Partnership Department, Ministry of Labour and Social Policy.

Ms Z. MEcyCH-TyLER, Senior Specialist in the Department of Labour Market, Ministry of Labour and Social Policy.

---

**Royaume-Uni  United Kingdom  Reino Unido**

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

Ms C. KITSELL, First Secretary, Permanent Mission, Geneva.

*substitute(s):*

Mr P. RUSSELL, Senior Policy Adviser, Joint International Unit, Department for Work and Pensions and Department for Education and Skills.

Mr N. WAPSPHERE, Second Secretary, Permanent Mission, Geneva.

*accompanied by:*

Ms L. TILLETT, Head of the International Employment and Social Policy Division, Joint International Unit, Department for Work and Pensions, Department for Education and Skills.

Mr R. HASSAN, Senior Policy Adviser, Department for Work and Pensions and Department for Education and Skills.

Ms C. ATKINSON, Department for International Development.

Mr P. GOODERHAM, Ambassador, Permanent Mission, Geneva.

Mr S. BLAND, Counsellor, Permanent Mission, Geneva.

Ms K. JONES, Legal Adviser, Permanent Mission, Geneva.

Ms N. DONKOR, Attaché, Permanent Mission, Geneva.

Ms T. MCGRATH, Attaché, Permanent Mission, Geneva.

---

**Fédération de Russie  Russian Federation  Federación de Rusia**

Mr A. SAFONOV, Deputy Minister, Representative of the Government of the Russian Federation in the Governing Body, Ministry of Health and Social Development.

Mr V. LOSHCHININ, Ambassador Extraordinary and Plenipotentiary, Permanent Representative, Permanent Mission, Geneva.
accompanied by:

Mr I. DUBOV, Director, Department of International Cooperation and Public Relations, Ministry of Health and Social Development.

Mr A. MATVEEV, Deputy Permanent Representative, Permanent Mission, Geneva.

Mr V. STEPANOV, Head of Section, Department of International Cooperation and Public Relations, Ministry of Health and Social Development.

Ms A.O. SHELOVNINA, Counsellor, Ministry of Health and Social Development.

Mr A. BASHKIN, Senior Counsellor, Permanent Mission, Geneva.

Mr D. GONCHAR, Counsellor, Permanent Mission, Geneva.

Ms T.G. NOVITSKAYA, Head of Section, Department of Employment and Labour Migration, Ministry of Health and Social Development.

Mr A. KULIKOV, Expert-Consultant, Department of Wage, Labour Protection and Social Partnership, Ministry of Health and Social Development.

Ms O. KUZNETSOVA, Head of Section, Legal Department, Federal Service on Labour and Employment.

Ms O. IVANOVA, Deputy Head of Section, Legal Department, Federal Service on Labour and Employment.

Mr S. KUZMENKOV, First Secretary, Permanent Mission, Geneva.

Mr E. KALUGIN, Third Secretary, Permanent Mission, Geneva.

Mr A. SEDLOV, Senior Expert, Institute of Economy of the Russian Academy of Sciences.

Mr Y. TAN, Ambassador, Permanent Mission, Geneva.

substitute(s):

Mr Y. ONG, Divisional Director, Labour Relations and Welfare Division, Ministry of Manpower.

Ms H. NG, Deputy Director, Labour Relations and Workplaces Division, Ministry of Manpower.

accompanied by:

Ms J. SHEN, Senior Assistant Director, Workplace Policy and Strategy Division, Ministry of Manpower.

Mr K. PERIYASAMY, Assistant Director, Work Pass Division, Ministry of Manpower.

Mr P. NG, Senior Manager, Labour Relations and Workplaces Division, Ministry of Manpower.

Ms Y. OW, First Secretary (United Nations), Permanent Mission, Geneva.

Ms L. NG, First Secretary (Labour), Permanent Mission, Geneva.

République-Unie de Tanzanie
United Republic of Tanzania
República Unida de Tanzanía

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

substitute(s):

Mr L. KOMBA, Permanent Secretary, Ministry of Labour, Employment and Youth Development.

accompanied by:

Mr E. NDIMBO, Director of Employment, Ministry of Labour, Employment and Youth Development.

Ms H. WENGA, Assistant Labour Commissioner, Ministry of Labour, Employment and Youth Development.

Mr B. LUVANDA, First Secretary, Permanent Mission, Geneva.

Ms C. MELKIOR, Labour Officer, Ministry of Labour, Employment and Youth Development.

Ms J. SHAIDI, Director for Youth Development, Ministry of Labour, Employment and Youth Development.

République tchèque
Czech Republic
República Checa

Mr M. ZABOKRTSKÝ, Director, Department for European Union and International Relations, Ministry of Labour and Social Affairs.
substitute(s):

Mr P. POKORNÝ, Department for European Union and International Cooperation, Ministry of Labour and Social Affairs.
Mr J. BLAZEK, Second Secretary, Permanent Mission, Geneva.

accompanied by:

Mr J. SKORPÍK, Department of Social Insurance, Ministry of Labour and Social Affairs.
Ms E. NEMECKOVÁ, Department for European Union and International Relations, Ministry of Labour and Social Affairs.

Tunisie  Tunisia  Túnez

M. A. KHELIFI, directeur général du travail, ministère des Affaires sociales, de la Solidarité et des Tunisiens à l’étranger.

suppléant(s):

M. M. BEL KEFI, chargé d’affaires a.i. de Tunisie, Mission permanente, Genève.
Mme S. CHOUBA, chargée de mission, directrice de la coopération internationale et des relations extérieures, ministère des Affaires sociales, de la Solidarité et des Tunisiens à l’étranger.
M. M. BDIOUI, conseiller des affaires étrangères, Mission permanente, Genève.
M. B. MASMOUDI, secrétaire des affaires étrangères, Mission permanente, Genève.

Venezuela (Rép. bolivarienne du)
Venezuela (Bolivarian Rep.)
Venezuela (Rep. Bolivariana de)

Sr. G. MUNDARAÍN HERNÁNDEZ, Embajador, Representante Permanente, Misión Permanente, Ginebra.

suplente(s):

Sr. J. ARIAS PALACIO, Embajador Alterno, Misión Permanente, Ginebra.
Sr. C. AGUILAR, Asesor del Despacho, Ministerio del Trabajo y la Seguridad Social.
Sra. O. CABRERA, Consultora Jurídica Adjunta, Ministerio del Poder Popular para el Trabajo y Seguridad Social.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Membres gouvernementaux adjoints</th>
<th>Deputy Government members</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>M. P. MAETER, président du comité</td>
<td>Mr P. DRAGANOV, Ambassador,</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>de direction, Service public fédéral</td>
<td>Permanent Representative,</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>emploi, travail et concertation</td>
<td>Permanent Mission, Geneva.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>sociale.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>suppléant(s):</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>M. A. VAN MEEUWEN, Ambassadeur,</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mission permanente, Genève.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>accompagné(s) de:</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>M. F. VANDAMME, conseiller général</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>de la Division des affaires</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>internationales, Service public</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>fédéral emploi, travail et</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>concertation sociale.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mme B. MINART, Représentante</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>permanente adjointe, Mission</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>permanente, Genève.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>M. E. ADRIAENSENS, ministre</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>conseiller, Mission</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>permanente, Genève.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>M. J. DE PRETER, premier</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>conseiller, Mission permanent</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Genève.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mme L. EVEN, attachée, Division</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>des affaires internationales,</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Service public fédéral emploi,</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>travail et concertation sociale.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>M. K. DIERCKX, conseiller, délégué</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>de la Communauté flamande de</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Belgique et de la Région flamande,</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mission permanente, Genève.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>M. M. CLAIRBOIS, conseiller,</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>délégué de la Communauté française</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>de Belgique et de la Région</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>wallonne, Mission permanente,</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Genève.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>M. E. MAES, délégué de la Région</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>de Bruxelles-Capitale.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mme V. KINOO, stagiaire, délégation</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>de la Communauté française de</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Belgique et de la Région</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>wallonne, Mission permanente,</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Genève.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>suppléant(s):</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mme M. KORA ZAKI LEADI, directrice</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>générale du travail, ministère</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>du Travail et de la Fonction</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>publique.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>M. N. AKIBOU, chargé d’affaires</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>du Bénin près la Suisse, Mission</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>permanente, Genève.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>accompagné(s) de:</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mme G. GAZARD, directrice des</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>normes du travail, ministère</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>du Travail et de la Fonction</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>publique.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>M. Y. TOSSAVI, directeur du Fonds</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>de développement et de la formation</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>professionnelle continue et de</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>l’apprentissage, ministère du Travail</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>et de la Fonction publique.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>M. J. DAGA, directeur des prestations de la</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Caisse nationale de sécurité sociale,</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ministère du Travail et de la Fonction</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>publique.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bénin</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>M. C. AGUIA, ministre du Travail</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>et de la Fonction publique.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Cambodge  Cambodia  Camboya

Mr S. SENG, Director-General of Labour, Ministry of Labour and Vocational Training.
Mr V. HEANG, Director of International Cooperation Department, Ministry of Labour and Vocational Training.

accompanied by:
Mr M. SOURNG, Deputy Director-General of Administration and Finance, Ministry of Labour and Vocational Training.
Mr H. VENG, Director of Child Labour Department, Ministry of Labour and Vocational Training.
Mr T. KOY, Director of Labour Dispute Department, Ministry of Labour and Vocational Training.
Mr R. NGUY, Deputy Director of International Cooperation Department, Ministry of Labour and Vocational Training.
Mr L. SOKHAN, Second Secretary, Permanent Mission, Geneva.

Canada  Canadá

Ms D. YOUNG, Director-General, Intergovernmental and International Labour Affairs, Human Resources and Social Development Canada.

substitute(s):
Ms D. ROBINSON, Director, International Labour Affairs, Human Resources and Social Development Canada.
Mr P. OLDHAM, Counsellor, Permanent Mission, Geneva.

accompanied by:
Mr D. MERCIER, Senior Policy Analyst, International Labour Affairs, Human Resources and Social Development Canada.

Congo

M. G. ONDONGO, ministre du Travail, de l’Emploi et de la Sécurité sociale.

suppléant(s):
M. R. MENGIA, Ambassadeur, Représentant permanent, Mission permanente, Genève.
Egypte  Egypt  Egipto
Ms A. ABDEL HADY ABDELGHANY, Minister of Manpower and Migration, Ministry of Manpower and Migration.

substitute(s):
Mr H. BADR, Ambassador, Permanent Mission, Geneva.
Mr A. THAB GAMALELDIN, Minister Plenipotentiary, Permanent Mission, Geneva.
Mr A. EDDINE, Deputy Minister, Deputy of the Permanent Representative, Permanent Mission, Geneva.

accompanied by:
Mr Z. BOGHDADY, Director of Cabinet of Minister of Manpower and Migration, Permanent Mission, Geneva.
Mr Y. HASSAN, Counsellor, Permanent Mission, Geneva.
Mr A. KHAATTAB, Officer-in-Charge of ILO, Ministry of Foreign Affairs.
Mr O. EL DANDARAWY, Second Secretary, Permanent Mission, Geneva.

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

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

Espagne  Spain  España
Sr. L. GONZÁLEZ GALLARDO, Subsecretario de Trabajo e Inmigración, Ministerio de Trabajo e Inmigración.

suplente(s):
Sr. J. GARRIGUES FLÓREZ, Embajador, Misión Permanente, Ginebra.

acompañado de:
Sr. E. RODRÍGUEZ VERA, Secretario General Técnico, Ministerio de Trabajo e Inmigración.
Sr. F. ARNAU NAVARRO, Consejero de Trabajo e Inmigración, Misión Permanente, Ginebra.
Sr. F. APARICIO ÁLVAREZ, Consejero, Misión Permanente, Ginebra.

Ghana
Mr K. BAAH-DUODU, Ambassador, Permanent Mission, Geneva.

substitute(s):
Ms D. RICHTER, Counsellor, Permanent Mission, Geneva.

Guinée  Guinea

suppléant(s):
M. P. MONLMON, conseiller chargé des affaires sociales et humanitaires, Mission permanente, Genève.

Hongrie  Hungary  Hungría
Ms M. LADÓ, Director-General for European Integration and International Affairs, Ministry of Social Affairs and Labour.

substitute(s):
Mr L. SZÉKELY, Chargé d’affaires, Permanent Mission, Geneva.
accompanied by:

Mr L. HÉTHY, Deputy Director-General, Central Employment Office.
Mr P. KLEKNER, Chief Adviser to the Minister, Ministry of Social Affairs and Labour.
Ms Á. FORGÓ, Attaché, Permanent Mission, Geneva.

Mr S. MOVALIZADEH, Deputy Minister of International, Legal and Parliamentary Affairs.

substitute(s):

Mr H. NATEGH NOURI, Director-General for International Affairs, Ministry of Labour and Social Affairs.

accompanied by:

Mr M. SEPEHRI, President of Labour and Social Security Institute, Ministry of Labour and Social Affairs.
Mr A. ENAYAT, Dean, Faculty of Health, Safety and Environment, Ministry of Labour and Social Affairs.
Mr J. AZIZI, Director-General for Employment Development, Ministry of Labour and Social Affairs.
Mr I. ZARIFIAZAD, Deputy Director-General for Regulation and Supervision of Industrial Relations, Ministry of Labour and Social Affairs.
Mr S. FATTAHI, Head of Office of Supervision and Coordination of Dispute Settlement Boards, Ministry of Labour and Social Affairs.
Ms M. FARMAHINI FARAHANI, Senior Expert, International Relations, Ministry of Labour and Social Affairs.
Ms N. RAHGOZAR, Expert, International Relations, Ministry of Labour and Social Affairs.

Kenya

Mr S. OJAAMONG, Assistant Minister for Labour, Ministry of Labour.

substitute(s):

Ms B. KITUYI, Permanent Secretary, Permanent Mission, Geneva.
Ms M. NZOMO, Ambassador, Permanent Mission, Geneva.
Mr G. OMONDI, Counsellor - Labour, Permanent Mission, Geneva.

accompanied by:

Mr P. WAMOTO, Deputy Labour Commissioner, Ministry of Labour and Human Resource Development.
Ms M. MULI, Director of Human Resources Management, Ministry of Labour and Human Resource Development.
Mr S. KARICHO, Technical Adviser, Permanent Mission, Geneva.

République islamique d’Iran
Islamic Republic of Iran
República Islámica del Irán

Mr S. MOVALIZADEH, Deputy Minister of International, Legal and Parliamentary Affairs.

substitute(s):

Mr H. NATEGH NOURI, Director-General for International Affairs, Ministry of Labour and Social Affairs.

accompanied by:

Mr M. SEPEHRI, President of Labour and Social Security Institute, Ministry of Labour and Social Affairs.
Mr A. ENAYAT, Dean, Faculty of Health, Safety and Environment, Ministry of Labour and Social Affairs.
Mr J. AZIZI, Director-General for Employment Development, Ministry of Labour and Social Affairs.
Mr I. ZARIFIAZAD, Deputy Director-General for Regulation and Supervision of Industrial Relations, Ministry of Labour and Social Affairs.
Mr S. FATTAHI, Head of Office of Supervision and Coordination of Dispute Settlement Boards, Ministry of Labour and Social Affairs.
Ms M. FARMAHINI FARAHANI, Senior Expert, International Relations, Ministry of Labour and Social Affairs.
Ms N. RAHGOZAR, Expert, International Relations, Ministry of Labour and Social Affairs.

Liban
Lebanon
Líbano

M. M. FNEICH, ministre du Travail, ministère du Travail.

 suppléant(s):

M. A. RAZZOUK, directeur général par intérim, ministère du Travail.

accompagné(s) de:

M. N. AL KHATIB, conseiller du ministre du Travail.
M. A. FAYAD, chef de Cabinet, ministère du Travail.
Mme M. SAAB, cheffe de la Section des relations extérieures, ministère du Travail.

Lituanie
Lithuania
Lituania

Mr R. KAIRELIS, State Secretary, Ministry of Social Security and Labour.

substitute(s):

Mr E. BORISOVAS, Ambassador, Permanent Mission, Geneva.

accompagné by:

Ms R. KAZLAUSKIENE, Director of the Department of International Affairs, Ministry of Social Security and Labour.
Ms R. ALISAUSKIENE, First Secretary, Permanent Mission, Geneva.
Ms K. JUODPUSYTE, Senior Specialist of the Department of European Integration and International Relations, Ministry of Social Security and Labour.

Ms R. ALISAUSKIENE, First Secretary, Permanent Mission, Geneva.
Ms K. JUODPUSYTE, Senior Specialist of the Department of European Integration and International Relations, Ministry of Social Security and Labour.

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

substitute(s):
Mr Z. AKRAM, Ambassador, Permanent Mission, Geneva.

accompanied by:
Ms T. JANJUA, Deputy Permanent Representative, Permanent Mission, Geneva.
Mr S. NUSRAT, Joint Secretary (LW), Labour and Manpower Division.
Mr S. GILLANI, Counsellor, Permanent Mission, Geneva.
Mr A. ISMAIL, Counsellor, Permanent Mission, Geneva.

Pérou Peru Perú
Sr. J. VILLASANTE ARANÍBAR, Ministro de Trabajo y Promoción del Empleo.

suplente(s):
Sr. E. PONCE VIVANCO, Embajador, Misión Permanente, Ginebra.
Sr. E. SCHIALER SALCEDO, Representante Permanente Adjunto.
Sr. C. CHOCANO BURGA, Ministro Consejero, Misión Permanente, Ginebra.
Sr. I. ZEVALLOS AGUILAR, Segundo Secretario, Misión Permanente, Ginebra.

Portugal
M. F. XAVIER ESTEVES, Ambassadeur, Mission permanente, Genève.

suppléant(s):
M. J. DE SOUSA FIALHO, Conseiller, Mission permanente, Genève.

Qatar
Mr M. AL-SULAITIN, Third Secretary, Permanent Mission, Geneva.

Soudan Sudán
Mr A. MAGAYA, Minister of Labour, Public Service and Human Resources Development.

substitute(s):
Mr J. LUETH UKEC, Permanent Representative, Permanent Mission, Geneva.

accompanied by:
Mr M. AL-HASSAN HAMID, Director, External Relations Department, Ministry of Labour and Administrative Reform.
Mr A. WIDATALLAH, Ministry of Labour and Administrative Reform.
Mr Z. ABDELFADEL KAYAB, Counsellor, Permanent Mission, Geneva.

Suède Sweden Suecia
Mr C. ERIKSSON, Director, Special Expert, Ministry for Employment.

substitute(s):
Ms M. MARTIGNIER, Counsellor, Permanent Mission, Geneva.

accompanied by:
Ms P. HERZFELD OLSSON, Deputy Director, Ministry for Employment.
Mr H. HUITFELDT, Senior Adviser, Swedish International Development Cooperation Agency (Sida).
Mr L. REMAHL, Senior Administrative Officer, Swedish Maritime Administration.
Mr H. DAHLGREN, Ambassador, Permanent Representative, Permanent Mission, Geneva.

Thaïlande Thailand Tailandia
Mr S. CHOOMRAT, Permanent Secretary, Ministry of Labour.
Mr S. PHUANGKETKEOW, Ambassador, Permanent Representative, Permanent Mission, Geneva.

substitute(s):
Mr V. ISARABHAKDI, Ambassador and Deputy Permanent Representative, Permanent Mission, Geneva.
Mr M. TANGUSAHA, Adviser of Permanent Secretary.
Mr S. GUKUN, Director, Bureau of International Coordination, Ministry of Labour.

accompanied by:
Mr P. CHARNBHUMIDOL, Minister Counsellor, Permanent Mission, Geneva.
Mr V. THANGHONG, Minister Counsellor (Labour), Permanent Mission, Geneva.
Ms P. WITTHYACHUMNARNKUL, Senior Labour Officer, Ministry of Labour.
Mr B. SIRIPREECHA, Senior Labour Officer, Ministry of Labour.
Ms K. WONGSUWAN, Director of International Affairs Division, Ministry of Labour.
Ms S. POTHIDEJ, Senior Labour Officer, Ministry of Labour.
Ms K. KAEWSRISANG, International Affairs Officer, Ministry of Labour.

Uruguay

Sr. E. BONOMI, Ministro de Trabajo y Seguridad Social.

suplente(s):
Sra. L. TRUCILLO, Representante Permanente Alterna, Misión Permanente, Ginebra.

acompañado(s) de:
Sra. S. WEISSEL, Encargada de la Asesoría en Relaciones Internacionales, Ministerio de Trabajo y Seguridad Social.
Sr. G. WINTER, Consejero, Misión Permanente, Ginebra.
Sr. C. PEREIRA, Misión Permanente, Ginebra.

Viet Nam

Mr A. VU, Minister Counsellor, Permanent Mission, Geneva.

substitute(s):
Mr X. NGUYEN, Counsellor, International Organisations, Officer-in-Charge, Permanent Mission, Geneva.

accompanied by:
Mr P. TRAN, Director, Ministry of Labour, Invalids and Social Affairs.

Zambie Zambia

Mr R. MUKUMA, Minister of Labour and Social Security.

substitute(s):
Mr N. CHISUPA, Permanent Secretary, Ministry of Labour and Social Security.
Mr M. DAKA, Chargé d’affaires, Permanent Mission, Geneva.
Ms I. MATYOLA-LEMBA, First Secretary, Permanent Mission, Geneva.

accompanied by:
Mr S. KAPILIMA, Assistant Labour Commissioner, Ministry of Labour and Social Security.
Mr G. MUKOSIKU, Chief Inspector of Factories, Ministry of Labour and Social Security.
Mr O. NGEMEZULU, Acting Chief Planner, Ministry of Labour and Social Security.
### Membres employeurs titulaires

**Membres employeurs titulaires**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Membre</th>
<th>Nom</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Sr. D. FUNES DE RIOJA</td>
<td>(Argentina)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sr. A. PEÑALOSA</td>
<td>(IOE)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mr B. WILTON</td>
<td>(IOE)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Regular Employer members

**Miembros empleadores titulares**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Membre</th>
<th>Nom</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Mr P. ANDERSON</td>
<td>(Australia), Chief Executive, Australian Chamber of Commerce and Industry (ACCI).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mr A. DAHLAN</td>
<td>(Saudi Arabia), Representative, Council of Saudi Chamber of Commerce and Industry.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sr. D. FUNES DE RIOJA</td>
<td>(Argentina), Vicepresidente del Consejo de Administración de la OIT, Funes de Rioja y Asociados.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ms R. GOLDBERG</td>
<td>(United States), Executive Vice-President and Senior Policy Officer, United States Council for International Business.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ms R. HORNUNG-DRAUS</td>
<td>(Germany), Managing Director, European Affairs and International Social Policy, Confederation of German Employers’ Associations (BDA).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>M. E. JULIEN</td>
<td>(France), directeur adjoint, Affaires sociales, européennes et internationales, Mouvement des entreprises de France (MEDEF).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mr A. MOORE</td>
<td>(United Kingdom), Special Adviser, Confederation of British Industry (CBI).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>M. B. NACOULMA</td>
<td>(Burkina Faso), président de Comité statuaire, CNPB.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mr O. OSHINOWO</td>
<td>(Nigeria), Director-General, NECA.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>M. M. OULD SIDI</td>
<td>(Mauritania), administrateur directeur général, Société nationale industrielle et minière.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mr T. SUZUKI</td>
<td>(Japan), Executive Adviser, Nippon-keidanren International Cooperation Center.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mr A. TABANI</td>
<td>(Pakistan), President Employers’ Federation of Pakistan Chairman Seri Sugar Mills Limited.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sr. M. TERÁN MOSCOSO</td>
<td>(Ecuador), Federación Nacional de Cámaras de Industrias del Ecuador.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mr G. TROGEN</td>
<td>(Sweden), Adviser International Affairs, Confederation of Swedish Enterprise.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

---

Ms A. GERSTEIN, accompanying Ms Hornung-Draus.
Mr A. GREENE, accompanying Ms Goldberg.
Mr H. MATSUI, accompanying Mr Suzuki.
Membres employeurs adjoints  
Deputy Employer members  
Miembros empleadores adjuntos

Mr S. ALLAM (Egypt), Chairman of Labour Committee, Federation of Egyptian Industries.

Sr. G. ARTHUR ERRÁZURIZ (Chile), Presidente, Asociación Gremial de Administradoras de Fondos de Pensiones.

Mme F. AWASSI ATSIMADJA (Gabon), secrétaire générale SIMPEX, Confédération patronale gabonaise.

Mr B. BURKETT (Canada), Partner, Heenan Blaikie Cie.

Mr L. CHEN (China), Executive Vice-President and Director-General, China Enterprise Confederation (CEC).

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

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

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

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

Mr D. LIMA GODOY (Brazil), Consulto Senio, Confederación Nacional de la Industria (CNI).

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

Mr Y. MODI (India), Chairman and CEO, Great Eastern Energy Corp. Ltd.

Ms J. MUGO (Kenya), Executive Director, Federation of Kenya Employers.

Mr P. O’REILLY (New Zealand), Chief Executive, Business New Zealand.

Mr A. RAMADASS (Malaysia), Vice-President, Malaysian Employers Federation (MEF).

Mr C. RENIQUE (Netherlands), Head, Education and Training Department, VNO-NCW.

M. L. TRAORE (Mali), secrétaire général, Conseil national du patronat du Mali.

Sr. A. URTECHO LÓPEZ (Honduras), Asesor Legal, Consejo Hondureño de la Empresa Privada (COHEP).

Mr V. VAN VUUREN (South Africa), Chief Operations Officer, Business Unity South Africa.

M. R. KURINKO, accompagnant M. Gryshchenko.
Ms H. LIU, accompanying Mr Chen.
Ms M. MOSKVINA, accompanying Mr Eremeev.
Mr B. PANT, accompanying Mr Modi.
Suppléants assistant à la session:
Substitute attending the session:
Suplentes presentes en la reunión:

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

Mr V. GRYSCHEKNO (Ukraine), First Deputy Chairman, Federation of Employers of Ukraine.

Sr. A. LINERO MENDOZA (Panamá), Asesor y Miembro de la Comisión Laboral, Consejo Nacional de la Empresa Privada (CONEP).

M. E. MEGATELI (Algérie), secrétaire général, Confédération générale des entreprises algériennes (CGEA).

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

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

Mr K. RAHMAN (Bangladesh), President, Bangladesh Employers’ Federation.

Mr P. TOMEK (Austria), Representative, Federation of Austrian Industry.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Membres travailleurs titulaires</th>
<th>Regular Worker members</th>
<th>Miembros trabajadores titulares</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Vice-président du Conseil d'administration:</td>
<td>Sir Roy TROTMAN (Barbados)</td>
<td>Vicepresidente del Consejo de Administración:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vice-Chairperson of the Governing Body:</td>
<td></td>
<td>Vicepresidente del Consejo de Administración:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Viceprésidente du Conseil d'administration:</td>
<td></td>
<td>Vicepresidente del Consejo de Administración:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Secrétaire du groupe des travailleurs:</td>
<td></td>
<td>Secretaria del Grupo de los Trabajadores:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Secretary of the Workers’ group:</td>
<td>Ms A. BIONDI (ITUC)</td>
<td>Secretaria del Grupo de los Trabajadores:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Secrétaire adjointe du groupe des travailleurs:</td>
<td></td>
<td>Secretaria del Grupo de los Trabajadores:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Deputy Secretary of the Workers’ group:</td>
<td>Sra. R. GONZÁLEZ (ITUC)</td>
<td>Secretaria del Grupo de los Trabajadores:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Secrétaire adjunto del Grupo de los Trabajadores:</td>
<td></td>
<td>Secretaria del Grupo de los Trabajadores:</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Sir R. TROTMAN (Barbados), Vice-Chairperson of the ILO Governing Body, General Secretary, Barbados Workers’ Union.

Mr N. ADYANTHAYA (India), Vice-President, Indian National Trade Union Congress.

Ms S. BURROW (Australia), President, Australian Council of Trade Unions.

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

Mme R. DIALLO (Guinée), secrétaire générale, Confédération nationale des travailleurs de Guinée (CNTG).

Sr. J. GÓMEZ ESGUERRA (Colombia), Secretario General, Confederación General del Trabajo (CGT).

Mr S. GURNEY (United Kingdom), Policy Officer of the British Trade Union Congress.

Mr S. NAKAJIMA (Japan), International Representative, Japanese Trade Union Confederation (JTUC-RENGO).

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

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

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

Ms T. SUNDNES (Norway), Confederal Secretary, Norwegian Confederation of Trade Unions (LO-Norway).

Ms A. WOLANSKA (Poland), Head, International Department NSZZ “Solidarnosc”.

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

Ms M. HAYASHIBALA, accompanying Mr Nakajima.
Membres travailleurs adjoints
Deputy Worker members
Miembros trabajadores adjuntos

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

Mr M. AL-MA’AYTA (Jordan), President, General Federation of Jordanian Labour Unions.

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

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

Mr A. BENEDETTI (Brazil), Secretario de Relaciones Internacionales, Unión General de Trabajadores (UGT).

Ms C. DEL RIO (Italy), Head of International Department, Unione Italiana del Lavoro (UIL).

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

Mme M. FRANCISCO (Angola), secrétaire, Relations internationales, Union nationale des travailleurs de l’Angola - Confédération syndicale (UNTA-CS).

M. B. HOSSU (Roumanie), président, Confédération nationale syndicale.

Mr A. HUSSAIN (Bahrain), General Federation of Bahrain Workers.

Mr G. JIANG (China), Executive Committee Member, All-China Federation of Trade Unions (ACFTU).

Sr. G. MARTÍNEZ (Argentina), Confederación General del Trabajo.

Ms L. MATIBENGA (Zimbabwe), Vice-President, Zimbabwe Congress of Trade Unions (ZCTU).

M. A. PALANGA (Togo), secrétaire général, Confédération nationale des travailleurs du Togo (CNTT).

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

Mr J. SITHOLE (Swaziland), Secretary General, Swaziland Federation of Trade Unions.

M. Y. VEYRIER (France), secrétaire confédéral, CGT-Force Ouvrière.

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

M. T. AERTS, accompagnant M. Edström.

Suppléants assistant à la session:
Substitute attending the session:
Suplentes presentes en la reunión:

Mr K. GYÖRGY (Hungary), International Secretary, National Confederation of Hungarian Trade Unions.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Algérie</th>
<th>Algeria</th>
<th>Argelia</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>M. I. JAZAÏRY, Ambassadeur, Représentant permanent, Mission permanente, Genève.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>M. B. CHEBIHI, ministre conseiller, Mission permanente, Genève.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>M. E. EL BEY, conseiller diplomatique, Mission permanente, Genève.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Chili</th>
<th>Chile</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Sr. O. ANDRADE, Ministro del Trabajo y Previsión Social</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sr. C. PORTALES, Embajador, Misión Permanente, Ginebra.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sr. A. ROGERS, Ministro Consejero, Misión Permanente, Ginebra.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sr. B. DEL PICÓ RUBIO, Segundo Secretario, Misión Permanente, Ginebra.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sra. A. ESQUIVEL UTRERAS, Agregada Laboral, Misión Permanente, Ginebra.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Angol\n</th>
<th>Angola</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>M. A. DO NASCIMENTO, Ambassadeur, Mission permanente, Genève.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mme A. M. COSTA, troisième secrétaire, Mission permanente, Genève.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Colombie</th>
<th>Colombia</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Sra. C. FORERO UCROS, Embajadora, Representante Permanente, Misión Permanente, Ginebra.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sra. A. MENDOZA AGUDELO, Ministro Consejero, Misión Permanente, Ginebra.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sr. A. AYALA, Ministro Consejero, Misión Permanente, Ginebra.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Costa Rica</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Sra. L. THOMPSON, Embajadora, Representante Permanente, Misión Permanente, Ginebra.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sr. C. GARBANZO BLANCO, Ministro Consejero, Misión Permanente, Ginebra.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Côte d’Ivoire</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>M. H. OULAYE, ministre de la Fonction publique et de l’Emploi.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>M. G. GAUZE, Ambassadeur, Mission permanente, Genève.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>M. D. BOLLOU BI DJEHIFI, directeur général du travail, ministère de la Fonction publique et de l’Emploi.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Country</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Danemark</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dinamarca</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Denmark</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Djibouti</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Equateur</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Grèce</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gabon</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Grèce</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Haïti</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Country</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Honduras</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Indonésie Indonesia</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Iraq</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Israël Israel</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lettonie Latvia Letonia</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jamahiriya arabe libyenne</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Libyan Arab Jamahiriya</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jamahiriya Arabe Libia</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Malaisie Malaysia Malasia</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Malawi</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Mauritanie  Mauritania

M. T. OULD ABDI SALEM, second conseiller, Mission permanente, Genève.

Myanmar

Mr U. WUNNA MAUNG LWIN, Ambassador, Permanent Representative, Permanent Mission, Geneva.
Mr U. KYAN MYO HTUT, Deputy Permanent Representative, Permanent Mission, Geneva.
Mr U. WYNN THEIN, Minister-Counsellor, Permanent Mission, Geneva.
Mr U. AUNG LATT, Counsellor, Permanent Mission, Geneva.
Mr U. THANT SIN, First Secretary, Permanent Mission, Geneva.
Mr U. ZAW HTUT, Attaché, Permanent Mission, Geneva.

Norvège  Norway  Noruega

Ms B. ANGELL-HASEN, Ambassador, Permanent Representative, Permanent Mission, Geneva.
Ms G. WAAGE, Counsellor, Permanent Mission, Geneva.
Mr A. MUNDAL, Executive Officer, Ministry of Foreign Affairs.
Ms A. SCHIVE VIKEN, Trainee, Permanent Mission, Geneva.
Ms E. JARBO, Deputy Director-General, Ministry of Labour and Social Inclusion.
Ms G. YTTERDAL, Adviser, Ministry of Labour and Social Inclusion.
Ms T. WIDTH, Ministry of Labour and Social Inclusion.

Nouvelle-Zélande  New Zealand  Nueva Zelandia

Ms N. CRENNAN, Deputy Director, International Services, Department of Labour.
Mr J. STRANG, Manager, Policy Manager, Employment Relations Policy, Workplace, Department of Labour.

Oman  Omán

Mr Y. AL-WABAIBI, Ambassador, Permanent Mission, Geneva.
Mr M. AL-RAWAHI, Counsellor, Permanent Mission, Geneva.
Ms N. AL-HASHMI, First Secretary, Permanent Mission, Geneva.

Pays-Bas  Netherlands  Países Bajos

Mr L. BEETS, Director for International Affairs, Ministry of Social Affairs and Employment.
Ms S. TERSTAL, Deputy Permanent Representative, Permanent Mission, Geneva.
Mr W. BEL, Deputy Director for International Affairs, Ministry of Social Affairs and Employment.
Mr E. DRIESEN, First Secretary, Permanent Mission, Geneva.
Mr O. BRINKMAN, Policy Adviser, Ministry of Social Affairs and Employment.
Ms C. VAN DER LOUW, Policy Adviser, Ministry of Social Affairs and Employment.
Mr J. RUNHAAR, Policy Adviser, Ministry of Foreign Affairs.

Philippines  Filipinas

Ms E. BASILIO, Ambassador Extraordinary and Plenipotentiary and Permanent Representative, Permanent Mission, Geneva.
Ms V. EASTWOOD, Attaché, Permanent Mission, Geneva.

Rép. démocratique du Congo  Democratic Republic of the Congo  República Democrática del Congo

M. S. MUTOMB MUJING, deuxième conseiller, Mission permanente, Genève.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>République dominicaine</th>
<th>Dominican Republic</th>
<th>República Dominicana</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Sr. H. HERNÁNDEZ SÁNCHEZ, Embajador, Representante Permanente, Misión Permanente, Ginebra.</td>
<td></td>
<td>M. A. RENGGLI, DFAE, Division politique III, Section Organisations internationales et politique d’accueil, Berne.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sra. Y. ROMÁN MALDONADO, Ministra Consejera, Misión Permanente, Ginebra.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Roumanie</th>
<th>Romania</th>
<th>Rumania</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>M. D. COSTEA, Ambassadeur, Mission permanente, Genève.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mme A. SPANU, attachée, Mission permanente, Genève.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Saint-Siège</th>
<th>The Holy See</th>
<th>Santa Sede</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Dr. P. GUTIÉRREZ, membre, Mission permanente, Genève.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Slovénie</th>
<th>Slovenia</th>
<th>Eslovenia</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Mr B. JERMAN, Minister Counsellor, Permanent Mission, Geneva.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mr A. LOGAR, Ambassador Extraordinary and Plenipotentiary and Permanent Representative, Permanent Mission, Geneva.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Suisse</th>
<th>Switzerland</th>
<th>Suiza</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>M. J. ELMIGER, Ambassadeur, chef des affaires internationales du travail, direction du travail.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mme V. BERSET BIRCHER, Affaires internationales du travail, direction du travail.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mme V. BATTISTON, Mission permanente, Genève.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>M. N. PLATTNER, troisième secrétaire, Mission permanente, Genève.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Représentants d’organisations internationales gouvernementales
Representatives of international governmental organizations
Representantes de organizaciones internacionales gubernamentales

Nations Unies
United Nations
Naciones Unidas

Ms J. BEAGLE, Deputy Director-General.
Ms V. COLLANTES, External Relations and Inter-Agency Affairs Officer, Office of the Director-General.

Programme des Nations Unies pour le développement
United Nations Development Programme
Programa de las Naciones Unidas para el Desarrollo

Ms C. ROBERT, Partnerships and Resource Mobilisation specialist.

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

Mr M. AHMAD, Director, FAO Liaison Office.

Organisation des Nations Unies pour l'éducation, la science et la culture
United Nations Educational, Scientific and Cultural Organization
Organización de las Naciones Unidas para la Educación, la Ciencia y la Cultura

Mr L. TIBÚRCIO, Director, Liaison Office, Geneva.

Organisation mondiale du commerce
World Trade Organization
Organización Mundial del Comercio

Ms M. PELLAN, Counsellor, Trade and Environment Division.

Organisation internationale de la francophonie
Organización Internacional de la Francofonía

M. L. BARARUNYERETSE, Ambassadeur, Représentant permanent.
Mme S. COULIBALY LEROY, Représentante permanente adjointe.
Mme C. LEQUE, conseillère aux affaires économiques et de développement.
Union africaine
African Union
Unión Africana

Ms K. MASRI, Ambassador, Permanent Observer.
Ms B. NAIDOO, First Secretary.

Organisation arabe du travail
Arab Labour Organization
Organización Árabe del Trabajo

Mr A. LUQMAN, Director-General.
Mr A. AL-HUMSI, Head of the Permanent Delegation of the ALO in Geneva.
Ms A. HILAL, Permanent Delegation of the ALO in Geneva.
Ms Z. KASBAOUI, Permanent Delegation of the ALO in Geneva.

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

Mr S. ALFARARGI, Ambassador, Permanent Observer.
Mr A. EL-FATHI, Minister Plenipotentiary.
Mr H. TOUNSI, Staff Member of the Delegation.

Conseil de l'Europe
Council of Europe
Consejo de Europa

Mr D. ILIOPOULOS, Ambassador, General Secretariat.
Mr G. HOUTTUIN, Minister Counsellor, General Secretariat.
Mr B. HANSES, First Counsellor, Liaison Office of the General Secretariat.
Mr S. VAN THIEL, Counsellor, Liaison Office of the General Secretariat.
Ms K. FRÖLIN, Adviser, Liaison Office of the General Secretariat.

Commission européenne
European Commission
Comisión Europea

Mr E. GUTH, Head of the European Commission Delegation, Geneva.
Mr X. PRATS MONNE, Director, DG Employment and Social Affairs.
Ms J. HIVONNET, First Counsellor of the Permanent Delegation.
Ms S. BOEHMERT, Official, Directorate General for Employment and Social Affairs, Int. Affairs and Enlargement.
Mr C. DUFOUR, UN Affairs Officer, Permanent Delegation.
Mr J. CLARKE, Minister.
Ms M. NILSSON, Adviser, Permanent Delegation.
### Représentants d'organisations internationales non gouvernementales assistant à titre d'observateurs

Representatives of international non-governmental organizations as observers

Representantes de organizaciones internacionales no gubernamentales presentes con carácter de observadores

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Organization</th>
<th>Chairperson</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Alliance coopérative internationale</td>
<td>Mr. I. MacDonald, Director-General</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>International Co-operative Alliance</td>
<td>Ms M. Chavez Hertig, Deputy Director-General</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Alianza Cooperativa Internacional</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fédération syndicale mondiale</td>
<td>Sra. O. Oviedo de la Torre, Representante Permanente</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>World Federation of Trade Unions</td>
<td>Sr. A. Miro, Secretario General Adjunto</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Federación Sindical Mundial</td>
<td>Sra. V. Moukano, Miembro, Secretaria Jóvenes Trabajadores</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Sra. A. Avella, Representante</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Organisation internationale des employeurs</td>
<td>Mr. A. Peñalosa, Secretary-General</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>International Organization of Employers</td>
<td>Mr. B. Wilton, Deputy Secretary-General</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Organización Internacional de Empleadores</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Organisation de l'unité syndicale africaine</td>
<td>Mr. H. Sunmonu, Secretary-General</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Organization of African Trade Union Unity</td>
<td>Mr. A. Diallo, OATUU Permanent Representative in Geneva</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Organización para la Unidad Sindical Africana</td>
<td>Mr. D. Diop, Assistant Secretary-General</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Association internationale de la sécurité sociale</td>
<td>Mr. H. Konkolewsky, Secretary-General</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>International Social Security Association</td>
<td>Mr. J. Thirion, Chief of Finance and Administration</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Ms A. BIONDI, Director, Geneva Office.
Ms R. GONZÁLEZ, Assistant Director, Geneva Office.
Ms E. BUSSER, Assistant, Geneva Office.
Mr A. AFFOLTER, Assistant.
| **Mouvement de libération**  
| **Liberation movement**  
| **Movimiento de liberación** |

**Palestine  Palestine  Palestina**

Mr B. HIJAZI, First Secretary.  
Dr. I. KHRAISHI, Ambassador of Palestine.  
Mr I. MUSA, Counsellor, Permanent Observer Mission of Palestine in Geneva.