



PART TWO

OBSERVATIONS AND INFORMATION CONCERNING PARTICULAR COUNTRIES**I. OBSERVATIONS AND INFORMATION CONCERNING REPORTS ON RATIFIED CONVENTIONS
(ARTICLE 22 OF THE CONSTITUTION)****A. General Observations and Information concerning Certain Countries***(a) Failure to supply reports for the past two years or more on the application of ratified Conventions*

The Employer members explained that the use of the term “automatic cases” could be misunderstood in that such term seemed unimportant. However, these cases were very important and were only called “automatic” because they were examined every year by the Committee. The fulfilment of the fundamental obligation of member States to submit reports under the ILO Constitution was the basis of the work, not just of this Committee, but of the whole supervisory machinery. If governments did not send their reports on the application of ratified Conventions, the ILO supervisory machinery would fail already before it had been started. The Employer members pointed out that if countries did not fulfil their reporting obligations, then it would be very difficult to evaluate the important issue of whether the contents of the Convention concerned were being complied with. In the view of the Employer members, one of the reasons why some governments were not submitting reports was because they could not implement the provisions of ratified Conventions in their national legislation and practice. The Employer members concluded that these countries should be urged to make every effort to supply reports on ratified Conventions, as it was often the same countries which failed to comply with their reporting obligations.

The Worker members considered that respect for the obligation to supply reports was the crucial element on which the ILO’s supervisory machinery was based. The information contained in these reports had therefore to be as detailed as possible. It was regrettable to note that the changes made in recent years to the reporting procedure to simplify this task for governments had not so far improved the situation. The countries which had not fulfilled their obligations to supply a report held an unfair advantage in that the absence of a report made it impossible for the Committee to examine their national law and practice in respect of ratified Conventions. Consequently, the Committee should strongly urge member States to take the measures necessary to respect this obligation in the future.

A Government representative of Bosnia and Herzegovina explained that the delay in communicating reports under article 22 of the Constitution of the ILO was due to difficulties of internal coordination within Bosnia and Herzegovina. This situation had been noted at the conference on the implementation of the peace agreements, held recently in Brussels. From 8 to 15 May 2000, the ILO had organized a training seminar on the application of international labour standards and on the procedures for the submission of reports. In the context of this technical assistance, it had been decided that the two entities of Bosnia and Herzegovina would transmit the reports required to the Minister of Foreign Affairs, who would subsequently be responsible for communicating them to the ILO. She expressed gratitude on behalf of her Government to the ILO for taking the initiative of supplying the above assistance and hoped that her country would be able to submit the reports due at the earliest possible date.

A Government representative of Burkina Faso referred to paragraphs 82 (failure to supply reports for the past two years or more on the application of ratified Conventions) and 93 (failure to supply information in reply to comments made by the Committee of Experts) of the report of the Committee of Experts and declared that

his country had always regularly fulfilled its constitutional obligations. The failings which had been pointed out by the Committee of Experts concerned the year 1999 and were due to administrative constraints. His Government regretted that this delay had taken place, thus impeding the work of the Committee of Experts, and undertook to respect its obligations under article 22 of the ILO Constitution as soon as possible.

A Government representative of Djibouti stated that his delegation was aware of the delay in the communication of the reports and apologized for it. This delay was due to internal difficulties faced by the administration, which was currently undergoing in-depth restructuring. During the visit of the members of the multidisciplinary advisory team based in Addis Ababa in March 2000, it had been decided that, with the technical support of the ILO, the Government would make up a large part of its delay in this field by the end of summer. However, in order to allow a larger number of civil servants to become involved in the handling of reports on ratified Conventions, the volume of which was very considerable, the Government hoped that the ILO would provide the Labour Ministry with special long-term training in the drafting of reports.

A Government representative of Georgia pointed out that his country did not wish to place itself outside the ILO and its activities. In his country, problems with the submission of reports were mainly due to defects on the administrative level. He assured the Committee that his country would fulfil its reporting obligations which it was currently unable to do because of technical reasons. In this regard, his Government relied on ILO technical assistance to comply with its reporting obligations.

A Government representative of Sao Tome and Principe stated that his Government recognized the obligations incumbent upon it, but due to problems of internal organization and technical reasons, as well as the existence of a certain degree of administrative instability, it had been unable to comply with them. His Government undertook to take all the measures necessary to comply with its obligations, particularly regarding the supply of reports, and he expressed his interest in obtaining the technical assistance of the ILO.

A Government representative of Sierra Leone informed the Committee that his country’s failure to submit reports was not due to lack of political will but rather to the fact that over the last nine years Sierra Leone had been engulfed in a civil war which had witnessed the wanton destruction of lives and property including the Ministry of Labour. Despite the extremely difficult environment in which his Ministry had had to work, he was very much concerned by his country’s failure to report on ratified Conventions. A letter explaining this situation had already been addressed to the ILO. Now that his country was engaged in a reconstruction process, it was his firm intention to ensure that his Government fulfilled its reporting obligations in future. His Government had therefore asked for ILO technical assistance to remedy the situation. With the support of the ILO/MDT based in Dakar, the Ministry archives had been rebuilt and a complete set of the first and last article 22 reports were available and complete. He reiterated his Government’s previous request that training on standards be provided to the officials from the Ministry of Labour as well as to the social partners.

A Government representative of the United Republic of Tanzania assured the Committee that her Government recognized the importance of supplying reports on ratified Conventions, and undertook to submit, as soon as possible, reports on the remaining

Conventions. In this regard her Government had communicated reports on the Forced Labour Convention, 1930 (No. 29), Minimum Age (Industry) Convention (Revised), 1937 (No. 59), Right to Organise and Collective Bargaining Convention, 1949 (No. 98), Abolition of Forced Labour Convention, 1957 (No. 105), Minimum Wage Fixing Convention, 1970 (No. 131), Prevention of Accidents (Seafarers) Convention, 1970 (No. 134), and Tripartite Consultation (International Labour Standards) Convention, 1976 (No. 144). Furthermore, dialogue between the Ministry of Labour and the social partners had ensued for the purpose of ratification of the four remaining unratified core Conventions. She was happy to report that these efforts were fruitful and that the Freedom of Association and Protection of the Right to Organise Convention, 1948 (No. 87), had been ratified earlier this year, and that the Equal Remuneration Convention, 1951 (No. 100), Discrimination (Employment and Occupation) Convention, 1958 (No. 111), and Worst Forms of Child Labour Convention, 1999 (No. 182), had been discussed by the Government and the social partners. The remaining three Conventions would be ratified before the end of the year 2000. Finally, she pointed out that failure to comply with reporting obligations was also due to resource constraints and that her Government would appreciate technical assistance from the ILO in terms of training personnel in the standards field on a continuous basis.

The Worker members observed that only a few of the countries which had been invited to speak on their failure to supply reports had actually done so, while the other countries were absent or not accredited to the Conference. These countries had referred to several factors which explained their failures, such as crisis situations or the conflicts which had been experienced in their countries, the lack of competent staff, the lack of sufficient resources, administrative instability and structural reforms. Nevertheless, it was important to note in this respect the commitments which had been undertaken and the promises which had been made by various speakers. The Committee should continue to urge member States to take all the necessary measures to fulfil this obligation. The need to strengthen the supervisory system, which had been repeatedly underlined by many speakers, would not be put into practice if governments did not respect the obligation to supply reports on the Conventions that they had ratified. Finally, the Committee should remind governments that they could call for the technical assistance of the ILO.

The Employer members endorsed what had just been concluded by the Worker members. The explanations given by some governments for not complying with their reporting obligations were well known to this Committee. With regard to the Government representative of Burkina Faso who had indicated that his Government had only failed to supply reports in 1999, the Employer members recalled that his country had been mentioned in the section of the report which enumerated those countries not having sent reports for a number of years. The Employer members suggested that sanctions could be imposed in cases where reports had not been sent for five or more years. Of course, if such a decision were to be taken, a constitutional amendment would be required. Serious consideration should be given to this idea and it was their hope that it would oblige countries to be more disciplined in complying with their reporting obligations.

The Committee recalled the fundamental importance of the supply of reports on the application of ratified Conventions, not just of their supply as such, but of doing so within the stipulated time limit. This obligation constituted the foundations of the supervisory system and the Committee expressed its firm hope that the Governments of Afghanistan, Armenia, Bosnia and Herzegovina, Burkina Faso, Comoros, Democratic Republic of the Congo, Djibouti, Equatorial Guinea, Georgia, Sao Tome and Principe, Sierra Leone, Solomon Islands, Somalia, United Republic of Tanzania (Zanzibar), The former Yugoslav Republic of Macedonia and Uzbekistan which had not, to date, submitted reports on the application of ratified Conventions would do so as soon as possible. The Committee decided to mention these cases in an appropriate section of its General Report.

(b) Failure to supply first reports on the application of ratified Conventions

The Employer members noted with regret the number of countries that had failed to supply first reports. It was difficult to understand the reason for this problem since, if a member State ratified a Convention, it was assumed to have already examined its law and practice in the relevant area and should not therefore experience any difficulty in compiling its first report. The Employer members stressed the particular importance of first reports, which detailed any changes a country had made to its legislation and practice in order to comply with the Convention ratified. Moreover, first reports were the basis on which the Committee of Experts made its initial assessment on the application of ratified Conventions. Accordingly, the Employer members urged that the Committee

prompt the countries concerned to make a special effort to supply the first reports as soon as possible.

The Worker members endorsed the statement made by the Employer members that member States must carefully examine the situation in their countries prior to ratifying a Convention. It was therefore difficult to understand why a country would delay in submitting its first report. First reports were especially important because they provided the basis for the Committee of Experts' initial evaluation of the application by a country of ratified Conventions. Moreover, supply of first reports helped countries to avoid misunderstandings regarding the application of Conventions from the beginning. The Worker members therefore considered that first reports were essential for the functioning of the supervisory system and urged the member States concerned to make a special effort to comply with their obligation to submit first reports on the application of ratified Conventions.

A Government representative of Georgia recognized the fundamental importance of the two Conventions concerned: Conventions Nos. 105 and 138. He noted that Georgia was preparing its first reports, but that this process had been delayed for technical reasons. His Government would soon submit its first reports on these Conventions with ILO assistance. Finally, he welcomed the introduction of sanctions against member States which failed to comply with their constitutional obligations.

The Employer members expressed regret that only one country had provided information to the Conference Committee on its failure to supply the first reports on ratified Conventions, and noted that this situation would be mentioned in the Committee's conclusions. The Employer members hoped that the Office would contact the countries concerned and remind them of their obligation to submit first reports.

The Worker members endorsed the remarks made by the Employer members, noting that countries often gave the same reasons for failing to fulfil their reporting obligations. It was not acceptable that first reports had been due on ratified Conventions since as long ago as 1992. These constituted serious shortcomings and the Worker members noted that the obligation to submit first reports was of crucial importance. If there were special problems in meeting these obligations, the member States should promptly inform the Office in order to obtain the necessary assistance. The Worker members hoped that the Office would contact the member States to determine their reasons for failing to provide the requested information.

The Committee noted the information supplied and explanations given by the Government representative who took the floor. It reiterated the crucial importance of submitting first reports on the application of ratified Conventions.

The Committee decided to mention these cases: namely *since 1992*: Liberia (for Convention No. 133); *since 1995*: Armenia (for Convention No. 111), Kyrgyzstan (for Convention No. 133); *since 1996*: Armenia (for Conventions Nos. 100, 122, 135 and 151), Grenada (for Convention No. 100), Uzbekistan (for Conventions Nos. 47, 52, 103 and 122); and *since 1998*: Armenia (for Convention No. 174), Equatorial Guinea (for Conventions Nos. 68 and 92), Georgia (for Conventions Nos. 105 and 138), Mongolia (for Convention No. 135, Uzbekistan (for Conventions Nos. 29 and 100), in the appropriate section of the General Report.

(c) Failure to supply information in reply to comments made by the Committee of Experts

The Employer members noted that the Governments' obligation to submit replies to comments made by the Committee of Experts formed part of the general reporting obligations of member States and expressed concern at the increasing number of countries which failed to supply replies to comments made by the Committee of Experts. Noting that a number of reports had been transmitted to the ILO in the period following the publication of the General Report, the Employer members nevertheless expressed concern at the number of countries failing to comply with this obligation and stressed the urgent need for the countries concerned to do so.

The Worker members noted that incomplete, unclear or late responses hampered the task of the Conference Committee and of the Committee of Experts. Governments must therefore take their reporting obligations seriously. The Worker members shared the concerns expressed by the Employer members and hoped that they would not hear the same explanations this year concerning the reasons why governments were unable to respond to the comments made by the Committee of Experts.

A Government representative of Bosnia and Herzegovina stated that the information supplied earlier was unfortunately still valid for the present. Five years after the end of the war, Bosnia and Herzegovina still needed technical assistance from the Office for the submission of its reports.

A Government representative of Burkina Faso stated that the information supplied earlier concerning the reasons for the failure

to supply information in reply to the comments of the Committee of Experts remained valid.

A Government representative of the Central African Republic pointed out that his Government had discharged its obligation to supply information in reply to the comments of the Committee of Experts in February 2000.

A Government representative of Denmark noted that the Faeroe Islands were independent in the area of social politics, and that, despite his Government's best efforts, it could not require the Faeroe Islands to comply with its reporting obligations. He nevertheless assured the Committee that his Government would continue to do its utmost to encourage the Faeroe Islands to supply the reports due.

A Government representative of France noted that his country constituted a type of a borderline case. As Conventions ratified by France had been declared applicable to several non-metropolitan territories by virtue of article 35 of the Constitution, the French Government had had to submit a very high number of reports on the application of Conventions (234 reports in 2000). Possible additional ratifications by France would further increase this number, as well as the scope of the dialogue with the Committee of Experts. Far from Geneva, reports on the application of ratified Conventions and exchanges with the Committee of Experts may seem to be of lesser importance. Without in any way providing a justification, the realities were such that the French Government's efforts to supply the reports due were affected by coordination difficulties with its numerous and dispersed counterparts, as well as a lack of administrative rigour and bad habits. These realities did not correspond to any desire by the French Government to dissimulate anything. The situation noted by the Committee of Experts could not be justified. As he was particularly concerned with the negative consequences that the failure to supply reports or information might have on the supervisory system, he reaffirmed his Government's intention to comply with all its obligations, so that the situation would improve considerably in the future.

A Government representative of Guinea-Bissau stated that his Government had taken note of the comments of the Committee of Experts and undertook to take steps to reply to these comments. An ILO mission was soon to arrive in his country with the aim, inter alia, of dealing with this matter. The Ministry of Public Administration and Labour had been restructured to enable the competent bodies to fulfil their obligations in line with the new reconstruction process in the country.

A Government representative of the Islamic Republic of Iran indicated that her Government's reports on the Conventions in question were being prepared and finalized and that the reports would be transmitted to the ILO within the next three months.

A Government representative of Jamaica regretted that his country had failed to submit timely reports. However, he pointed out that it had been impossible for his Government to fulfil its reporting obligations due to staff changes in the Ministry of Labour. These changes had taken place at critical times for the section responsible for dealing with ILO matters. The situation had now been corrected and reports would be submitted to the ILO within the next three months. He thanked the ILO's Caribbean Office for its assistance and assured the Committee of his Government's full compliance in the future.

A Government representative of Kenya expressed his regret that his country had not submitted timely responses to comments made by the Committee of Experts. He noted that his Government had submitted some of the replies and he assured the Committee that the remaining replies would be transmitted as soon as possible. The delays were not deliberate, but were caused by a high turnover rate among the staff trained to handle ILO reporting responsibilities. Another equally important factor had been the delays experienced in receiving replies from the relevant departments. In order to rectify the situation, his Government had proposed establishing an interministerial committee, to handle ILO matters, consisting of representatives of the Labour Ministry, the Attorney General's Office and the Ministry of Foreign Affairs. The ILO Area Office in Dar-es-Salaam had been asked to provide capacity-building training for members of the interministerial committee and a sensitization workshop had also been requested for staff from other ministries. In order to prevent a recurrence of the problem caused by staff turnover, the ILO had been asked to provide assistance in training three officers to handle ILO reporting obligations, in the hope that they would also pass on their skills to other staff. Kenya remained committed to the ideals of the ILO and would continue to comply with its constitutional obligations.

A Government representative of the Libyan Arab Jamahiriya stated that his country attached special importance to the Committee of Experts' reports, and was always ready to engage in a dialogue with the Committee of Experts on his country's law and practice relating to ratified Conventions. He noted that his Government had taken measures to facilitate the preparation of responses to the

Committee of Experts' comments, including establishing a body composed of labour experts who represented relevant sectors of industry as well as employers' and workers' organizations. This body was responsible for preparing periodic responses to the Committee of Experts' comments, examining Conventions approved by the International Labour Conference to determine conformity with the national legislation and determining whether domestic legislation should be amended to conform with ratified Conventions. The Conventions concerned had been examined by this body and reports would be transmitted to the Committee of Experts. He also noted that the political constraints that had been imposed on his country for seven years had impeded the exchange of information.

A Government representative of Malaysia explained that technical reasons had prevented the supply of information in reply to comments by the Committee of Experts. Although the replies had been drafted by the Ministry of Labour, they had not been sent on by other authorities. His country undertook to supply the requested information in the near future.

A Government representative of the Netherlands (Aruba) expressed regret that his country had once again been called upon to explain its position concerning its failure to fulfil its obligations to supply information in reply to comments made by the Committee of Experts. He reiterated the information provided in previous years to the effect that Aruba was a full and equal member of the Kingdom of the Netherlands and was therefore itself fully responsible for fulfilling its international obligations. The European partner of the Kingdom could therefore do little when Aruba fell behind in fulfilling its reporting obligations. However, he reported that during recent contacts with Aruba he had been told that a number of reports and answers to the comments of the Committee of Experts were on the point of being sent. He nevertheless reiterated his great regret that a country such as his own, which prided itself on being fairly efficient, had failed to discharge important obligations and he hoped for an improvement in the near future.

A Government representative of Nigeria observed that it had been difficult for his country to supply reports during the period 1994-98 because of the political situation in the country, which had adversely affected its labour administration. The dissolution of the National Executive Council of the Nigeria Labour Congress had made the National Labour Advisory Council (NLAC) moribund for that period. In the absence of the NLAC, it had not been possible to consult with employers' and workers' organizations on the reports due to the ILO. However, he affirmed that his Government had amended the anti-labour legislation which had been commented upon by the Committee of Experts. He reported that the NLAC had recently been reconstituted and would meet in due course to deal with all outstanding labour matters. He appealed for co-operation and support in his country's efforts to sustain its nascent democracy.

A Government representative of Sao Tome and Principe stated that he regretted this situation, particularly since his Government had been cited on three occasions in the list of automatic cases. He also referred to the Conventions ratified by Sao Tome and Principe, as well as several laws enacted to implement these Conventions. Finally, he recalled that the main reasons for the failures noted by the Committee of Experts were of an administrative, technical and organizational nature. His Government undertook to remedy the situation.

A Government representative of Sierra Leone explained that the failure to supply information in reply to comments made by the Committee of Experts was not due to a lack of political will by his Government. The long-lasting conflict in his country had made it impossible to provide any comprehensive replies. However, he expressed the firm intention of fulfilling the respective obligations in future.

A Government representative of the Slovak Republic observed that his country had been obliged to supply 15 reports to the ILO for the year 1999 on the measures which had been taken to give effect to ratified Conventions. Seven reports had been supplied in response to requests by the Committee of Experts on Conventions [Nos. 11, 42, 111, 138, 144 and 161](#). However, reports had not been provided on several other Conventions. He explained that his country had experienced staffing problems in the elaboration of the above reports. However, recent information indicated that the requested reports on [Conventions Nos. 12, 17, 89, 130, 148, 155 and 160](#) had been completed and would be communicated to the ILO in July or August after translation into English or French. He apologized for the delay.

A Government representative of Swaziland explained that he could neither confirm nor deny receipt of the requests for the reports from the Committee of Experts. This was because the office of the Commissioner of Labour was located some distance from that of the Principal Secretary of the Ministry. He therefore suggested that all ILO correspondence should in future be addressed to the Principal Secretary, but using the address of the Commission-

er of Labour, who would take the necessary action on all such official correspondence. His country undertook to check whether the requests from the Committee of Experts had reached the office of the Commissioner of Labour and either take appropriate action to send the reports to the ILO or inform the ILO that they had not been received.

A Government representative of the United Republic of Tanzania apologized for the failure to comply with reporting obligations, which had been due to human resources problems, as she had explained previously with regard to Zanzibar. In relation to Conventions Nos. 17 and 144, she observed that the request for information by the Committee of Experts had arisen mainly from the poor drafting of the reports submitted and she undertook to resubmit fuller reports in the near future. With regard to Conventions Nos. 63 and 137, she said that technical assistance might be required for their application. Finally, with regard to [Convention No. 148](#), she acknowledged that an inadequate report had been submitted following the reform of the labour legislation. She re-emphasized the importance of replying to the comments of the Committee of Experts and undertook to supply reports promptly once technical assistance had been provided.

A Government representative of Trinidad and Tobago apologized for the adverse effects her country's failure to supply the requested reports had had on the work of the supervisory mechanisms. She reaffirmed that her Government was very mindful of the comments made by the Committee of Experts and had actively been seeking to take the necessary action to bring its law and practice into line with the provisions of ratified Conventions. The delay in supplying the requested reports was therefore deeply regretted. The Ministry of Labour in her country was endeavouring to find its own equilibrium in an era of modernization and strategic planning. Her Government undertook to provide comprehensive responses within the deadline period.

A Government representative of Uganda noted that although his country had supplied a total of 14 reports, it had failed to provide the reports requested on [Conventions Nos. 105, 144, 154, 159 and 162](#). While he was in Geneva, he would contact the Office to review the action necessary in this regard as soon as possible. There were a number of technical reasons why his country had not fulfilled its reporting requirements. In the first place, his Government had recently carried out an administrative restructuring, with a downsizing of the staff. Difficulties had also arisen in coordination between the ministry responsible for labour matters and other ministries, which were often slow to provide the necessary information. He added that the process of reforming the labour legislation had taken a long time. However, the Workers' Compensation Act had been approved by parliament earlier in the year and was now ready to receive presidential assent. Technical assistance had been received from the ILO and UNDP concerning other labour legislation. He thanked the ILO for its support and technical assistance and looked forward to continued cooperation in the future.

A Government representative of Yemen stated that his Government had a strong will to ratify international labour Conventions. The question of the ratification of the Tripartite Consultation (International Labour Standards) Convention, 1976 ([No. 144](#)), had been submitted to the competent authorities. The instrument of ratification of the Worst Forms of Child Labour Convention, 1999 ([No. 182](#)), had been sent to the ILO and the Government had taken all the necessary measures for the ratification of the Minimum Age Convention, 1973 ([No. 138](#)). The Government ensured the supply of reports on ratified Conventions, but it required technical assistance from the Office for the proper fulfilment of these obligations. In recent years, Yemen had made great progress in the execution of its reporting obligations. The Government had thoroughly examined the observations which the Committee of Experts had addressed to it and had submitted a response to the ILO on that subject. He apologized for the delays incurred, which would be remedied as soon as possible.

The Employer members noted that a variety of explanations had been provided by the governments concerned with regard to their failure to reply to the comments made by the Committee of Experts. In some cases, rather bizarre explanations had been given. The number of countries listed, and the fact that one of them had failed to reply to the comments made on 29 Conventions, meant that the situation penalized the work of the supervisory machinery. They also noted the indications made by many governments that a lack of resources and rapid changes in personnel had caused their failure to reply to the comments of the Committee of Experts. In this respect, they recalled, in the case of changes in the staff dealing with matters related to international labour standards, the relevant professional competence needed to be transmitted. It would not be justified to request technical assistance from the ILO on every occasion that the personnel changed. They emphasized that the obligation to reply to comments made by the Committee of Experts formed part of the general reporting obligations of governments.

Finally, if a decision were to be taken to introduce sanctions in cases of serious failure to comply with reporting obligations, these sanctions should also be applicable in the event of failure to reply to the observations and direct requests of the Committee of Experts.

The Worker members observed that they had been provided with the same explanations as in the past concerning the reasons why governments had been unable to reply to the comments made by the Committee of Experts. Several governments had not spoken on the issue, despite the opportunity afforded to them. Additional steps needed to be taken by these governments to meet their reporting obligations and it was hoped that the situation would improve next year. They emphasized that incomplete reports affected the ability of the Committee of Experts to carry out its functions effectively. They therefore urged the governments concerned to take all the necessary measures.

The Committee took note of the diverse information provided and the explanations given by the Government representatives. It insisted upon the great importance, for the continuation of an essential dialogue, of communicating clear and complete information in response to comments made by the Committee of Experts. It reiterated that this was an aspect of the constitutional obligation to report. In this connection, it expressed its profound concern at the very high number of cases of failure to supply information in reply to comments made by the Committee of Experts. It reiterated that assistance from the ILO could be requested by governments in order to overcome any difficulties they might be facing.

The Committee urged the governments concerned, namely Afghanistan, Antigua and Barbuda, Bosnia and Herzegovina, Burkina Faso, Central African Republic, Comoros, Democratic Republic of the Congo, Denmark (Faeroe Islands), Djibouti, Equatorial Guinea, Fiji, France (French Guiana and St. Pierre and Miquelon), Gabon, Guinea-Bissau, Islamic Republic of Iran, Jamaica, Kenya, Kyrgyzstan, Libyan Arab Jamahiriya, Malaysia, Netherlands (Aruba), Nigeria, Saint Lucia, Sao Tome and Principe, Sierra Leone, Slovakia, Solomon Islands, Swaziland, United Republic of Tanzania, The former Yugoslav Republic of Macedonia, Trinidad and Tobago, Uganda and Yemen to spare no effort to provide the information requested as soon as possible. The Committee decided to mention these cases in the appropriate section of its General Report.

(d) Written information received up to the end of the meeting of the Committee on the Application of Standards¹

Belize. Since the meeting of the Committee of Experts, the Government has sent replies to most of the Committee's comments.

Benin. Since the meeting of the Committee of Experts, the Government has sent replies to most of the Committee's comments.

Bolivia. Since the meeting of the Committee of Experts, the Government has sent the first report on the application of Convention No. 159.

Cape Verde. Since the meeting of the Committee of Experts, the Government has sent replies to most of the Committee's comments.

Ethiopia. Since the meeting of the Committee of Experts, the Government has sent replies to most of the Committee's comments.

Grenada. Since the meeting of the Committee of Experts, the Government has sent replies to most of the Committee's comments.

Guinea. Since the meeting of the Committee of Experts, the Government has sent replies to most of the Committee's comments.

Ireland. Since the meeting of the Committee of Experts, the Government has sent replies to all of the Committee's comments.

Jamaica. Since the meeting of the Committee of Experts, the Government has sent the first report of the application of Convention No. 144.

Mali. Since the meeting of the Committee of Experts, the Government has sent the first reports concerning the application of [Conventions Nos. 141 and 151](#).

Malta. Since the meeting of the Committee of Experts, the Government has sent replies to most of the Committee's comments.

Niger. Since the meeting of the Committee of Experts, the Government has sent replies to most of the Committee's comments.

¹ The list of the reports received is to be found in part I C of the Report.

Saint Lucia. Since the meeting of the Committee of Experts, the Government has sent the report on [Convention No. 98](#).

Slovenia. Since the meeting of the Committee of Experts, the Government has sent replies to all of the Committee's comments.

Sweden. Since the meeting of the Committee of Experts, the Government has sent replies to all of the Committee's comments.

Uruguay. Since the meeting of the Committee of Experts, the Government has sent replies to most of the Committee's comments.