



INTERNATIONAL LABOUR OFFICE

GB.298/PV
298th Session

Governing Body

Geneva, March 2007

Minutes of the 298th Session

Minutes of the 298th Session

The 298th Session of the Governing Body of the International Labour Office was held in Geneva, from Tuesday, 27 to Friday, 30 March 2007, under the chairmanship of Mr Membathisi Mdladlana (South Africa).

The list of persons who attended the session of the Governing Body is appended.

Table of contents by order of item on the agenda

<i>Item No.</i>	<i>Document No.</i>	<i>Title</i>	<i>Page</i>	<i>Decision paragraph No.</i>
1	GB.298/1	Approval of the minutes of the 298th Session of the Governing Body	1	2
2		Date, place and agenda of the International Labour Conference	1	
	GB.298/2	Agenda of the 98th Session (2009) of the International Labour Conference	1	57
	GB.298/2/1	Date of the 97th Session (May–June 2008) of the International Labour Conference	9	58
3	GB.298/3	Review of annual reports under the follow-up to the ILO Declaration on Fundamental Principles and Rights at Work	9	71
4		Developments in the United Nations	12	
	GB.298/4/1	Developments in the United Nations and other international forums	12	115
	GB.298/4/2	The ILO in an evolving multilateral system: An overview	12	115
	GB.298/4/3	The report of the Secretary-General's High-level Panel on UN System-wide Coherence in the areas of development, humanitarian assistance and the environment, "Delivering as one": Implications for the ILO	12	115
5	GB.298/5/1	Developments concerning the question of the observance by the Government of Myanmar of the Forced Labour Convention, 1930 (No. 29)	20	139–141
	GB.298/5/1(Add.)	Other activities following the 2006 Conference decision	20	139–141
	GB.298/5/1(Add.2)	The functioning of the complaint mechanism established under the "Supplementary Understanding"	20	139–141
	GB.298/5/2	Preparations for the Governing Body to request an advisory opinion of the International Court of Justice	20	139–141
6	GB.298/6	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)	25	159
7		Reports of the Committee on Freedom of Association	29	
	GB.298/7/1	344th Report	29	197, 201, 203
	GB.298/7/2	345th Report	35	212
8		Report of the Programme, Financial and Administrative Committee	37	
	GB.298/8/1(Rev.)	<i>First report: Financial questions and programme implementation</i>	37	
		Programme and Budget for 2006–07	37	
		(a) Position of accounts as at 31 December 2006	37	
		(b) Collection of contributions from 1 January 2007 to date	37	213
		Appointment of the External Auditor	37	214
		Follow-up to the report of the Chief Internal Auditor for the year ended 31 December 2005	37	
		Report of the Chief Internal Auditor for the year ended 31 December 2006	37	
		Follow-up to the report of the External Auditor on the accounts for 2004–05	37	215

<i>Item No.</i>	<i>Document No.</i>	<i>Title</i>	<i>Page</i>	<i>Decision paragraph No.</i>
		Terms of reference for the review of the ILO field structure	37	216
		Update on the adoption of International Public Sector Accounting Standards (IPSAS)	37	217
		Establishment of an Independent Oversight Advisory Committee (IOAC)	38	218
		Delegation of authority under article 18 of the Standing Orders of the International Labour Conference	38	219
		Report of the Information and Communications Technology Subcommittee	38	220
		Report of the Building Subcommittee	38	221–222
		Report on programme implementation in 2006	39	223
		Other financial questions	39	
		The United Nations System Chief Executives Board (CEB) for Coordination – Statistical report on the budgetary and financial situation of organizations of the United Nations system	39	224
		Meeting of Experts on Labour Statistics	39	225
		ILO capacity-building strategy: The role of the International Training Centre of the ILO, Turin	39	226
	GB.298/8/2	<i>Second report: Personnel questions</i>	39	
		I. Statement by the staff representative	39	
		II. Composition and structure of the staff	39	227
		III. Decisions of the United Nations General Assembly on the report of the International Civil Service Commission	39	228
		IV. Pensions questions	40	
		(a) Decisions of the United Nations General Assembly on the report of the United Nations Joint Staff Pension Board	40	
		(b) Report of the Board of Trustees of the Special Payments Fund	40	229
		V. Matters relating to the Administrative Tribunal of the ILO	40	
		(a) Recognition of the Tribunal's jurisdiction by the Centre for the Development of Enterprise (CDE)	40	230
		(b) Composition of the Tribunal	40	231
	GB.298/8/3(Rev.)	<i>Third report: Programme and Budget proposals for 2008–09</i>	41	234
	GB.298/8/4(Rev.)	<i>Fourth report: Report of the Government members of the Committee on Allocations Matters</i>	42	
		Assessment of the contributions of new member States	42	235–236
		Scale of assessment of contributions to the budget for the 2008–09 financial period	42	237
9	GB.298/9(Rev.)	Report of the Committee on Legal Issues and International Labour Standards	42	
		<i>First part: Legal issues</i>	42	
		I. Resolutions in the International Labour Conference: Additional considerations	42	238
		II. Standing Orders of the International Labour Conference: Status of interim provisions concerning the verification of credentials	43	239

<i>Item No.</i>	<i>Document No.</i>	<i>Title</i>	<i>Page</i>	<i>Decision paragraph No.</i>
		III. Other legal issues: Rules of Regional Meetings: 11th African Regional Meeting (Addis Ababa, 24–27 April 2007)	43	240
		<i>Second part: International labour standards and human rights</i>	43	
		IV. Improvements in the standards-related activities of the ILO: From strategy to implementation	43	241
		V. General status report on ILO action concerning discrimination in employment and occupation	43	242
		VI. Form for reports on the application of unratified Conventions and Recommendations (article 19 of the Constitution): The Occupational Safety and Health Convention, 1981 (No. 155), the Protocol of 2002 to the Occupational Safety and Health Convention, 1981, and the Occupational Safety and Health Recommendation, 1981 (No. 164)	44	243
		VII. Form for reports on the application of ratified Conventions (article 22 of the Constitution): the Promotional Framework for Occupational Safety and Health Convention, 2006 (No. 187)	44	244
		VIII. Report of the Joint ILO/UNESCO Committee of Experts on the Application of the Recommendations concerning Teaching Personnel (CEART)	44	245
		IX. Other questions	44	
		Provisional agenda of the next session of the Committee on Legal Issues and International Labour Standards	44	246
10	GB.298/10	Report of the Subcommittee on Multinational Enterprises	45	
		I. Update on planning for the event to mark the 30th anniversary of the Tripartite Declaration of Principles concerning Multinational Enterprises and Social Policy	45	247
		II. Report on the modalities of a programme to give an orientation on international labour standards, the Tripartite Declaration of Principles concerning Multinational Enterprises and Social Policy and other related matters	45	248
		III. Updates on corporate social responsibility-related activities: (a) within the ILO, including the InFocus Initiative on corporate social responsibility and the International Training Centre; and (b) within other organizations	45	249
		IV. Update on strategic priorities for MULTI for 2006–07	45	250
11	GB.298/11(Rev.)	Report of the Committee on Employment and Social Policy	46	
		A. An update on the implementation of the Global Employment Agenda (country presentations): (i) Pakistan; (ii) Burkina Faso; (iii) Global Employment Agenda implementation update	46	251
		B. Wages around the world: Developments and challenges	46	252
		C. Portability of skills	46	253
		D. The informal economy	46	254
12	GB.298/12(Rev.)	Report of the Committee on Sectoral and Technical Meetings and Related Issues	47	
		I. Future orientation of the Sectoral Activities Programme and proposals for activities in 2008–09	47	
		(a) Future orientation of the Sectoral Activities Programme	47	255
		(b) Proposals for activities in 2008–09	47	256

<i>Item No.</i>	<i>Document No.</i>	<i>Title</i>	<i>Page</i>	<i>Decision paragraph No.</i>
		II. Report of the Global Steering Group on ongoing Action Programmes	48	257
		III. Effect to be given to the recommendations of sectoral meetings	48	
		Tripartite Meeting on Labour and Social Issues Arising from Problems of Cross-border Mobility of International Drivers in the Road Transport Sector (Geneva, 23–26 October 2006)	48	258
		IV. Joint ILO/UNESCO Committee of Experts on the Application of the Recommendations concerning Teaching Personnel (CEART), (Ninth Session) (Geneva, 30 October–3 November 2006)	48	259
		V. Report on the 92nd Session of the IMO Legal Committee	49	
		(a) Progress report on the work of the Joint ILO/IMO Ad Hoc Expert Working Group on Liability and Compensation regarding Claims for Death, Personal Injury and Abandonment of Seafarers	49	260
		(b) Second meeting of the Joint ILO/IMO Ad Hoc Expert Working Group on the Fair Treatment of Seafarers in the Event of a Maritime Accident	49	261
		VI. Strengthening information sharing and research capacity	49	262
		VII. Other questions	50	
		(a) Further developments in relation to the drafting of an international instrument on shipbreaking/ship recycling	50	263
		(b) Update on the ILO's participation in the development by IMO of safety recommendations for small fishing vessels	50	264
		(c) Information on the revision of the International Medical Guide for Ships	50	264
		(d) Update on the promotion of the Maritime Labour Convention, 2006	50	264
13	GB.298/13(Rev.)	Report of the Committee on Technical Cooperation	50	
		I. Women's entrepreneurship and the promotion of decent work: A thematic evaluation	50	265
		II. Operational aspects of the International Programme on the Elimination of Child Labour (IPEC)	51	266
		III. Public–private partnerships for technical cooperation	51	266
		IV. Special technical cooperation programme for Colombia	51	266
		V. Other questions	51	266
14	GB.298/14(Rev.)	Report of the Working Party on the Social Dimension of Globalization	51	
		Oral report of the Chairperson of the Working Group, Mr M. Mdladlana, Government delegate, South Africa	51	267
15		Report of the Director-General	51	
		I. Membership of the Organization	51	271
		II. Progress in international labour legislation	51	271
		III. Internal administration	51	271
		IV. Publications and documents	51	271

<i>Item No.</i>	<i>Document No.</i>	<i>Title</i>	<i>Page</i>	<i>Decision paragraph No.</i>
	GB.298/15/1	<i>First Supplementary Report:</i> Report of the Committee of Experts on the Application of Conventions and Recommendations (Geneva, 21 November–8 December 2006)	52	275
	GB.298/15/2	<i>Second Supplementary Report:</i> International Basic Safety Standards for Protection against Ionizing Radiation and for the Safety of Radiation Sources	52	276
	GB.298/15/3	<i>Third Supplementary Report:</i> Promotion of ratification of the Maritime Labour Convention, 2006	53	283
	GB.298/15/4	<i>Fourth Supplementary Report:</i> Incomplete delegations at tripartite meetings	54	288
	GB.298/15/5	<i>Fifth Supplementary Report:</i> Collaboration between the International Labour Organization and the International Organization for Standardization (ISO)	54	295
	GB.298/15/5(Add.)	General information on the International Organization for Standardization (ISO)	54	295
	GB.298/15/6	<i>Sixth Supplementary Report:</i> Report of the Committee set up to examine the representation alleging non-observance by Chile of the Old-Age Insurance (Industry, etc.) Convention, 1933 (No. 35) and the Invalidity Insurance (Industry, etc.) Convention, 1933 (No. 37), made under article 24 of the ILO Constitution by the College of Teachers of Chile AG	56	296
	GB.298/15/7	<i>Seventh Supplementary Report:</i> Report of the Committee set up to examine the representation made by the Confederation of Turkish Trade Unions (TÜRK-İS) under article 24 of the Constitution of the ILO, alleging non-observance by the Netherlands of the Equality of Treatment (Social Security) Convention, 1962 (No. 118)	57	297
	GB.298/15/8	<i>Eighth Supplementary Report:</i> Chief Internal Auditor position – Recommendation	57	309
16		Reports of the Officers of the Governing Body	59	
	GB.298/16	Representation alleging non-observance by Mexico of the Labour Inspection Convention, 1947 (No. 81), the Labour Inspectorates (Non-Metropolitan Territories) Convention, 1947 (No. 85), the Labour Administration Convention, 1978 (No. 150), the Occupational Safety and Health Convention, 1981 (No. 155), the Chemicals Convention, 1990 (No. 170), the Prevention of Major Industrial Accidents Convention, 1993 (No. 174), and the Safety and Health in Mines Convention, 1995 (No. 176), by the Sindicato Nacional de Trabajadores de Caminos y Puentes Federales de Ingresos y Servicios Conexos	59	310
17	GB.298/17	Composition and agenda of standing bodies and meetings	59	
		Tripartite Meeting on the Production of Electronic Components for the IT Industries: Changing Labour Force Requirements in a Global Economy (Geneva, 16–18 April 2007)	59	311
		Invitation of an international non-governmental organization	59	311
		Eleventh African Regional Meeting (Addis Ababa, 24–27 April 2007)	59	312
		Invitation of international non-governmental organizations	59	312
		Tripartite Meeting to Examine the Impact of Global Food Chains on Employment (Geneva, 24–27 September 2007)	60	313
		Invitation of international non-governmental organizations	60	313

<i>Item No.</i>	<i>Document No.</i>	<i>Title</i>	<i>Page</i>	<i>Decision paragraph No.</i>
		International Symposium on the Role of Trade Unions in Workers' Education: The Key to Trade Union Capacity Building (Geneva, 8–12 October 2007)	60	314
		Invitation of international non-governmental organizations	60	315
		Symposium on the Labour and Social Aspects of Global Production Systems: Issues for Business (Geneva, 17–19 October 2007)	61	316
		Tripartite Meeting of Experts on Labour Statistics (Geneva, 3–6 December 2007)	61	317
		Meeting of Experts to Examine Instruments, Knowledge, Advocacy, Technical Cooperation and International Collaboration as Tools with a view to Developing a Policy Framework for Hazardous Substances (Geneva, 10–13 December 2007)	61	318
		Invitation of international non-governmental organizations	61	318
		Appointment of an ILO delegation to the 50th Session of the IMO Subcommittee on Stability and Load Lines and on Fishing Vessels' Safety (London, 30 April–4 May 2007)	62	319
		Appointment of Governing Body representatives on various bodies: Tripartite Meeting to Examine the Impact of Global Food Chains on Employment (Geneva, 24–27 September 2007)	62	320
	GB.298/Inf.1 GB.298/Inf.2 GB.298/Inf.3	Information notes	62	321

MINUTES OF THE 298TH SESSION OF THE GOVERNING BODY OF THE INTERNATIONAL LABOUR OFFICE

Geneva, Tuesday, 27 to Friday, 30 March 2007

First item on the agenda

APPROVAL OF THE MINUTES OF THE 297TH SESSION OF THE GOVERNING BODY (GB.298/1)

1. The Office had received the following corrections:

Paragraph 36, replace the second sentence as follows:

He was not convinced that item (b) was suitable for standard setting.

Paragraph 272, replace the second sentence as follows:

He said that the ILO should find a way to prevent ISO from developing an international standard first, and requested, should this prove impossible, that all the necessary measures be taken to ensure the primacy of the ILO in that field.

Governing Body decision:

2. *The Governing Body approved the minutes of its 297th Session, as amended.*

(GB.298/1, paragraph 3.)

Second item on the agenda

DATE, PLACE AND AGENDA OF THE INTERNATIONAL LABOUR CONFERENCE

Agenda of the 98th Session (2009) of the International Labour Conference (GB.298/2)

3. *The Chairperson* recalled that the Governing Body had held a first discussion on this subject at its 297th Session (November 2006) and that at its present session it would have to select three of the six technical items proposed for the 2009 Session of the Conference:

- (i) protection of children and young workers (standard setting – follow-up to the conclusions of the Working Party on Policy regarding the Revision of Standards);
- (ii) decent work in global supply chains (general discussion);
- (iii) employment and social protection in the new demographic context (general discussion based on an integrated approach);
- (iv) strengthening national responses to HIV/AIDS in the world of work (different options);

(v) the right to information and consultation in the context of economic restructuring (general discussion);

(vi) gender equality at the heart of decent work (general discussion).

4. *The Employer Vice-Chairperson* opened the discussion by expressing a preference for item (i), examination of which would offer continuity to the corresponding conclusions of the Working Party on Policy regarding the Revision of Standards (the Cartier Working Group) and could result in a revision of the various instruments through a double discussion procedure. The Minimum Age Convention, 1973 (No. 138), and the Worst Forms of Child Labour Convention, 1999 (No. 182), would not be included in this examination. He then supported items (iii) and (vi), the latter for general discussion. In contrast with item (i), for which a typically standard-setting approach would be adopted, item (iii) should be covered by a general discussion based on an integrated approach, focusing on the considerations set out in the Office paper.
5. With regard to item (iv), he recalled that the Employers had unreservedly supported all the measures and activities undertaken by the social partners and the ILO on that subject. He referred to the agreement concluded with the then International Confederation of Free Trade Unions (ICFTU), the resolution adopted by the Conference in 2000 and the *ILO code of practice on HIV/AIDS and the world of work*. He expressed opposition to the formulation of a standard on item (iv), as a general discussion would be sufficient. The ILO should evaluate its action in that area and strengthen the application of existing instruments with a view to consolidating dialogue and improving knowledge of the phenomenon.
6. *The Worker Vice-Chairperson*, with reference to item (iv), said that he had understood from previous discussions that the Employers supported the adoption of a standard, and that it was only necessary to determine what form the standard would take. He believed that it was logical that the broad range of texts prepared and the activities undertaken by the ILO on HIV/AIDS and the world of work should be crowned by a Convention supplemented by a Recommendation, as such standards offered great potential for raising public awareness and acting as a reference point for the formulation of national policies. He also supported item (vi), with a view to the formulation of a Recommendation, and item (ii). He emphasized that items (ii) and (v) had certain similarities in relation to quality and globalization, and that both could offer the occasion for a discussion on such issues as flexicurity or allowing for mergers and takeovers. In contrast, he feared that the formulation of a standard on item (i) might run counter to the Office's policy of efficiency and avoiding the duplication of instruments. He recalled the high rate of ratification of Convention No. 182 and the current programme for the promotion of Conventions Nos 182 and 138. With regard to item (iii), he considered that reflection on the matter was not sufficiently advanced for it to be examined by the ILO at the present time.
7. He added that in the Governing Body, it was the role of the Workers' group to support the interests of humankind, without adversely affecting Governments or angering the Employers. The method followed to determine the agenda of the Conference did not make their task any easier. He therefore proposed that the items on the agenda of the Conference should be selected by a smaller group that would present its conclusions to the Governing Body, which would have the option of rejecting them. Such a procedure would have the advantage of setting out positions clearly and concisely, while avoiding the need for individual interventions by Governments and the social partners.
8. *A Government representative of the Netherlands* hoped that the forthcoming discussion on strengthening the ILO's capacity to assist its Members' efforts to reach its objectives in the context of globalization would lead to improvements in the current methods of deciding on

the agenda of the Conference. The selection of items from a longer list prevented any in-depth analysis of the subjects proposed and did not facilitate the choice of current priority issues. A more strategic approach should be adopted which would continue the work on the revision of standards. He supported items (iii), (i) and (iv). He welcomed the fact that the Office document took up the opinion expressed on previous occasions by his delegation that the examination of item (i) should not involve the revision of Conventions Nos 138 and 182. In relation to item (vi), he indicated that the ILO should focus on the full implementation of the existing standards and expressed support for the technical cooperation that would be carried out by the ILO to place gender equality at the heart of decent work.

9. *A Government representative of Sri Lanka* expressed support for item (i), in view of the need for a comprehensive examination of the issue of the protection of children in employment or work, and item (iv), with a view to the adoption of a framework Convention, as the international community had acknowledged the unique role that the ILO could play by setting standards on that subject. He also supported the selection of item (iii).
10. *A Government representative of Canada* endorsed the remarks made by the Government representative of the Netherlands regarding the methods used to select agenda items for the Conference. He supported items (iii), (iv) and (vi) for general discussion, although he believed that it would be preferable to leave one agenda item open for future selection. He reiterated that he did not see HIV/AIDS in the world of work as an appropriate subject for standard setting. He welcomed the fact that item (i) was a proposal that followed up activities for the revision of standards and hoped that there would be other similar proposals in future. With regard to item (i), however, he was concerned that there was no clear description of the proposed outcome of the discussion and that its selection would therefore be premature.
11. *A representative of the Government of Malawi* supported items (vi), (ii) and (iv). Discussion of item (vi) would provide an opportunity to review the ILO's progress towards achieving gender equality in the world of work, would provide guidance for all future action in relation to that central objective – and particularly its systematic mainstreaming in all ILO programmes – and would enhance dialogue to reduce the vulnerability of women to discrimination and poverty in countries such as his own, where women only occupied 14 per cent of decision-making positions. In response to that situation, Malawi was focusing on higher education for girls with a view to employment.
12. *A Government representative of Japan* preferred that the number of items selected should be limited to two at the present time, with the third being chosen closer to the time of the Conference. He supported item (iii), on which it would be constructive to engage in an exchange of national experience, and item (ii), in view of the huge numbers of workers engaged in global supply chains and the possibility of advancing the Decent Work Agenda in those and other occupations.
13. *A Government representative of France* reiterated her Government's interest in item (iii), as the ILO needed to contribute to the formulation of national strategies to address the consequences of demographic developments in employment and social protection. She also supported item (vi), as the last discussion of gender equality in the world of work had been in 1985 and discrimination continued to be a factor in underdevelopment. In relation to item (iv), she considered that the possibility should be examined of adopting a framework instrument which could serve as a guide in the formulation of national policies and measures. She added that the possibility should not be excluded of the Conference holding a second discussion on strengthening the ILO's capacity to assist its Members' efforts to reach its objectives in the context of globalization.

14. *A Government representative of the United States* agreed with the Government representatives of Canada and Japan that it would be preferable to leave one item open for a later date. He supported items (iii) and (iv), the latter not for the formulation of a new standard, but with a view to focusing the ILO's resources and talent on improving the delivery of services to those in need.
15. *A Government representative of India* expressed support for items (vi), (iii) and (iv), the latter with a view to the formulation of a Recommendation. However, she emphasized that the Conference should not be under any compulsion to place standard-setting items invariably on the agenda of each Conference, as that would result in a proliferation of standards, which would further burden the reporting system. With reference to item (i), on a semantic issue, since the concern was with child workers, she called for the expression "Protection of child and young workers" to be used instead of "Protection of children and young workers".
16. *A Government representative of Mexico* said that the Government of his country agreed that there should be a general discussion on item (iii), in view of the financial and social complications facing countries as a result of higher life expectancies, and on item (v), because it was important to pool examples of successful collaboration between the social partners in order to deal with structural changes and mobilize the full potential of enterprises. The third item selected was (vi), given the interest of the Mexican Government in promoting gender equality and publicizing the activities undertaken as part of its policy in that area.
17. *A Government representative of El Salvador* supported items (i), (iv) and (vi). He said that in his country, some 42,000 children had been taken out of the worst forms of child labour thanks to the implementation of a national plan, national legislation on HIV/AIDS and the rights of women workers had been strengthened, and a special unit had been set up in the Ministry of Labour to prevent discrimination based on gender.
18. *A Government representative of Spain* reiterated his objections to the methodology involved, which involved selecting topics two years in advance. That restricted the Governing Body's freedom of action and was at variance with the mandate of the Cartier Working Party, and had an effect on efficiency, unity, and quality of service to constituents. He would prefer the third item to be selected at a date closer to the Conference, as though it were an "urgent item", although he would be prepared to go along with the majority decision. Having said that, he supported items (vi) and (iii), the former in view of its relevance to the Equality Act adopted by the Spanish Parliament and on the understanding that the objective was to achieve equality in appointments to senior posts in the public and private sectors, and the latter because it was clear that owing to demographic changes, it would be of topical importance in 2009.
19. *A Government representative of Nigeria* opted for items (iii), (iv) and (vi). He based the choice, in the case of the first, on the importance of employment as a factor in social cohesion, economic prosperity and political stability; in the case of the second, on the urgent need to share experiences with regard to the HIV/AIDS phenomenon, such as the national policy adopted by Nigeria's Council of Ministers; and in the case of the third, on the need to combat discrimination against women, not only in employment but also in other areas of economic and social activity in almost all countries.
20. *A representative of the Government of Romania* indicated that the Romanian Government supported item (i) as providing continuity in the review of standards and responding to the call in the ILO Constitution and the UN Convention on the Rights of the Child for States to adopt appropriate measures. Romania had ratified Conventions Nos 138 and 182, and he

emphasized the importance of gearing the educational system to the changing requirements of the labour market. Items (vi) and (iv) were also supported.

21. *A Government representative of the United Kingdom* supported items (iii), (vi) and (ii).
22. *A Government representative of Finland* shared the view of the Government representative of the Netherlands concerning the establishment of the Conference agenda. He supported items (iii), (vi) and (iv). With regard to (v), he agreed with the Workers that the subject needed to be studied in greater depth.
23. *A Government representative of Australia* said he would prefer to leave pending the selection of the third item. He nevertheless supported items (iii), (i) – on the understanding that Conventions Nos 138 and 182 would not be revised – and (vi). If consensus were reached on item (iv), Australia would prefer a general discussion.
24. *A Government representative of Poland* supported item (i), which was part of the process of follow-up in connection with the revision of standards. He also supported items (iii) and (v), the latter because in his view the existence of legitimate dialogue between employers and workers within the enterprise was a precondition for achieving the targets of globalization and decent work.
25. *A Government representative of Morocco*, while acknowledging the current relevance and priority of all the items proposed, favoured items (iii), (vi) and (iv).
26. *A Government representative of Cameroon* reiterated that the Cameroon Government opted for item (iv), since about 60 per cent of all registered deaths among the active population in African countries were attributable to the HIV/AIDS pandemic. Coming as he did from a country where social protection was enjoyed by only 10 per cent of citizens, he felt bound to support item (iii). He also supported item (v) because in his view wealth generation was inconceivable without dialogue in the enterprise.
27. *A Government representative of China* said he was in favour of items (i), (iii) and (iv), the last item for a general discussion.
28. *A Government representative of the Czech Republic* reiterated her Government's preference for items (iii), (iv) and (vi).
29. *A Government representative of Germany* supported the following items: (iii), as an indicator of the necessary balance between flexibility and security; (vi), given the need to rescue the topic from the total neglect of the past 25 years, despite being one of the cross-cutting themes of the Decent Work Agenda; and (iv), for the reasons given by the Worker Vice-Chairperson. The speaker wondered if it was really appropriate for the ILO to act as a co-sponsoring organization of UNAIDS, and thought that the discussion would need to define carefully the best way of tackling the problems caused by HIV/AIDS in the world of work.
30. *A Government representative of the Bolivarian Republic of Venezuela* supported items (iii) and (vi). With regard to item (iv), he was in favour of drawing up a Convention supplemented by a Recommendation, which would serve to “ignite” public awareness and would make it possible to adopt appropriate measures in response to a global public health problem which affected the core active population.
31. *A Government representative of Argentina* said that while all the proposed topics warranted priority attention, her Government favoured items (iii), (iv) and (vi).

32. *A Government representative of the Russian Federation* considered that at the current stage, only two items should be selected, and in his view they should be (iii) and (i). Selection of the third item should be postponed until a date nearer the Conference.
33. *A Government representative of Chile* considered that priority should be given to topics relating to the strengthening of democratic systems, and therefore supported items (iii), (vi) and (i).
34. *A Government representative of Greece* said that, in view of the importance of social dialogue and the need for the economic actors to improve their capacity for collaboration under conditions of globalization, she supported items (v), (ii) and (iii).
35. *A Government representative of Brazil* reiterated his support for items (iii) and (iv). He would support item (vi) as the final item, but would prefer the third item to be selected at a later date.
36. *A Government representative of Cuba* said she would also prefer selection of the third item to be postponed for the time being. For the first two, she supported items (iii) and (i).
37. *The Employer Vice-Chairperson* praised the interest shown by the Governments in the discussion and accepted the idea of selecting the third item at a later date. He agreed that it was necessary to revise the method of establishing the Conference agenda. It was clear from the discussions that item (iv) had less support than items (iii) and (vi). He agreed that a standard was not the ideal solution to the problem of combating the HIV/AIDS pandemic, and that the ILO needed to combine all its efforts and continue enhancing its technical cooperation activities in that area.
38. *The Worker Vice-Chairperson* recalled that the idea of selecting the third technical item at a date closer to the meeting at which it would be discussed had come from the Workers' group, but it had always been put on a back burner. The Workers were consistent in their ideas, but were now willing to continue with the existing system if it were sure of leading to a successful result.
39. *A representative of the Director-General*, summarizing the discussion, noted that the three items with the greatest support were (iii) and (vi) (for a general discussion or general discussion based on an integrated approach) and (iv). In the case of item (iv), there was no agreement regarding the outcome of the examination: the Workers and five Governments supported the development of a standard, while the Employers and five other Governments favoured a general discussion. The other Governments who had supported the item had not indicated their preferred method of examination.
40. With regard to the selection of the third item, the speaker indicated that of the 29 Governments which had participated in the discussion, eight plus the Employers' group were in favour of postponing a decision. As to the proposal that one of the items should be left free to allow for urgent questions, he indicated that there was already a way of including items under such circumstances. Those questions were part of the discussion on the reform of the Conference and it was too early to take a decision. However, he warned that the later agenda items were selected, the more rushed the preparation phase would be, especially in the case of a standard-setting item, as had been the case with the Seafarers' Identity Documents Convention (Revised), 2003 (No. 185). If it were necessary to postpone the selection of the third item, it would have to be chosen from items (iv) and (vi), given that both had been supported by 19 Governments, the Employers and the Workers. Item (iii) had more support than either of the other two items, and was supported by the Employers but not by the Workers. Under the circumstances, he proposed selecting

item (iv) for a general discussion based on an integrated approach, with the possibility that it might lead to standard-setting action if the Conference so decided.

41. *A Government representative of Spain* explained that when he had proposed that the selection of the third item be completed at a later date, he was not referring to the complex process of standard setting, much less an instrument like Convention No. 185, but meant a general discussion item based on a brief and precise document. As he was not satisfied with the purely mathematical recapitulation of the discussion that had been carried out, he suggested that every member of the Governing Body should indicate in a questionnaire the item and form of discussion they preferred and that the questionnaires be deposited in a ballot box.
42. *The Worker Vice-Chairperson* argued that the reports for discussion with a view to achieving a given result (such as standard setting) always envisaged the possibility that the Conference might decide otherwise, and that was in fact what had already happened. He was surprised that only 29 Governments had participated in the discussion out of the 58 that could have done so. The Workers' group was aware that there was a general interest in item (iv) and that, given the seriousness of the HIV/AIDS pandemic, there was an urgent need to adopt a Convention or, at the very least, a strongly worded Recommendation, as there was no point in merely holding a general discussion on what was already the subject of important texts. He added that there was a recent tendency towards a proliferation of general discussions. Similarly, there appeared to be a contradiction in holding a general discussion on item (vi), given that a great deal of work had already been done on gender equality in the ILO. In conclusion, he said that the Workers were not in a position to support item (iii) – which warranted more than a general discussion – as they had not yet finished examining it, but that they would be prepared to go along with the majority.
43. *The Employer Vice-Chairperson*, referring to the assessment of the level of support for each item, expressed his dissatisfaction with the mathematical and political evaluation of the discussion. Concerning the possibility of deferring the selection of the third item, he stated that he did not intend to eliminate any topic in advance and that he would go along with the majority decision. He recalled, however, that at the time the Employers had agreed to postpone the decision on a given item so that the agenda for the 2007 session could include another topic, which might even feature again in 2008. With regard to the inclusion of a fourth item, this would pose logistical problems for his delegation. Concerning item (iv), he was surprised that the recapitulation proposed a general discussion based on an integrated approach, since this eventuality had not in fact been mentioned in the discussion. If the Governing Body decided to include item (iv), rather than deferring its decision to a later date, he agreed with its inclusion as an item for general discussion. Lastly, he urged the Governments that had not expressed their views to take the opportunity of doing so now.
44. *A Government representative of Pakistan* expressed his preference for items (iii), (vi) and (iv), the latter as an item for general discussion, but without ruling out the possibility that the discussion might lead to standard setting.
45. *A Government representative of South Africa* reiterated that the discussion of item (iv) should be with a view to standard setting. He also supported items (vi) and (i).
46. *A Government representative of Nigeria* emphasized that the seriousness of the problem of HIV/AIDS justified standard setting on the issue.
47. *A Government representative of Senegal* was in favour of standard setting on item (iv), preferably in the form of a Recommendation.

48. *A Government representative of Kenya* pointed out the urgent need to hold an in-depth discussion on item (iv) and to adopt substantive resolutions, particularly given the need for a requirement that medical treatment be provided free of charge.
49. *A Government representative of the Netherlands* stated that a general discussion should be held on item (iv) to begin with, and other action could be taken in the light of the outcome of that discussion. He highlighted the importance of coordination with other institutions, since the problems arising from HIV/AIDS did not only have an impact on the workplace.
50. *A Government representative of Belarus* was in favour of a discussion on item (iv) with a view to adopting an instrument, which could be a Recommendation. He was pleased that his Government would have the opportunity during the discussion to share its experience in fighting HIV/AIDS at the workplace.
51. *Government representatives of the Bolivarian Republic of Venezuela, Malawi, Brazil, Chile, Argentina and Barbados* were in favour of a discussion on item (iv) with a view to standard setting.
52. *A Government representative of Singapore* opted for a general discussion on item (iv) as a unifying solution which would take account of all the views expressed.
53. *A representative of the Director-General* explained that at no time had he suggested including a fourth item, rather he had merely mentioned the existence of procedures enabling the inclusion of urgent items. In the light of the outcome of the discussion, he referred to paragraph 55 of the Office paper, which indicated that “a general discussion could aim to identify further options for ILO constituents to address the issues, including, as the case may be, those that might be better addressed through standard setting”. Paragraph 56 mentioned some of the measures that might be taken and listed ILO standards having a bearing on the subject. Paragraph 57 referred to the possible options – a Convention, a Convention supplemented by a Recommendation, or a Recommendation – and pointed out that the standard setting could take place through a double discussion or in a single discussion at the Conference. He concluded that item (iv) for general discussion based on an integrated approach would be included in the agenda of the 2009 session of the Conference, and that that discussion would determine what form the standard that might be adopted in 2010 would take.
54. *The Worker Vice-Chairperson* expressed surprise at this conclusion, since a clear preference for standard setting had emerged from the last statements.
55. *The Employer Vice-Chairperson* stated that for the sake of consensus, he was prepared to accept the formula proposed by the representative of the Director-General.
56. *A Government representative of Nigeria* said that the conclusion did not reflect the statements made by speakers, most of whom were in favour of standard setting.

Governing Body decision:

57. ***The Governing Body decided that the 98th Session (2009) of the International Labour Conference would be held in Geneva, and that the following three technical items would be placed on the agenda of that session:***
 - (i) ***employment and social protection in the new demographic context (general discussion based on an integrated approach);***
 - (ii) ***gender equality at the heart of decent work (general discussion);***

(iii) adoption of an autonomous Recommendation on HIV/AIDS in the world of work (standard setting, double discussion).

(GB.298/2, paragraphs 2 and 6.)

*Date of the 97th Session (May–June 2008)
of the International Labour Conference
(GB.298/2/1)*

58. The Governing Body took note of the paper.

(GB.298/2/1.)

Third item on the agenda

REVIEW OF ANNUAL REPORTS UNDER THE FOLLOW-UP TO THE ILO DECLARATION
ON FUNDAMENTAL PRINCIPLES AND RIGHTS AT WORK
(GB.298/3)

59. *The Employer Vice-Chairperson* described the discussion as very important and reaffirmed that the Employers supported not only the Declaration's principles but also the follow-up process. He stressed that the promotion of ratifications and the follow-up to the Declaration were two completely independent concepts, and said he regretted that those concepts were often confused. The Employers supported the baseline system for the presentation of information but insisted that the baselines should in no way be used to rank countries. They stressed the need for greater involvement of the social partners and requested the Office to provide all the technical cooperation necessary to strengthen the capacities of employers' and workers' organizations, whose response rate, although on the increase, remained insufficient. The voluntary collaboration of Liberia and Sierra Leone was an encouraging sign. With regard to the future, although the increase in the number of countries that had ratified the fundamental Conventions was satisfactory, it was nonetheless necessary to continue efforts and to examine how to review the follow-up to the Declaration and guarantee its relevance. The Employers were asking what the value added was of the studies mentioned in paragraphs 27–29 and whether resources would not have been better allocated to technical cooperation activities. Despite those reservations, the Employers' group supported the report.
60. *The Worker Vice-Chairperson* welcomed the report and referred in particular to paragraphs 8 and 9, which emphasized the link between the rights and principles contained in the Declaration and democratic values. Countries which failed to respect fundamental rights at work were also the countries least likely to establish genuine democratic institutions. From that perspective, annual reports were a good test of developments around the world. The Workers welcomed the increase in the number of ratifications, but noted that the breakdown of those ratifications was less satisfactory: of the total number of new ratifications of various fundamental Conventions recorded between June 1998 and December 2006, there had been 83 ratifications of the Minimum Age Convention, 1973 (No. 138), but only 19 ratifications of the Right to Organise and Collective Bargaining Convention, 1949 (No. 98), and only 25 of the Freedom of Association and Protection of the Right to Organise Convention, 1948 (No. 87). Moreover, it was important to consider not only the number of countries but also the number of people affected. In fact, half of the workers around the world were not covered by fundamental Conventions Nos 87 and 98. Four of the richest countries, some of which were undergoing extremely rapid growth, had not ratified those texts. Those countries should be responsible for setting an example with regard to standard setting. For the Workers' group, the report should provide the

opportunity to examine social justice and human rights issues while adopting a mutual assistance approach and by taking certain countries as an example to show how it was possible to improve living conditions and make the world a better place.

61. *A Government representative of the Netherlands* stressed the importance of the Declaration and insisted on the importance of technical cooperation to implement the fundamental principles and rights at work. He endorsed the recommendation of the Expert-Advisers that the Office and donor community should help employers' and workers' organizations to strengthen their capacity.
62. *A Government representative of Kenya* commended the work done by the Expert-Advisers. As indicated in the Office document, the difficulties faced by some regions accounted for the fact that implementation had not kept pace with the ratification rate, but that situation could not justify the failure to foster a human rights culture contributing to the consolidation of democratic values among constituents and throughout the world at large. Kenya was grateful to the Office for the assistance it had provided in reviewing the country's labour laws. The high reporting rate by governments was encouraging. Moreover, it was indicative of the commitment to the Declaration's principles and was a source of support for the Decent Work Agenda. The baselines provided an indication of each country's progress towards respect for the Declaration's principles. Kenya welcomed the importance attached to case studies and to national tripartite dialogue. Finally, the speaker was pleased to note that a number of international financial institutions had incorporated the Declaration's principles into their policies and programmes. Kenya supported the point for decision.
63. *A Worker representative from India* recalled that his country had been an IPEC partner since 1992 and had carried out interesting projects such as the INDUS project designed to rehabilitate child workers. However, despite being the largest democracy in the world, India had not yet ratified the Minimum Age Convention, 1973 (No. 138), or the Worst Forms of Child Labour Convention, 1999 (No. 182). According to a 2001 government survey, 12 million children were not in education and were working, even though the right to education had been enshrined in the Constitution of India since the 1950s. The speaker expressed the wish for a speedy ratification of those texts, which had been under consideration for some time.
64. *A Government representative of Spain* said that irregular labour migration was a serious transversal problem. According to the Expert-Advisers, "this relatively new phenomenon can therefore give rise to servitude in its traditional form". The speaker regretted that such a topical issue, which would continue to arise in the future, had not been put on the Conference agenda.
65. *A Worker representative from the United Kingdom* spoke of the abolition of child labour and said that the Workers welcomed the increase in the number of ratifications of Conventions Nos 138 and 182. Child labour was a fundamental human rights issue, which explained why the Declaration placed Members under the obligation to abolish it regardless of their level of development. Ratification of the Conventions concerned was determined not by level of development but rather by political will, as shown by the fact that some of the richest countries, such as Australia, Canada, New Zealand and the United States, had not ratified Convention No. 138, which remained the core text relating to the abolition of child labour. The speaker also cited the case of the Canadian Province of Alberta, which permitted children of 12 years of age to work in restaurants. In contrast, India should be commended for its envisaged ratification of Convention No. 182, and the speaker was sure that the Office would provide all the technical assistance necessary to support that process. He stressed the importance of education and recalled that the Expert-

Advisers had emphasized the link between the abolition of child labour and universal education.

66. *A Government representative of India* expressed her country's support for the Declaration and said that India fully endorsed the principles embodied in it, which had been implemented through various national laws and programmes. India had ratified four of the eight fundamental Conventions. Before ratifying a Convention, the procedure in India was first to amend its laws in order to bring them into line with the provisions of the Convention so as to avoid any discrepancies at a later date. With regard to child labour, the speaker explained that India had a national programme that should soon cover the entire country. The funds allocated to the abolition of child labour should increase considerably under India's 11th National Plan. The speaker also referred to a rehabilitation project for child workers being carried out in partnership with the United States Department of Labor. She concluded by saying that the activities carried out by the ILO to implement the principles contained in the Declaration should place more emphasis on the practical side, and that collaboration between the ILO and national governments should be strengthened in order to identify the obstacles to the Declaration's implementation.
67. *A Worker representative from the United States* drew attention to a number of problems related to freedom of association and collective bargaining faced by workers in his country. In fact, one case on that subject had already been referred to the Committee on Freedom of Association and another case would be referred to it during the current session. The United States National Labor Relations Act was not in line with the principles of Article 2 of Convention No. 87. He recalled furthermore that the United States had not ratified the Forced Labour Convention, 1930 (No. 29), the Discrimination (Employment and Occupation) Convention, 1958 (No. 111), or the Minimum Age Convention, 1973 (No. 138), and that problems were being encountered concerning the implementation of the Worst Forms of Child Labour Convention, 1999 (No. 182), which had been ratified. With regard to Canada, a recent report by the International Trade Union Confederation had revealed gaps in the implementation of core labour standards and restrictions in trade union rights in provincial laws. Canada had ratified five of the eight fundamental Conventions and it was unacceptable that Convention No. 98 had not been ratified. Canada had also not ratified Convention No. 29, even though the last privately managed prison – the reason given for not ratifying that Convention – had now been closed. In referring to the previously mentioned case of the Canadian Province of Alberta, the speaker expressed his regret that the Canadian provinces in general were not moving to support the ratification of Conventions within their jurisdiction, but said that the responsibility ultimately lay with the national Government.
68. *A Government representative of Canada* wished to reply to a number of the observations made about his country. The comments made clearly reflected a poor understanding of the system of constitutional law in an extremely decentralized federal State such as Canada. With regard to the province of Alberta, the truth was that the draft law permitting children to work in the section of bars where alcohol was not served had been rejected immediately by the head of government of the province. In conclusion, the speaker pointed out that among the Expert-Advisers was a Canadian trade unionist known for his outspokenness, and that if the experts had considered certain points to be particularly important, they would have included them in the report.
69. *An Employer representative from India* expressed his regret that the discussion was focusing exclusively on child labour. He recalled that the Declaration, which he had been following since its adoption in 1998, was a very important text that had permitted a new awareness among employers' and workers' organizations of a comprehensive development approach. In their introduction, the Expert-Advisers recommended that the Office help employers' and workers' organizations to develop their capacity to promote the principles

and rights contained in the Declaration. The speaker encouraged the Office to follow up on this recommendation with increased resources and stressed that the Declaration was the cornerstone of a stable, peaceful and democratic society in the world of work.

70. *A representative of the Director-General* reassured the Employers' group that the baselines were not used to rank countries. In reply to a question relating to paragraph 27, he explained that the purpose of the Expert-Advisers was to help countries to carry out their own evaluation of the manner in which they respected the fundamental principles and rights and to decide on the appropriate follow-up. With regard to the ratification issue, he said that the follow-up to the Declaration was not a ratification campaign and that the aim of the annual reports was to examine the progress made by countries and to identify technical cooperation needs. In reply to the Government representative of India, he indicated that the ILO International Labour Standards Department was responsible for the provision of technical assistance for ratification and that such assistance did not come under the scope of the Declaration follow-up programme. It was important to note that the number of ratifications had increased and that 124 countries out of 180 had ratified the eight fundamental Conventions. As stressed by the Worker Vice-Chairperson, the breakdown of those ratifications was a source of concern but that could be addressed in the global reports as had been the case for freedom of association and the right to collective bargaining. Finally, in reply to the Government representative of Spain, he indicated that migration problems were mentioned in the preamble and addressed by technical cooperation programmes carried out under the four key principles.

Governing Body decision:

71. *The Governing Body, having examined the Introduction by the ILO Declaration Expert-Advisers to the compilation of annual reports, adopted the recommendations contained in paragraphs 27–29 of the document.*

(GB.298/3, paragraph 4.)

Fourth item on the agenda

DEVELOPMENTS IN THE UNITED NATIONS

Developments in the United Nations and other international forums
(GB.298/4/1)

The ILO in an evolving multilateral system: An overview
(GB.298/4/2)

The report of the Secretary-General's High-level Panel on UN System-wide Coherence in the areas of development, humanitarian assistance and the environment, "Delivering as one": Implications for the ILO
(GB.298/4/3)

72. *The Director-General* commented that the three papers before the Governing Body attested to greater interest in ILO issues within the multilateral system in general. The first document in question provided an overall perspective. The Office was principally concerned with how to implement the outcome document of the 2005 General Assembly, which had made decent work a global goal, and how to follow-up on the United Nations Economic and Social Council (ECOSOC) declaration that mainstreamed the Decent Work Agenda into the international organizations within the new context of UN reform. This should be done in a manner that reflected the content of the Decent Work Agenda, an ILO

trademark with its four strategic objectives of rights, social protection, employment and social dialogue.

73. The main thrust of ILO work with the specialized agencies reflected common interests in terms of the organizations' normative, analytical and operational functions. Cooperation with the United Nations Development Programme (UNDP) had been deepened as the Office sought to make the Decent Work Country Programmes (DWCPs) clearly understood by the UNDP as the ILO's contribution within the United Nations Development Assistance Framework (UNDAF) and to Poverty Reduction Strategy Papers (PRSPs). There would be additional frameworks in future, but it was essential to include the UNDP as part of the ILO effort to make DWCPs a success at the national level.
74. Integrating fully into the system, while maintaining identity, was problematical. The ILO's knowledge base and technical know-how were unparalleled and the Organization possessed a rich identity and constituency. Therefore, accepting UN reform should be on the basis of the fact that the ILO held many trump cards, which could be better utilized through improved coordination and integration. There should be three guiding principles to UN reform: first, it should be country-driven not donor-driven. The goals of international cooperation were well defined but the way countries addressed these commitments varied. The UN system was there to help countries implement national policies in response to global commitments. Yet, too often, commitment to national ownership had been based more on rhetoric than reality. Real reform must start with real respect for dialogue and national priorities – which was the driving force of DWCPs. Second, reform should be comprehensive. Multilateral organizations must work together in a much more integrated way, not only in the delivery of their activities, to avoid duplication and waste, but in greater convergence of policies to support countries. In this regard, the ILO normative framework was a common reference for the action of the entire multilateral system. Reform should promote the best organizational knowledge and practice. Third, reform should be inclusive. If the common objective was delivery at the country level, it was essential to bring together all the key development actors in any one country with the aim of streamlining and harmonizing them. This meant both the Bretton Woods institutions and bilateral development partners. Reform that did not acknowledge and recognize the ILO as a tripartite institution would not be inclusive.
75. Action for reform was required at government level to promote policy convergence. However, without reform of the multilateral system, reform of the UN would be pointless: the International Monetary Fund and the World Bank must be reformed as well. Reform also implied changes in donor countries and donor agencies. However, there was no UN reform blueprint agreed to by the General Assembly. There was only the High-level Panel report which contained a variety of recommendations. There was also no government decision on UN reform.
76. A key proposal of the High-level Panel report was that the United Nations organizations deliver as one at the country level – something the beneficiary countries themselves wanted. The report outlined some potential implications for the ILO, particularly in three priority areas: the country level, the inter-agency level and ILO support to those efforts. In each dimension, the role of governments, employers and workers was absolutely critical to ensuring that the ILO played its full role as a normative, tripartite institution.
77. At the country level, the High-level Panel report had recommended the establishment of pilot countries to test the “One UN” approach and the ILO was participating in seven of the eight pilots identified. The new role foreseen for the UNDP as manager of the Resident Coordinator system would be especially critical, in particular to the specialized agencies, because it required a knowledge-base that Resident Coordinators did not currently have and would not have for some time. To this end, the ILO was cooperating with the UNDP in

training UN Resident Coordinators, using the ILO International Training Centre's facilities in Turin, to ensure these officials fully understood the tripartite strength of the ILO. It was essential to focus on providing an ILO report that contained as much detailed analysis as possible.

78. The success of the pilot countries would depend to a large degree on the commitment of the social partners at the country level and was an opportunity and responsibility to show tripartism at work. The ILO intended to maximize technical support to constituencies in this fundamental area. The Pakistan pilot, in which the ILO was influential through Governing Body members, would be a pointer to what could be achieved in other countries and in making the DWCPs the ILO contribution to the "One UN" approach. A task force on UN reform had been established in-house to ensure full ILO participation in the "One UN" pilots and particularly to ensure support to the constituents in those countries.
79. There were other problems and challenges: the first was that the process risked being driven by certain donors who had their vision of what the UN reform should be and who pressured countries into reform through implicit conditionality. A second challenge was that reform might dilute the respective strengths of the different agencies. Thirdly, did the "One UN" approach imply that all organizations were obliged to be present in every country? This was clearly impossible: in practice, the only two organizations that had global presence in almost every country were the UNDP and the World Bank. The implementation of the role of UN Resident Coordinators was therefore very important, and needed to be extremely well planned. At present, there was scant planning in place.
80. The reform process provided a great opportunity for the ILO to mainstream tripartism into the UN system, to improve areas in its policy space and to implement the 2005 World Summit Outcome document and the ECOSOC mainstreaming of 2006. To seize the opportunity, the ILO had to be proactive; in this connection, the guidance given by the Committee on Technical Cooperation at the International Labour Conference in 2006 was extremely clear. The ILO should concentrate on the pilot countries, which provided a practical and concrete framework in which to demonstrate that tripartism worked. The ILO should be a part of the reform from the beginning, and should use tripartism as a force to influence the entire process.
81. *The Employer Vice-Chairperson* said that the entire issue had generated much reflection in the Employers' group. The Employers considered it critical to establish a clear ILO strategy in this context, rooted in the added value that the ILO brought to the UN system through standards, the theme of employment, and technical cooperation. It was therefore important that the Governing Body was kept fully abreast of all developments in respect of the reform process.
82. For the Employers, tripartism was fundamental, the ILO's very essence. It created a space for permanent dialogue, debate, analysis and creation of policies, ideas and standards for dealing with employment-related problems. It was this tripartite vision that made the ILO unique, and gave it its ability to initiate dialogue and to build consensus. However, tripartism had to be constructed, and the group noted that in many countries, including some of the pilot countries, the social partners did not possess the required organizational capacity. This was why the ILO needed the Committee on Freedom of Association, the Committee on the Application of Standards, and commissions of inquiry. This statement was not an accusation, simply recognition of the fact that a pilot in country A was not the same as a pilot in country B.
83. The Employers had doubts about the implementation of cooperation in the field between the ILO and the UNDP as coordinating body. The group was concerned about marginalization of the social partners in the DWCPs: many of the problems in the social

sphere and in the world of work stemmed from a lack of social dialogue built through properly consolidated tripartism. There was not the slightest doubt that many of the major industrialized countries owed their progress to social dialogue based on social consensus achieved with partners who were strong protagonists. Problems arose where strong social dialogue did not exist.

84. First and foremost, tripartism must be preserved; secondly, tripartism had to be promoted much more vigorously than to date, because it was a way of defending the ILO; thirdly, the Employers insisted on being kept informed and on taking part in all evaluations; and fourthly, the pilots must act as “test beds”, though close attention should be paid in situations where there was opposition to tripartism. It was much easier to put a good gloss on facts where the social partners were not present to provide balance.

85. Finally, with reference to paragraphs 7–9 of document GB.298/4/2, the group had a concern regarding the elaboration of a toolkit for mainstreaming employment and decent work in UN system activities. This was a technical activity, but it was also a highly political activity. The tools were designed to implement the Decent Work Agenda which, as the Director-General had said, was a trademark of the ILO. As such, it required both in-house technical and tripartite approval. The Decent Work Agenda was present in many documents issued from other institutions, including the General Assembly and ECOSOC. However, although it might be absorbed into the UN system as the ILO’s contribution to that system, it was essential that it had the stamp of tripartite approval if it was to retain its legitimacy.

86. *The Worker Vice-Chairperson* said his group believed that the ILO’s role was clearly established in the Preamble to the Constitution of the ILO and in the Philadelphia Declaration. There could be no peace without social justice, and tripartism should be used as a means of obtaining this justice. The group took this as its point of departure. Ninety years after the founding of the ILO, these problems for which the Organization was created, persisted throughout the world. At the Extraordinary Summit of Heads of State and Government on Employment and Poverty Alleviation (Ouagadougou, 2004) the African countries returned again and again to the fact that poverty was a serious cause of social unrest in the continent, and a threat to peace. The Workers were open to discussion on reform of the UN system, but were absolutely opposed to any weakening of the ILO. Governments should recall that without workers providing labour and paying taxes, and without employers, whose capital produced profits that were also taxed, there would not be the money with which to fund UN agencies.

87. The creation of wealth was one question, but the ILO had come into being to ensure that countries treated their labour with respect, and rewarded it properly. If the ILO was now to consider UN reform, there had to be an understanding by UN agencies that the ILO’s work would be recognized. The ILO provided the means for workers to deal with ministries of labour and government officials as equals. It established a tripartite platform on which consensus between governments, employers and workers could be reached. There was no other institution in the UN family that treated labour with this degree of respect, upheld workers’ rights and considered workers as very important contributors to peace and development.

88. The group was satisfied with the ongoing high-level dialogue on international migration and development, and congratulated the Office for making sure that a number of issues, pertaining to matters like immigration and the treatment of immigrants, the feminization of migration, and the abuse and exploitation of migrant workers, were featured. The Workers hoped that when that matter was brought forward into the proposed global forum in Brussels in July 2007, that the Workers could participate in the debates.

89. The group supported the Director-General's views in respect of the eight pilot countries, provided that the other agencies within the UN family understood that these were pilots, which must be followed by a review, and that a report must be submitted to the Governing Body to enable it to take part in follow-up decisions regarding the eight pilots.
90. As regards "One UN", the Workers saw a contradiction. There was a suggestion that the ILO would have to surrender 80 per cent of its budget, which would mean loss of funds for technical assistance and the supervisory machinery of the ILO. The Workers were also concerned that money should be spent in a transparent way to the benefit of poor people, to improve work and quality of life. A full discussion was required on this issue. While supporting the multilateral system, the Workers believed that the ILO should make every effort possible to correct the unacceptable state of affairs created where UN agencies did not want to treat standards and rights-based issues as the ILO did, and where they did not want to deal with the social partners. The Office must be able to educate, train and make people understand these issues, keeping the Governing Body informed at every stage of the process. In this connection, there was a problem with the projected two or three days training allocated to Residential Coordinators. More time was required and the Director-General must explain this to the UNDP Administrator. The Resident Coordinators had to be provided with the necessary tools to perform their tasks as leaders who would take on the role of leading where often there was no ILO office, and would have to be able to treat the social partners as equals.
91. Finally, the Workers' group had not officially seen the toolkit referred to by the Employer Vice-Chairperson; those who had seen it unofficially had been disappointed that it contained no references to freedom of association or to collective bargaining. The group could not agree to something that it had not seen. A means had to be found for the parties to discuss the issue with a view to making modifications to the toolkit in order to claim ownership of it.
92. *A Government representative of Germany*, speaking on behalf of the European Union, said that the candidate countries: Turkey, Croatia and The former Yugoslav Republic of Macedonia, the Stabilization and Association Process and potential candidate countries: Albania, Bosnia and Herzegovina, Montenegro, Serbia; and the European Free Trade Association (EFTA) countries: Iceland and Norway, members of the European Economic Area, as well as Ukraine and the Republic of Moldova and Switzerland, aligned themselves with the declaration. The European Union considered effective multilateralism with a strong UN at its side to be a central element of its external action. The European Union had therefore continuously supported reform initiatives to strengthen the UN in this regard. A more effective and efficient UN would be essential to better ensure that development assistance delivered results and accelerated progress throughout the Millennium Development Goals and other internationally agreed development goals and objectives.
93. The European Union was particularly satisfied to see a thorough initial analysis of the implications of the High-level Panel report on UN system-wide coherence, and welcomed the ILO's recognition of the concept of delivering as one, as put forward by the UN Secretary-General's High-level Panel report. This offered an important opportunity for continued engagement of the ILO in UN reform and system-wide coherence. The potential gains from applying this concept also brought with them considerable challenges for the ILO, while safeguarding its unique tripartite structure along with its standard-setting capacity provided a real message to the UN system as a whole.
94. The speaker noted that the Director-General's role in leading the ILO in the reform process would be vital, and appreciated the ILO's approach to the pilot exercises in selected countries to explore ways of improving UN system-wide coherence. ILO constituents at

country level should ensure that tripartism strengthened the UN country team and UNDAFs and the “One UN” pilots. The European Union was pleased that the ILO was an active participant in UN reform and would become increasingly active in that process. The recent ILO/UNDP common plan of action to strengthen collaboration at policy and operational levels was also an important step towards better inter-entity coordination and increased UN coherence at country level.

95. The principle of country ownership was at the heart of the High-level Panel recommendations. Hence, the pilot UN programmes should derive from, and respond to, the needs and priorities of each country. The speaker welcomed the fact that various governments had already volunteered or expressed interest in hosting such country pilots and that several pilot exercises were currently taking place. In view of the importance of the Organization’s mandate, particularly the Decent Work Agenda, and of the need to ensure that the ILO’s tripartite constituency was closely involved in the preparations of DWCPs, as well as their integration into comprehensive development strategies, the ILO should participate actively in the “One UN” pilot activities and other initiatives that might arise. They would provide lessons for the future process both within the ILO and the UN system at large. The Governing Body should receive full information on this process at its next session, and at subsequent sessions.
96. *A Government representative of South Africa* agreed that the ILO’s tripartite structure was a major asset within the current evolving multilateral system. This should be used to lead the drive for greater coherence throughout the system. The acceptance by the global community of decent work as central to the governance of globalization made this more opportune. The Government of South Africa recognized the increased global challenges; these required strong and coherent responses. South Africa therefore supported the ILO approach to the “One UN” system, based on DWCPs.
97. His Government favoured a clear understanding between the ILO and the UNDP with respect to authority, reporting lines and the accountability framework, and emphasized the need to ensure that the ILO’s mandate and governance structure were recognized and respected. National tripartite constituencies should be involved in the preparation of DWCPs. In this connection, respect for fundamental principles and rights at work was essential.
98. Adequate and predictable funding was important for the UN and, in particular, for the ILO to fulfil its global responsibilities, especially in delivering technical assistance. Member States should pay their assessed contributions in full and on time to the ILO. The next Governing Body meeting should be informed of further developments in the UN system.
99. *A Government representative of the Bolivarian Republic of Venezuela* agreed with the views presented in GB.298/4/3 on rapid global change, poverty, degradation of the environment and the slowing down of development. A more coherent multilateral framework was required in order to respond to the challenges and needs of countries and communities.
100. The system currently suffered from over-complicated bureaucracy, which impeded coherence. It had also demonstrated a total lack of capacity to prevent the latest conflicts and their negative consequences. His Government believed that the negative factors that had made the system inoperative included contradictory policies and decisions, lack of political will, dilution of authority and ambiguity in functions and responsibilities. Urgent solutions were required for a complete transformation of the system. In this respect, he advocated the unified concept expressed in paragraph 11 of the document, firstly regarding areas of development, secondly humanitarian assistance, and thirdly protection of the environment.

- 101.** His Government recognized the interest that brought the ILO to engage in this reform process, not only in pushing for the setting up of the High-level Panel but also for its persistence regarding DWCPs, its participation in the pilots, its efforts for representation and participation of tripartite partners in the process, and the offer of technical cooperation to any country that requested it. However, none of these actions would have any meaning if the reform of the UN system did not take place in a more democratic, participative and transparent manner.
- 102.** *A Government representative of Spain* said that what was important in the reform was that each institution should retain its essence which, in the case of the ILO, was tripartite dialogue, and also the Organization's institutional memory, from which it derived its moral strength. The ILO had lasted for many years, precisely because of its efficiency, which had contributed to nothing less than resolving social conflicts around the world. It was this essence that had to be preserved and could not be diluted when integrating more coherently in the UN system.
- 103.** *A Government representative of Jordan* touched on two points that were interlinked. The ILO was a unique organization because of tripartism, and its responsibility was to promote tripartism and to ensure that tripartism was a facilitating, rather than an obstructive, factor. The second point concerned ensuring that the ILO had the capacity, and the funding, to deliver in its specialized sphere of action. He emphasized the importance of building the technical capacity of the ILO within UN reform. If the ILO could not convince colleagues in the UN that it had something special to offer, it would be the loser.
- 104.** *A Government representative of the United States* said that the Office paper highlighted many of the significant issues that would have to be dealt with as the "One UN" framework moved forward. The United States Government supported the Office taking an active role in the process, in order to take advantage of the opportunities and address the challenges that these developments presented.
- 105.** Three scenarios were possible. The first involved interaction with a greater UN system in which the ILO could stress its unique capabilities: labour standards, workers' rights, social dialogue, tripartism, social protection and employment; and, if the interaction were carried out correctly, the work of the Organization would be greatly magnified by working with all the other players of the UN system. The second would involve a protectionist ILO, staying as it was, while the world changed. The third involved interaction carried out incorrectly, with the ILO becoming dispersed and irrelevant. The first scenario – getting involved in the UN system and doing it right – was the one to follow. The ILO mandate had to remain centred on the four strategic objectives. The focus of activities must be on the ILO's comparative advantages and what it did best. The ILO also had to be able to provide the technical assistance required to carry out its mandate.
- 106.** *A Government representative of Nigeria* perceived the entire reform process as facilitating development. The role of the ILO should be to promote this development. The Organization should focus on rights, protection, employment and social dialogue, and developing appropriate toolkits to facilitate this. DWCPs should be designed to ensure that ILO principles were included in the entire process of national poverty reduction strategies. Within the link between objective action plans and strategic steps and outcomes, the ILO had to be able to measure its performance on a continuous basis, and review its relationship with other members of the United Nations system. If this was done, whatever progress or advantage gained within the period of eight years that were left for the ILO to deliver what it had promised in the form of decent work, then it would be able to measure its own performance. On this basis, the world would be able to appreciate the added value of the ILO in the entire development process.

107. *A Worker member from France* stressed, as had the Employer Vice-Chairperson, that it was the ILO's identity that gave it a comparative advantage, not its knowledge or technical expertise. As he had already remarked in the Programme, Financial and Administrative Committee (PFAC), tripartism was greater than the sum of its three parts; it was a way of doing and of being. The ILO did not approach the issue of HIV/AIDS as the World Health Organization (WHO) did. The ILO's aim was to abolish discrimination and promote prevention, hygiene and safety at work. Equally, the ILO did not address child labour as UNICEF did. The ILO was more direct and told employers that they must stop using children.
108. The Government representative of the United States had pointed to a UN reform scenario that involved failure. The speaker asked the Director-General to provide the Governing Body with his opinion of how other UN agencies were responding to this possibility and if there were not ambitious persons in these institutions who sought to be leaders in this type of grouping or coordination. The discussion in the Governing Body seemed to assume that the ILO would be the leader, but this was by no means certain. The ILO did not know what others were doing and it would be useful to know the psychological reaction of others to the proposed reform.
109. Returning to the issue of identity, he pointed out that the more the ILO was inflexible on the fact that it was the ILO, and tripartite, the better. If the Office was flexible regarding the ILO's identity, the more the Workers would be afraid. It was a question of trust between the Office and the Governing Body. The Governing Body was willing to agree to any unification, provided the essential identity of the ILO was preserved. But it would oppose any danger of dilution. There was also the problem of the person who would be in charge of the issue and of how long the reform would take.
110. He noted with satisfaction that a Government representative had alluded to the issue of payment of contributions on time. Technical capacity had also been evoked, and this depended on funding as well. The representative of the Government of Jordan had suggested that it was those institutions with the funding that would emerge successfully from the reform process. This implied paying contributions on time and reviewing the budget. The Director-General had stated clearly, in the PFAC, that the ILO had lost money in relative terms over the past 15 years. To face these issues a lot of money was required, not just the US\$2.5 million set aside. Financial help would be required to ensure that tripartism was to be part of the discussions.
111. *The Director-General* said that the meeting had given him the guidance as to the key areas for action by the Office. The Preamble to the Constitution and the Philadelphia Declaration would provide the fundamental ILO arguments in the reform process. The ILO would not simply go to the UN as one more governmental organization. The question remained as to how to make tripartism recognized.
112. The Director-General would do all he could to obtain assurances that tripartism would be recognized and respected, and that the ILO would have a seat at the table, but nothing was guaranteed so far. Only the ILO could guarantee its own work through the way in which it presented itself. The Office would do what it could, but could not act alone, without the backing of the Governing Body. Moreover, at no point throughout the discussions had he heard the Governing Body promise that it supported action in the process, and the Governing Body's support and backing was essential to the Office.
113. It was important to convince the United Nations system that tripartism was a method of action, a method of resolving conflicts, a way of action to improve policy. Not all governments would be in agreement with this, but there were sufficient governments in the world that would respond positively.

114. The potential was enormous, but agreement had to be reached and commitments made so that the subject could be given the importance it deserved. The Office was prepared to do whatever was needed, but in six months' time, when progress in the pilot countries was reviewed, the Office would be seeking further support and guidance from its constituents.

115. *The Governing Body took note of the three reports.*

(GB.298/4/1, GB.298/4/2 and GB.298/4/3.)

Fifth item on the agenda

DEVELOPMENTS CONCERNING THE QUESTION OF THE OBSERVANCE BY THE
GOVERNMENT OF MYANMAR OF THE FORCED LABOUR CONVENTION, 1930 (No. 29)
(GB.298/5/1)

Other activities following the 2006 Conference decision
(GB.298/5/1(Add.))

*The functioning of the complaint mechanism established
under the "Supplementary Understanding"*
(GB.298/5/1(Add.2))

*Preparations for the Governing Body to request an advisory opinion
of the International Court of Justice*
(GB.298/5/2)

116. *The Ambassador of Myanmar* thanked the Director-General for the continued ILO assistance extended to Myanmar to eradicate forced labour in the country. The constructive trend in relations between the Government and the ILO continued: the three pending cases had been resolved; a six-month moratorium on action against false complaints of forced labour had been extended, pending the establishment of a mechanism to address cases of forced labour; in accordance with the Governing Body conclusion that the Myanmar authorities should conclude an agreement with the Office on such a mechanism, a Supplementary Understanding was signed in Geneva on 26 February 2007, which set up the mechanism in question. Myanmar had thus satisfied the main priority of the 297th Session of the Governing Body (November 2006), and shown its willingness to cooperate with the ILO in eradicating forced labour in the country. The agreement was now in a 12-month trial period.

117. A number of cases that had been assessed by the Liaison Officer a.i. had now been referred to the Ministry of Labour for investigation. In one case, action was already being taken against three local officials and officials from the Forestry Department alleged to have exacted forced labour. Two of the local officials had been sentenced to six months' imprisonment under section 374 of the Penal Code; the third had been acquitted. Another case involving forced recruitment of a boy into the army had been resolved, and action had been taken against those responsible by the Adjutant General's office, while the boy had been returned to his parents.

118. In view of these positive developments, the delegation of Myanmar requested that the Governing Body should allow time for the mechanism that had been put in place to function properly, and refrain from pursuing legal action against the country.

119. *The Worker Vice-Chairperson* thanked the Ambassador for facilitating the agreement that had been reached. Significant efforts had been made, and the group looked forward to

receiving more reports relating to freedom of association and the removal of people from forced labour in Myanmar. There was a 12-month trial period during which the mechanism could be reviewed for progress. However, the group had received very serious reports from Myanmar of increasing numbers of persons subjected to forced labour. In the Taungoo district, over a very short period, as many as 5,555 persons had been forced into labour; 136 persons had been shot; 122 persons had been arrested for no known reason; ten people had been arrested and tortured. While willing to allow the 12-month trial period to progress, the group wished to see the situation improve, not just in the capital city, or in particular areas pinpointed earlier. The group was still waiting for the full implementation of the recommendations of the Commission of Inquiry. The Government should issue instructions to the administration, and in particular to members of the armed forces, that would filter down to the people in the villages, so that ILO staff would be able to ascertain from people in the districts that clear orders concerning the eradication of forced labour had been issued, and understood, in the relevant languages. The preparation of a report to this effect could not be the work of one person – the present Liaison Officer a.i. It was therefore imperative that the Liaison Office should be reinforced, with sufficient staff members, benefiting from freedom of movement and of access to information within Myanmar. The Government should realize that an impartial report of this kind, showing progress made, should be in its interests.

120. Real progress had therefore been made. However, to preserve the integrity of the ILO and of the Governing Body, vigilance was essential to make sure that events on the ground reflected this progress. If not, then it would be necessary to approach the International Court of Justice (ICJ). The paper describing the preparations for the Governing Body to request an advisory opinion of the ICJ did not reflect the decision taken by the Governing Body at its previous sitting. The Office should prepare a series of questions which would be structured to cover the areas of concern in a helpful manner, with the intention being to move away from a confrontational approach to the problem. The developments that had taken place should be reinforced to allow further progress. The Office should suggest ways for the more active involvement of employers' and workers' organizations, which if they were allowed to play their proper roles, within national law and the constitution, would surely be able to help advance national development. The ILO should also promote regional discussion on social dialogue, with the social partners and also, if he accepted, the head of the Myanmar Government. This forum might provide the opportunity for introducing other partners, such as Amnesty International and Anti-Slavery, to the discussion, as well as institutions that the Employers might wish to put forward, and thus open up the international dialogue which had been closed to the Government for many years.
121. *The Employer Vice-Chairperson* joined the Worker Vice-Chairperson in thanking the Ambassador of Myanmar for the efforts he had made to arrive at an agreement. He wished also to highlight the work of the Office and of the Liaison Officer a.i. This had been carried through with persistence, objectivity and close cooperation, and genuine progress had been made. The group was therefore satisfied at this outcome, though it considered it to be no more than an important first step towards the final goal of eradication of forced labour in Myanmar, the guarantee that should forced labour occur, those responsible would be punished, and that those denouncing it should not be punished for doing so. The Supplementary Understanding provided a means to an end, and also fulfilled the important function of rebuilding confidence between the parties. The Employers' group would consider the suggestions put forward by the Worker Vice-Chairperson regarding further action that might be taken. The Employers were generally disposed to take any action that would further the aims of the Organization, without hindering the work of the Liaison Officer a.i.

122. The group supported the point for decision in paragraph 7 of document GB.298/5/2. However, it believed that should there be a breakdown in the relations established by the Supplementary Understanding between the Government and the ILO, the Organization should be ready to go ahead with the plan to submit a question for an advisory opinion by the ICJ. This should not be viewed as a threat, but as a definite plan of action through obtaining an external opinion regarding the application of the Forced Labour Convention, 1930 (No. 29) in Myanmar.
123. *A Government representative of Germany*, speaking on behalf of the European Union (EU); the candidate countries: Turkey, Croatia and The former Yugoslav Republic of Macedonia; the countries of the stabilization and association process and potential candidates: Albania, Bosnia and Herzegovina, and Serbia; the European Free Trade Association (EFTA) countries: Iceland and Norway; members of the European Economic Area (EEA), as well as Ukraine, the Republic of Moldova and Switzerland, noted that the human rights situation in Burma/Myanmar had been before the relevant United Nations bodies and the ILO for a number of years, a period marked by the persistent failure of the authorities to commit themselves in words and actions to bring an end to forced labour. The EU now welcomed the Supplementary Understanding of 26 February 2007 between the ILO and the Burma/Myanmar authorities, which established a credible and effective complaint mechanism for victims of forced labour in the country. The main objective of the Supplementary Understanding was to allow victims of forced labour to seek redress without fear of further victimization. The EU appreciated the efforts made by both sides in reaching this agreement, but strongly urged the Burma/Myanmar authorities to show good faith by implementing the agreement fully, so that it became a first step towards the eradication of forced labour in the country. The ASEAN countries should support Burma/Myanmar in its efforts to do so.
124. As regards the consideration of legal options, including referral to the ICJ, to seek an advisory opinion concerning the interpretation of Convention No. 29, the EU believed that following the signing of the Supplementary Understanding, the ILO should refrain from submitting the request at this time. Such a request remained, however, an appropriate step, that should be kept on the table and reconsidered when the implementation of the Supplementary Understanding was reviewed. The EU would therefore monitor its implementation closely, and endorsed the point for decision in paragraph 7 of document GB.298/5/2.
125. *A Government representative of the Philippines* praised the efforts made on both sides to arrive at the Supplementary Understanding. The Government of the Philippines was opposed to the practice of forced labour and encouraged Myanmar to comply with Convention No. 29. The signing of the Supplementary Understanding was a positive development, and the process should be given a chance to develop, before alternative measures, such as referral to the ICJ for an advisory opinion, were considered.
126. *A Government representative of Australia*, speaking also on behalf of New Zealand, expressed appreciation of the efforts made by the ILO in arriving at an agreement with the authorities, and welcomed the Supplementary Understanding. Myanmar should ensure that the Liaison Officer a.i. was able to conduct independent assessments of complaints, was free to travel without hindrance, and free to have confidential access to relevant persons, as stipulated in the Supplementary Understanding. The report of the Liaison Officer a.i. that the mechanism had begun to operate was encouraging, and suggested that there would be considerable work in the coming months, requiring more international and local staff in the Liaison Office. The Government should comply with any requests to this effect. At this stage, a request to the ICJ for an advisory opinion should be deferred. The Supplementary Understanding was only a first step. To function effectively, the mechanism should lead to

the full implementation of the recommendations of the Commission of Inquiry. The Governing Body should remain concentrated on this goal.

127. *A Government representative of Japan* noted that the Supplementary Understanding bore witness to tremendous efforts on both sides in overcoming the difficulties and reaching an agreement. The Supplementary Understanding was a tangible first step forward: the international community and the tripartite members of the Governing Body should therefore pay careful attention to the functioning of the mechanism it established. The Government of Japan would do its utmost to promote cooperation between the ILO and the Government of Myanmar.
128. *A Government representative of Canada* noted that the Supplementary Understanding was an important step in the struggle to redress a human rights situation in Burma/Myanmar on which Canada had frequently commented. As confidence in the new complaints system was built up, it should be extended indefinitely until the problem of forced labour was rooted out.
129. *A Government representative of Sri Lanka* welcomed the new complaints mechanism established under the Supplementary Understanding, and the report of the first cases reviewed by the mechanism. The Government of Myanmar should continue the process of dialogue and cooperation with the ILO. Referral to the ICJ for an advisory opinion should be deferred pending review of the complaints mechanism.
130. *A Government representative of the United States* noted positive results since the previous Governing Body session: the pardon of the two persons prosecuted and sentenced for complaints of forced labour; the moratorium, which should be made permanent, on prosecutions of forced labour complainants since the 2006 International Labour Conference; and now the Supplementary Understanding of 26 February 2007. Retaliation against complainants must cease; perpetrators of forced labour must be prosecuted; and the use of forced labour must be ended. The Myanmar military and local authorities continued to use forced labour. This must stop. The United States agreed that the decision to request an advisory opinion from the ICJ should be deferred, pending review of the implementation of the Supplementary Understanding. The United States resolutely supported the people of Burma/Myanmar in their search for freedom to enjoy their worker rights, human rights and democracy.
131. *A Government representative of India* considered the signing of the Supplementary Understanding to be a positive development. Both sides should be commended for their commitment in arriving at this agreement. India was strongly opposed to the practice of forced labour, which was prohibited under the Constitution and national legislation. The cooperation between the Government and the ILO should continue in order to achieve the goal of eradication of forced labour in Myanmar.
132. *A Government representative of South Africa* mentioned that protection against forced labour was a constitutional imperative in his country. It was for this reason that South Africa believed the ILO to be the most suitable body to deal with the issue in Myanmar. The Supplementary Understanding was a welcome development. It should be fully implemented to begin an effective and speedy process ending the use of forced labour in the country. The decision to request an advisory opinion from the ICJ should be deferred, pending the implementation of the Supplementary Understanding.
133. *A Government representative of China* welcomed the agreement reached and the signing of the Supplementary Understanding. China had always held the opinion that only economic development and poverty reduction could eliminate forced labour, and open dialogue and

cooperation were the best means of advancing towards these goals. There was no need to refer to the ICJ for an advisory opinion.

134. *A Government representative of Cuba* said that his Government rejected all forms of forced labour and supported the measures adopted for its eradication by the ILO. Dialogue and cooperation were the means to achieve this goal, and the Supplementary Understanding was a step in the right direction. There was therefore no need to request an advisory opinion from the ICJ, and future action should be based on close monitoring of the implementation of the complaints mechanism.
135. *A Government representative of the Republic of Korea* said that the Supplementary Understanding represented a true breakthrough and provided a sound basis for the elimination of forced labour in Myanmar. The Republic of Korea was ready to assist in any efforts towards this end.
136. *A Government representative of the Russian Federation* said that sanctions were not the way to achieve the eradication of forced labour in Myanmar. Dialogue and cooperation between the Government and the ILO would show the way forward, as had been demonstrated by the signing of the Supplementary Understanding. It was also positive that Myanmar had ceased prosecuting complainants of forced labour, and had released persons accused of making false reports of forced labour. The Government of the Russian Federation had grave doubts concerning the request for an advisory opinion from the ICJ, which it had already expressed at the previous Governing Body session. In view of the Supplementary Understanding, discussion in the Governing Body on this question should be suspended.
137. *A Government representative of Viet Nam* welcomed the conclusion of the Supplementary Understanding, which should be supported through continued dialogue and cooperation between the two sides.
138. *The Government representative of Cambodia* said that, following the conclusion of the Supplementary Understanding, the Government of Myanmar should be given more time to prove itself by the full implementation of the complaints mechanism. The ILO should provide all cooperation necessary to allow the Government to make progress towards the eradication of forced labour.

Governing Body decision:

139. *The Governing Body considered all the information before it, including the comments and information provided by the Permanent Representative of Myanmar. It welcomed the signing of the Supplementary Understanding between the ILO and the Government of Myanmar establishing a mechanism to enable victims of forced labour to seek redress. It also welcomed as part of a progressive building of confidence the fact that the implementation of the mechanism had begun, and that action had been taken by the authorities in those cases that involved forced labour.*
140. *The Governing Body underlined the importance of the mechanism continuing to function effectively in the context of a very serious forced labour situation. In this regard, as foreseen in the Supplementary Understanding, it was vital that the Liaison Officer a.i. had the necessary staff resources to adequately discharge the responsibilities. The Governing Body requested the Office to move quickly to assign suitable international staff to assist the Liaison Officer a.i., and requested the Government of Myanmar to extend the necessary cooperation and facilities.*

- 141. *The Governing Body decided to defer the question of an advisory opinion by the ICJ on the understanding that the necessary question or questions would continue to be studied and prepared by the Office, in consultation with the constituents and using the necessary legal expertise, to be available at any time that might be necessary.***

Sixth item on the agenda

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.298/6)

- 142.** *A Government representative of Belarus* reviewed the progress made by his country's Government in implementing the recommendations of the Commission of Inquiry since the 297th Session (November 2006) of the Governing Body. He began by referring to the draft law on trade unions, which would be submitted for consultation of all the parties concerned, including the Federation of Trade Unions of Belarus (FPB), the Belarusian Congress of Democratic Trade Unions (CDTU), the employers' organizations, the National Council on Labour and Social Issues (NCLSI) and the Council for the Improvement of Legislation in the Labour and Social Sphere. That draft law would be submitted to Parliament in the following autumn and meanwhile, all the necessary changes could be made to bring its provisions into conformity 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). The right to organize would be strengthened by the text and every individual would be able to exercise it. Parallel to that, the Government of Belarus had adopted a number of concrete measures intended to simplify the trade union registration procedure.
- 143.** The speaker assured those present that despite certain divergences of opinion, the Government of Belarus was pursuing dialogue and cooperation with the ILO. This was evidenced by the fact that it had suggested that the ILO consider the possibility of holding a seminar on anti-union discrimination and that, at its session on 31 January 2007, the NCLSI had officially included the President of the CDTU among its members and reaffirmed the importance of preventing any interference by enterprises in trade unions' internal affairs. Referring to the Council for the Improvement of Legislation in the Labour and Social Sphere, he said that that body, which had been set up after consultations held in Geneva in October 2006 and included CDTU representatives among its members, would be charged, inter alia, with examining individual complaints by workers who considered that they had been discriminated against on account of their trade union membership, and would also study the draft law on trade unions.
- 144.** *The Worker Vice-Chairperson* would have liked to know that the progress made by the Government of Belarus concerning the implementation of the recommendations of the Commission of Inquiry was genuine and not merely prompted by the impending session of the Governing Body or the International Labour Conference to which accounts had to be rendered. He stated that the Government of Belarus failed to demonstrate compliance with Conventions Nos 87 and 98. He insisted that the dismissed workers should be reinstated in their posts and be paid the compensation due. The ILO had been providing guidance to the Government of Belarus since 2000, as had the Committee of Experts on the Application of Conventions and Recommendations in recent years. If there were divergences of opinion, the Government would have to assume its responsibilities and demonstrate that its aim was

not to control the trade unions, but rather to respect freedom of association in all its manifestations.

145. The Workers' group requested the Governing Body to call upon the Government of Belarus, firstly, to cooperate fully with the International Labour Office for the implementation of all the recommendations of the Commission of Inquiry; secondly, to ensure that all trade unions could obtain registration and function freely and without interference of any kind; and thirdly, to abandon the present concept of the draft trade union law and review all its legislation in consultation with the social partners concerned in order to ensure that the right to organize was fully guaranteed in law and in practice, and that free and independent trade unions could exercise their full rights. The Workers' group requested the Governing Body to inform the Government of Belarus of its firm intention to keep developments under close review.

146. *The Employer Vice-Chairperson* noted that, thanks to the intervention of several ILO bodies, it had been possible to achieve some concrete results in the dialogue that the Governing Body had opened several years earlier with the Government of Belarus. However, he regretted that this willingness to cooperate did not translate into observance of Convention No. 87, which required a climate of respect for freedom of association and non-interference in the internal affairs of workers' and employers' organizations and, in the present case in particular, the abolition of all politically motivated measures aimed at registering trade unions and regulating their activities. Regulation did not mean restricting those rights. The speaker urged the Government of Belarus to provide convincing proof of its willingness to cooperate and to abandon any draft legislation that was not in full conformity with the provisions of Convention No. 87.

147. *A Government representative of Germany* took the floor on behalf of the Governments of the Member States of the European Union; the candidate countries Turkey, Croatia and The former Yugoslav Republic of Macedonia; the Stabilization and Association Process States and potential candidate countries Albania, Bosnia and Herzegovina, Montenegro and Serbia; the European Free Trade Association/European Economic Area States Iceland and Norway; Ukraine, Republic of Moldova and Switzerland. The speaker pointed out that, while the European Union acknowledged the different activities carried out by the Government of Belarus in cooperation with the ILO for the implementation of the recommendations of the Commission of Inquiry, as described in the Office paper, she was obliged to note that the range of high-level activities was in contrast to the results obtained, which did not reflect any significant progress in regard to the issues raised by the Committee of Experts on the Application of Conventions and Recommendations.

148. The European Union expressed its deep concern at the situation in regard to trade union rights in Belarus. The speaker referred in particular to the draft law on trade unions, which not only did not respect Convention No. 87, but failed to take into account the comments made by the ILO and the Committee of Experts. The text, which focused on the issue of representativeness, stipulated that where a trade union represented 75 per cent of the workers in an enterprise and had signed a collective agreement with the employer, no other primary-level trade union could be registered. This concept of trade unionism would have a serious impact on the existence of primary-level organizations, as well as their organizations at national level, and would lead to a de facto monopoly of workers' representation.

149. The European Union urged the Government of Belarus to abandon the principle of representativeness and amend the draft law on trade unions immediately so as to bring its provisions into conformity with Convention No. 87 and to guarantee fully freedom of association and the right of all workers to join organizations of their own choosing, whether through a traditional primary-level organization or through enterprise-level

organizations. It also urged the Government of Belarus to take immediate measures to ensure that all trade unions were registered without delay. Bearing in mind that the Government of Belarus had only partly implemented the recommendations of the Commission of Inquiry and that the Committee on Freedom of Association had received new allegations of failure to implement those recommendations, the European Union urged the Government of Belarus to pursue close and transparent dialogue with the ILO.

150. The European Union supported the recommendation contained in paragraph 99 of the 345th Report of the Committee on Freedom of Association and proposed that developments in the situation in Belarus be reviewed at the 96th Session (2007) of the International Labour Conference. Lastly, on behalf of the Governments of the Member States of the European Union and Switzerland, the speaker supported the point for decision proposed by the Worker Vice-Chairperson.
151. *A Government representative of India* was in favour of solving the problems that arose between the ILO and its Members through dialogue and cooperation. Accordingly, she considered that the tangible and positive measures taken by the Government of Belarus to implement the recommendations of the Commission of Inquiry, as well as those made by the International Labour Conference in June 2006 and the Governing Body in November 2006, should be encouraged. These measures included the streamlining of the procedure for registering trade unions and the drafting of a law on trade unions, both in consultation with the social partners and the ILO. The Government's good will, reiterated by the Deputy Prime Minister of Belarus in his statement, should be seen as a harbinger of continued progress.
152. *A Government representative of the Bolivarian Republic of Venezuela* valued the important progress made by the Government of Belarus with a view to implementing the recommendations of the Commission of Inquiry and its spirit of openness in regard to resolving, in cooperation with the ILO, the conflicts relating to the application of Conventions Nos 87 and 98. The ILO should continue to support the adoption of measures that would benefit the workers and ensure that all the procedures for the examination of cases met the requirements of transparency, objectivity and impartiality.
153. *A Government representative of the United States* stated that, to date, the Government of Belarus had not implemented the 12 recommendations made by the Commission of Inquiry in 2004, when it had presented its general assessment of the violations of law and practice in regard to freedom of association committed by the Government of Belarus. Care should be taken, in particular, to ensure that the draft law on trade unions currently being prepared was in conformity with ILO standards and was adopted and applied without delay. He trusted that consultations with the ILO would be pursued to that end and that, failing substantial progress, the Governing Body would continue to examine the situation with a view to the adoption of further measures by the ILO.
154. *A Government representative of the Russian Federation* commended the clear progress made by the Government of Belarus in regard to the implementation of the recommendations of the Commission of Inquiry. He referred, in particular, to the drafting of a new concept for a law on trade unions based on those recommendations (which had been published again, this time in the newspaper with the highest circulation, *Respublika*), the dissolution of the National Registration Commission, the granting of a seat to the CDTU on the NCLSI and the work being done in the Ministry of Justice to supervise the application of government decisions. All of this was convincing proof of the willingness of the Government of Belarus to cooperate with the ILO with a view to the application of Conventions Nos 87 and 98. Accordingly, the speaker felt it would be counterproductive to propose the adoption of further measures against Belarus or to refer the discussion to the

next session of the Conference, and therefore he could not accept the proposal put forward by the Worker Vice-Chairperson.

155. *A Government representative of China* noted with satisfaction the progress made in the labour and trade union spheres by the Government of Belarus since the last session of the Governing Body. She trusted that dialogue and cooperation between the Government of Belarus and the ILO would be pursued with a view to more effective implementation of the recommendations of the Commission of Inquiry.
156. *A Government representative of Belarus* assured those present that the Government of his country was intent on improving internal legislation and practice, in conformity with Conventions Nos 87 and 98. Accordingly, he would study the proposals put forward by the Workers, the Employers and the Government representatives during the discussion. He considered that the plan submitted by the Government of Belarus in 2005 was satisfactory and showed the need for a step-by-step approach, since any process took time. He was confident that he would be able to present a positive outcome of cooperation with the ILO at the 96th Session (2007) of the Conference.
157. *The Worker Vice-Chairperson* emphasized the need for ILO member States to comply with the provisions of Conventions Nos 87 and 98, which were exactly the same for everyone. He took note of the measures taken by the Government of Belarus and could only hope that the process would continue towards improving the trade union legislation and that trade unions would be allowed to exist in the country.
158. *The Employer Vice-Chairperson*, reaffirming his conviction that the dialogue that had been opened was positive, considered the proposal put forward by the Worker Vice-Chairperson appropriate, subject to certain adjustments. He trusted that the convergence of the joint efforts being made by different ILO bodies would convince the Government of Belarus of the need to find a solution without delay to the situation that had arisen in the country.

Governing Body conclusions:

159. *The Governing Body:*

- (i) *called upon the Government of Belarus to cooperate fully with the International Labour Office for the implementation of all the recommendations of the Commission of Inquiry;***
- (ii) *called upon the Government of Belarus to ensure that all employers' and workers' organizations can function freely and without interference, and obtain registration;***
- (iii) *urged the Government to abandon the present concept of the draft trade union law and review all its legislation, in full consultation with all the social partners concerned, in order to ensure fully the right to organize both in law and in practice, in accordance with the Freedom of Association and Protection of the Right to Organise Convention, 1948 (No. 87), so that free and independent trade unions may exercise their full rights;***
- (iv) *decided to keep the developments under close review.***

Seventh item on the agenda

REPORTS OF THE COMMITTEE ON FREEDOM OF ASSOCIATION

344th Report (GB.298/7/1)

160. *The Chairperson* informed the Committee of a change in the procedure of the Committee on Freedom of Association effective as of June 2007. At the request of the Committee, and with the approval of the Officers of the Governing Body, from the 299th Session onwards, the independent Chairperson would act as the Reporter of the Committee and present a report to the Governing Body. This would allow members, particularly the Employer and Worker members, to express their groups' views.
161. *The Reporter of the Committee* announced that the Committee had before it 132 pending cases with 34 examined on their merits. It had had to issue urgent appeals in Cases Nos 2477 (Argentina), 2318 (Cambodia) and 2422 (Bolivarian Republic of Venezuela), where, despite the time elapsed since the submission of the complaints, the complete observations of the governments concerned had not been received.
162. The Committee had examined 48 cases in which the governments kept it informed on the measures taken to give effect to its recommendations and noted with satisfaction or interest developments in six of these cases, especially in respect of the reinstatement of trade union members and officials. These six positive developments were related to Cases Nos 2148 (Togo), 2211 (Peru), 2291 (Poland) and 2388 (Ukraine). In the case of the Republic of Moldova (Case No. 2350), the Committee noted with satisfaction the legislation adopted concerning the deductibility of membership fees paid by employers to their organizations.
163. Unfortunately, there were also serious and urgent cases, and the Committee drew the special attention of the Governing Body to Case No. 2471 (Djibouti) and Case No. 2365 (Zimbabwe).
164. Regarding Case No. 2471 (Djibouti), the Reporter deeply regretted that no reply had been made by the Government to the allegations, despite the time that had elapsed and the urgency of the appeal. The Committee had examined the case of intimidation and increasingly serious violations of trade union rights and regretted the allegations of abusive dismissal of numerous trade union leaders and activists and the subsequent detention of nearly 200 workers acting in solidarity with the dismissed workers. The Government had been requested to institute an independent inquiry rapidly into the allegations of abusive dismissal and, in the event that they were proved to be founded, ensure the reinstatement of the workers without loss of pay. Regarding the arrest of trade union leaders in June 2006, the Committee expressed the firm expectation that they had since been released and that no charges would remain pending against them.
165. Case No. 2365 (Zimbabwe) was very serious; it concerned the deportation of, and refusal of entry to, foreign trade unionists collaborating with the ZCTU, the free trade union centre. The Government had actually sponsored a rival faction within the ZCTU in order to undermine its leadership, breaking up their meetings, raiding their headquarters, seizing their property, launching unfounded inquiries, proposing amendments to the labour legislation in violation of freedom of association, as well as on several occasions arresting, detaining and beating leaders and members.
166. The Committee urged the Government to drop the charges brought against trade unionists for reasons connected to their trade union activities and their participation in the 13 September 2006 demonstration, and further urged the Government to ensure that no

other charges were pending against trade unionists under the Public Order and Security Act for the exercise of legitimate trade union activity.

167. The Committee also urged the Government to initiate independent inquiries into the allegations of beatings of trade union members while in detention as well as into the disruption of their meetings and physical assault by rival factions within the union. Following the deportation and refusal of entry to a number of foreign trade unionists, the Committee urged the Government to allow mutual support missions into the country, subjecting any approval to objective criteria only. The Committee again noted with deep concern that the trade union situation in Zimbabwe had not evolved and may even have worsened since the last examination of the case. There was great concern that the Government had refused a direct contacts mission; it should reconsider the request for such a mission.

168. Case No. 2467 (Canada, Province of Quebec) concerned 12 unions that had complained of government intervention in the collective bargaining process and of the unilateral imposition by law of conditions of employment for employees in the public service. It was yet another case concerning Canadian provinces where established collective bargaining rights had been violated. The Reporter urged the Government to avoid such legislative intervention in future without full and frank consultations with the parties concerned and to consider submitting any disputes to impartial and independent arbitration.

169. Case No. 2460 (United States) concerned the legislation of the State of North Carolina, which expressly prohibited any collective agreement between cities, towns, municipalities or the State and any trade union in the public sector. The Committee recalled the importance of bargaining in good faith and the free and voluntary nature of collective bargaining and requested the Government to promote the establishment of a collective bargaining framework in the public sector in North Carolina. The Government could avail itself of ILO technical assistance.

170. Regarding Case No. 2241(Guatemala), the allegations pending referred to a number of acts of anti-union arrests and the dismissal and physical and verbal abuse of union members. The Committee regretted these acts and stressed that a free and independent trade union movement could only develop in a climate free from violence, threats and pressure. It requested the Government to carry out an investigation without delay into the allegations of physical and verbal abuse and to reply to the latest allegations that included threats to the physical safety of trade union members.

171. *The Employer spokesperson of the Committee* associated the Employers with the remarks of the Reporter and noted that 12 cases concerned Latin America, eight Central and North America, five Africa, two Asia and nine Europe. In addition, the case of Belarus was also dealt with in a separate document. The Employers were extremely positive that definitive conclusions had been reached in 25 of the 34 cases examined. The Employers also supported the appointment of the Chairman of the Committee as Reporter in future.

172. The Employers' group was once again concerned with the naming of companies in some of the cases, in particular Case No. 2470 (Brazil), although the employers in this case were able to make submissions, but were not guaranteed an opportunity to state their case. The Employers' group had identified areas in the past that should be debated regarding the future functioning of the Committee and were satisfied with the processes set in motion to do this. Some clarity had been provided on the right to protection of property regarding the security officers and the accompanying people on premises, as the case dealt with the right to have security guards and escort persons, including trade union officials on company premises.

173. Cases Nos 2464 (Barbados), 2423 (El Salvador), 1052 (Mexico) and 2466 (Thailand) were cases that acknowledged the role of internal processes of courts in contested dismissal cases. Case No. 2464 (Barbados) made an important distinction between matters for dialogue in the realms of collective bargaining.
174. Regarding Case No. 2467 (Canada), where a legislative amendment was sought, the Employers looked forward to a positive result. This point was also confirmed in Case No. 2496 (Burkina Faso) where the Government was asked to review the legislation.
175. In Case No. 2434 (Colombia), a clear statement had been made that the Committee did not have the mandate of a state legislative power on pension schemes as long as collective bargaining was respected. This case had to be distinguished from Case No. 2502 (Greece), where the Government intruded in collective bargaining.
176. Case No. 2509 (Romania) was important in that reference was made to the fact that purely political strikes were not within the framework of the right to strike.
177. Case No. 2437 (United Kingdom) made a clear statement that it was against freedom of association to force union deductions without an agreement. The Employers had pointed out that at some point the Committee of Experts would have to provide clear guidance to governments on the issue of their embassy staff.
178. Case No. 2460 (United States) concerned the role of the Committee vis-à-vis countries that had not ratified Conventions. The Employers were of the opinion that further debate was required.
179. The Employers concurred with the Reporter on the serious cases of Djibouti and Zimbabwe. Djibouti was an example of governments ignoring their responsibility to respond to allegations. It was disturbing to note that treating the Committee with contempt appeared to go hand in hand with the unacceptable situation in the respective countries. In Zimbabwe, a clear statement had been made through strong recommendations to end what was clearly an untenable situation. The Employers stressed the role played by governments in applying and maintaining international standards and asked governments to continue to address Committee issues in an expeditious and responsible manner.
180. *The Worker spokesperson of the Committee* endorsed the statement made by the Reporter. Case No. 2365 (Zimbabwe) continued the story of arrests of trade union leaders, interference in internal trade union matters, including sponsoring of a rival faction in the ZCTU, and refusal to allow foreign trade unionists to enter the country. He said it was doubtful if the Government intended to follow the recommendation by the Committee for an independent inquiry into the alleged beatings of ZCTU members by the police. As could be seen from Cases Nos 1937 and 2027 (Zimbabwe), the Government had refused to set up an inquiry with regard to the attack on Morgan Tsvangirai which occurred when he was the leader of the ZCTU. The recent events in Zimbabwe, where Mr Tsvangirai and other activists of the MDC were severely beaten while in police custody, confirmed that these acts were sanctioned by the Government. In November of last year, the Committee had expressed its concern on the extreme situation in the country and deplored the Government refusal to cooperate with the Committee, a fact confirmed by the refusal to accept a direct contacts mission.
181. In Case No. 2471 (Djibouti) the Workers' group expected the Government to cooperate with the Committee and expected that the four trade union leaders of the Djibouti Union of Workers (UTP) arrested in June 2006 would be released.

- 182.** Case No. 2448 (Colombia) had been examined in May 2006. The Committee had had to repeat its request that minor workers, organized in a cooperative, should be able to exercise their trade union rights freely. This case was of deep concern to the Workers' group, partly because the enterprise in question had apparently been involved in the establishment of the Minor Workers' Pre-cooperative (COOTRAMENOR), with the effect that these workers could not join a trade union and also because the Government had failed to recognize the violation of principles of freedom of association and the Promotion of Cooperatives Recommendation, 2002 (No. 193), which called on governments to ensure that cooperatives were not set up or used for non-compliance with labour law or used to establish disguised employment relationships.
- 183.** In Case No. 2470 (Brazil) the Workers' group was concerned that again an employer, in this case a multinational company, tried to force workers to leave their trade union, including through the distribution of resignation forms and setting up a toll-free telephone line where resignation from the union could be requested. It was also disturbing that the Government had not made a comment on the matter but only transmitted information from both parties.
- 184.** In Case No. 2468 (Cambodia) there had been no reply from the Government other than that the matters were under investigation. The case concerned dismissals of trade union leaders, refusal by the employer to reinstate them – despite an award to this effect by the Arbitration Council and attempts by the Ministry of Social Affairs – and the alleged attempts to set up a puppet trade union. It confirmed that there was no effective protection against anti-union discrimination and that sufficiently dissuasive sanctions did not exist.
- 185.** In Case No. 2467 (Canada, Province of Quebec) the Workers' group deplored the continued legislative interventions in the collective bargaining process in the public sector and the employment conditions. Again the Committee had concluded that Act 43 should be amended, as it violated freedom of association principles and had requested the Government, who in this case also acted as the employer, to bargain in good faith. The Committee also regarded the sanctions provided for in Act 43 as excessive and not conducive to developing harmonious relations. The Workers' group expected the Federal Government of Canada to take appropriate action.
- 186.** In Case No. 2434 (Colombia) the Government had, through legislation, restricted the right of trade unions to bargain freely in pension-related matters and invalidated any collective agreement that differed from what would be provided in the law as from August 2010. The Committee had requested that previously concluded agreements should continue to be valid until their date of expiry and that the Government should hold in-depth consultations with the parties concerned to find a negotiated solution for future agreements that were acceptable to all parties concerned in accordance with Conventions Nos 87 and 98.
- 187.** The recommendations by the Committee were similar to those made in Case No. 2171 (Sweden), where the Committee had to note, with deep regret, that no official meeting had taken place for more than two years. The Committee strongly urged the Government to negotiate with the social partners in a meaningful manner to settle the matter.
- 188.** Case No. 2502 (Greece) constituted another example of government interference in collective agreements in pension-related matters. Bank employees had, in their collective agreements, provisions for supplementary pension funds. Through legislative measures, the Government, in practice, dissolved these private pension funds and confiscated the money by transferring it to a public social security scheme, despite the fact that these pension funds had not received state finance through the public budget. The Committee had requested the Government to amend the legislation as soon as possible and to ensure

that supplementary pension schemes could continue to be the subject of collective bargaining.

- 189.** Case No. 2437 (United Kingdom) contained a vast amount of arguments provided by the Government on why it had no obligation to give effect to the fundamental principles on freedom of association and collective bargaining to locally recruited personnel in its embassies, consulates or other offices. The Committee had concluded that fundamental principles had to be respected and requested the Government to bargain collectively with the union concerned on the terms and conditions of employment of locally engaged staff.
- 190.** The Workers' group was concerned by the growing number of acts of anti-union discrimination, including dismissal of trade union leaders that occurred at workplaces in Poland and the excessive delay in the judicial proceedings to deal with such acts. This could be seen in Case No. 2474 (Poland). The Committee had expressed its deep concern regarding the labour relations situation in the companies concerned. It urged the Government to provide for the effective recognition of trade unions and adequate protection against acts of anti-union discrimination and interference.
- 191.** In Case No. 2423 (El Salvador), the Committee had to repeat its earlier request from May–June 2006 that the private security sector union SITRASSPES would be granted legal personality in accordance with Article 2 of Convention No. 87. The Committee also noted in paragraph 939(f) that protection of trade union rights was not guaranteed, either in the legislation or in practice. Consequently, the Committee recommended ILO technical cooperation in drafting future legislation.
- 192.** Case No. 2460 (United States) was an example where a state, North Carolina, in its legislation, had a total ban on collective bargaining in the public sector, thereby violating freedom of association principles. The Committee had requested the Government to repeal the act in question and promote a framework allowing collective bargaining in the public sector in that State. The Workers' group appreciated that the federal Government had replied to the Committee and expected that it would ensure the effective recognition of the right to collective bargaining throughout the country's territory, with the technical assistance of the ILO, if required.
- 193.** In Case No. 2496 (Burkina Faso), the Committee also had to remind the Government that there should be no obstruction in the right of trade unions to use strike action to support their position in the search for solutions to problems posed by major social and economic policy trends which had a direct impact on their members and workers in general, in particular, as regards employment, social protection and standards of living.
- 194.** He noted that Case No. 2466 (Thailand) was typical, involving anti-union discrimination and dismissals of trade union leaders one month after the union gained registration. The fact that a public company was involved also illustrated that such violations occurred both in the public and private sector. The trade union leaders were unfairly dismissed almost two and a half years ago but, despite appeals by the employer, had not been reinstated.
- 195.** The Workers' group stated that it would appreciate any advice from the Governing Body on how to deal with Case No. 2301 (Malaysia). The Committee recalled once again that it had commented upon the extremely serious matters arising out of fundamental deficiencies in the legislation on several occasions, over a period spanning 15 years.
- 196.** Finally, the Workers' group was encouraged by the progress made with Case No. 2350 (Republic of Moldova) and Case No. 2148 (Togo).

Governing Body decision:

197. *The Governing Body took note of the introduction to the report of the Committee, contained in paragraphs 1–253, and adopted the recommendations made in paragraph 268 (Case No. 2373: Argentina); paragraph 280 (Case No. 2456: Argentina); paragraph 304 (Case No. 2458: Argentina); paragraph 314 (Case No. 2461: Argentina); paragraph 331 (Case No. 2464: Barbados); and paragraph 352 (Case No. 2491: Benin).*
198. A Government representative of Brazil said his Government gave great importance to the content of the complaint made in respect of Case No. 2470 (Brazil). Unfortunately, in the absence of a prior inquiry, it was impossible to establish the truth of the allegations. With a view to fully investigating the facts, apart from the visit of the labour inspector to the headquarters of the union and of the enterprise, the Ministry of Labour and of Employment proposed the holding of a joint arbitration meeting with the union, in order to reach a solution to the problems. The Enterprise was in favour of this approach, but the union was not.
199. In respect of the allegation in paragraph 386(e) that the Government had not sent its observations regarding the non-recognition by the enterprise of the National Trade Union, the Government referred to paragraph 959 of the *Digest of decisions and principles of the Freedom of Association Committee* which stated the principle that the competent authorities should, in all cases, have the power to proceed to an objective verification of any claim by a union that it represented the majority of the workers in an undertaking, provided such a claim appeared plausible. Should it prove that the union in question did represent the majority of workers, the authorities should take steps to ensure that the employer recognized the union for the purpose of collective bargaining. In the Ministry's view, the efforts at conciliation were adequate, but the union did not wish to find a solution to the problem. Nevertheless, the Government had attempted to bring the undertaking and the union together to find a solution.
200. The Government of Brazil reiterated its conviction that through social dialogue and non-interference in union affairs it fully respected the principles of freedom of association, to the benefit of the workers and enterprises of the country.

Governing Body decision:

201. *The Governing Body adopted the Committee's recommendations in paragraphs 386 and 415.*
202. A Government representative of Cambodia referred to the letter signed by his Minister on 2 March 2007, regarding Case No. 2468, in which, having seen the complaint made by the Cambodian Tourism Service Workers' Federation against the Royal Government of Cambodia, regarding Convention No. 87, the Ministry of Labour stated that the Royal Government had actively performed its obligation, in accordance with the procedures concerning this case. However, conciliation could not be reached. The Arbitration Council had decided not to take the case into reconsideration. According to the judicial system and legal procedures, this case was beyond the competence of the Ministry of Labour and Vocational Training and the Government required the trade union to submit the case to the courts for settlement. He promised to keep the Committee informed on developments.

Governing Body decision:

203. *The Governing Body adopted the Committee's recommendations made in paragraph 439 (Case No. 2476: Cameroon); paragraph 460 (Case No. 2467: Canada); paragraph 587 (Case No. 2462: Chile); paragraph 667 (Case No. 2465: Chile); paragraph 724 (Case No. 2434: Colombia); paragraph 801 (Case No. 2448: Colombia); paragraph 823 (Case No. 2481: Colombia); paragraph 844 (Case No. 2493: Colombia); paragraph 864 (Case No. 2495: Costa Rica); paragraph 879 (Case No. 2471: Djibouti); paragraph 896 (Case No. 2483: Dominican Republic); paragraph 913 (Case No. 2423: El Salvador); paragraph 939 (Case No. 2460: United States); paragraph 999 (Case No. 2502: Greece); paragraph 1023 (Case No. 2241: Guatemala); paragraph 1040 (Case No. 2479: Mexico); paragraph 1052 (Case No. 2454: Montenegro); paragraph 1066 (Case No. 2484: Norway); paragraph 1096 (Case No. 2474: Poland); paragraph 1158 (Case No. 2486: Romania); paragraph 1215 (Case No. 2509: Romania); paragraph 1248 (Case No. 2437: United Kingdom); paragraph 1321 (Case No. 2466: Thailand); paragraph 1332 (Case No. 2365: Zimbabwe); paragraph 1453, and adopted the 344th Report of the Committee on Freedom of Association as a whole.*

345th Report
(GB.298/7/2)

204. *The Reporter of the Committee* said that this was the third time the Committee had studied the measures taken by the Government of Belarus to implement the recommendations of the Commission of Inquiry, which were noted by the Governing Body in its meeting in November 2004. The Committee took note of some positive steps taken by the Government, including the disbanding of the Republican Registration Commission by Presidential Decree, the publication of ILO recommendations in a widely disseminated national newspaper and the announcement of a seat on the NCLSI for the CDTU.
205. The Committee further noted with interest the high-level ILO mission that went to Minsk to attend the seminar on the issues of trade union protection in the activity of Belarusian courts and prosecutor authorities, and the dissemination and discussion of the Commission's recommendations that took place in this respect.
206. Nevertheless, the Committee noted with continuing concern that several important matters raised by the Commission of Inquiry and figuring in its corresponding recommendations had not yet been implemented by the Government, including the non-registration of a certain number of primary level organizations and the consequent denial of registration to several regional organizations.
207. As regards the legislative situation, the Committee noted the concerns raised by the Committee of Experts in relation to the draft Concept Note on the law on trade unions and expressed concern that several proposals in the Concept Note, if applied in the current circumstances, represented a *quasi de factum* monopoly of workers' representation. The Committee considered that before establishing the notion of representation in the trade union legislation, the Government should ensure an atmosphere in which trade union organizations could develop in the country. The Committee further felt that the general approach in the Concept Note in its current form could only be understood as a continuing effort to eliminate any independent voices within the trade union movement in Belarus and urged the Government to abandon this approach and to ensure that the new law on trade unions would fully and truly ensure freedom of association for all workers to form and join organizations of their own choosing. This included the elimination of all remaining

obstacles to trade union registration and their functioning. The Committee also urged the Government to consult rapidly the NCLSI and to continue its cooperation with the ILO as well as the social dialogue with all partners, including the independent trade unions, to implement all the Commission's recommendations.

- 208.** *The Employer spokesperson of the Committee* endorsed the remarks of the Reporter and supported the recommendations. He pointed out that clarity was needed regarding the ILO forums that addressed this matter to avoid duplication of effort in future. The Employers encouraged the players to continue on a path to positive outcomes while recognizing that much commitment and hard work was still required to normalize the situation.
- 209.** *The Worker spokesperson of the Committee* recognized that a few measures had been taken by the Government in response to the demands made by the Commission of Inquiry, but most had not been acted on. For the Workers' group, the major problem was that the violations constituted an integral part of a system in the labour market that was actively promoted by the Government. The violations of trade union rights occurred with its direct or indirect support. A significant change could only be achieved by a genuine understanding and a real political will to stop anti-union discrimination and allow free trade unions. The Workers' group had not seen change by the Government, despite assurances given. This view was confirmed by the draft law on trade unions that would strengthen the trade union monopoly and destroy all that remained of free trade unions. The Workers' group fully supported the conclusions and recommendations made by the Committee and expressed its deep concern for the continued lack of respect for freedom of association in Belarus.
- 210.** *A Government representative of Belarus* believed it necessary to note that in its report there was evidence of positive steps being taken to fulfil the recommendations for the dissolution of the Commission for Registration, the publication of the text of the recommendations in the newspaper *Respublika*, the holding of seminars for judges and public prosecutors, and the inclusion of Mr Yaroshuk in the NCLSI. He said that the Committee's report did not place sufficient emphasis on other steps taken by the Government, including the work which had been done in the two committees of social partnership in Belarus. The NCLSI had taken decisions which showed that the Government and social partners would not tolerate interference in unions' internal affairs.
- 211.** The experts of the Committee had worked with the Ministry on what had been happening in the Grodno and Baleshina factories, and the decision ultimately relating to these cases was reached by union members who were not part of the Federation of Trade Unions of Belarus (FPB). The preparation of the draft law was continuing and, in this light, it was worth underlining that the Government was carrying out intensive consultations within the country which could have a significant impact on its content. The agenda was looking at specific questions relating to the situation in Belarus and therefore the more detailed information relating to what is being done by the Government would be discussed in the current Governing Body session.

Governing Body decision:

- 212.** *The Governing Body adopted the Committee's recommendations in paragraph 99 and adopted the 345th Report of the Committee on Freedom of Association as a whole.*

Eighth item on the agenda

REPORT OF THE PROGRAMME, FINANCIAL AND ADMINISTRATIVE COMMITTEE

*First report: Financial questions and programme implementation
(GB.298/8/1(Rev.))*

Programme and Budget for 2006–07

(a) Position of accounts as at 31 December 2006

*(b) Collection of contributions from
1 January 2007 to date*

213. The Governing Body took note of this part of the report. (GB.298/8/1(Rev.), paragraphs 2–8.)

Appointment of the External Auditor

Governing Body decision:

214. Taking into account the selection process followed and the unanimous recommendation of the Selection Panel, the Governing Body decided to appoint the Auditor General of Canada as the External Auditor of the ILO for the 71st and 72nd financial periods, with the appointment to commence on 1 April 2008 for a period of four years. (GB.298/8/1(Rev.), paragraph 17.)

*Follow-up to the report of the Chief Internal
Auditor for the year ended 31 December 2005*

*Report of the Chief Internal Auditor for the
year ended 31 December 2006*

*Follow-up to the report of the External Auditor
on the accounts for 2004–05*

215. The Governing Body took note of these parts of the report. (GB.298/8/1(Rev.), paragraphs 18–51.)

Terms of reference for the review of the ILO field structure

Governing Body decision:

216. The Governing Body approved the terms of reference for the review of the ILO field structure, as set out in document GB.298/PFA/6, and decided to finance the related expenditure, estimated at US\$230,000, from savings in Part I of the budget for 2006–07 or, failing that, through Part II. (GB.298/8/1(Rev.), paragraph 78.)

*Update on the adoption of International Public
Sector Accounting Standards (IPSAS)*

217. The Governing Body took note of this part of the report. (GB.298/8/1(Rev.), paragraphs 79–82.)

*Establishment of an Independent
Oversight Advisory Committee (IOAC)*

Governing Body decision:

- 218. *The Governing Body decided that the Office should continue the process of consultation with a view to reaching consensus on the establishment of an Independent Oversight Advisory Committee (IOAC). (GB.298/8/1(Rev.), paragraph 91.)***

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

Governing Body decision:

- 219. *The Governing Body delegated to its Officers, for the period of the 96th Session (June 2007) of the Conference, the authority to carry out its responsibilities under article 18 of the Conference Standing Orders in relation to proposals involving expenditure in the 70th financial period, ending 31 December 2007. (GB.298/8/1(Rev.), paragraph 94.)***

*Report of the Information and Communications
Technology Subcommittee*

Governing Body decision:

- 220. *The Governing Body approved the IT Strategy as contained in document GB.298/PFA/ICTS/1 on the understanding that the Office would submit for decision an updated IT Strategy to the November 2007 meeting of the Information and Communications Technology Subcommittee, account being taken of the views expressed by the members of the Subcommittee during the March 2007 discussion. (GB.298/8/1(Rev.), paragraph 101.)***

Report of the Building Subcommittee

Governing Body decision:

- 221. *The Governing Body authorized the Office to enter into negotiations on the possible transfer or sale of land and of the leasehold, with a view to submitting a comprehensive plan for financing the renovation of the headquarters building to the members of the Building Subcommittee for consultation prior to any decision, if necessary, by the Officers of the Subcommittee, of the Programme, Financial and Administrative Committee, and of the Governing Body.***
- 222. *The Governing Body decided to recommend to the International Labour Conference at its 96th Session (June 2007) that, in derogation of article 11.1 of the Financial Regulations, the net proceeds from any transfer or sale of land and of the leasehold in Geneva, Switzerland, be credited to the Building and Accommodation Fund and that it adopt a resolution in the following terms:***

The General Conference of the International Labour Organization decides, in derogation of article 11.1 of the Financial Regulations, to credit the net proceeds from any transfer or sale

of land and of the leasehold in Geneva, Switzerland, to the Building and Accommodation Fund.

(GB.298/8/1(Rev.), paragraphs 111–112.)

Report on programme implementation in 2006

223. The Governing Body took note of this part of the report. (GB.298/8/1(Rev.), paragraphs 113–143.)

Other financial questions

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

224. The Governing Body took note of this part of the report. (GB.298/8/1(Rev.), paragraphs 144–145.)

Meeting of Experts on Labour Statistics

Governing Body decision:

225. The Governing Body approved the additional cost of the Meeting, estimated at US\$118,700, and its financing from savings in Part I of the budget for 2006–07 or, failing that, through Part II. (GB.298/8/1(Rev.), paragraph 156.)

ILO capacity-building strategy: The role of the International Training Centre of the ILO, Turin

226. The Governing Body took note of this part of the report. (GB.298/8/1(Rev.), paragraphs 157–183.)

Second report: Personnel questions
(GB.298/8/2)

I. Statement by the staff representative

II. Composition and structure of the staff

227. The Governing Body took note of these parts of the report. (GB.298/8/2, paragraphs 1–18.)

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

Governing Body decision:

228. The Governing Body noted the action taken by the Director-General to give effect to the measures adopted by the United Nations General Assembly and in particular endorse the proposals in paragraphs 6 and 9 of document GB.298/PFA/19. (GB.298/8/2, paragraph 26.)

IV. Pensions questions

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

(b) Report of the Board of Trustees of the Special Payments Fund

229. The Governing Body took note of these parts of the report. (GB.298/8/2, paragraphs 27–33.)

V. Matters relating to the Administrative Tribunal of the ILO

(a) Recognition of the Tribunal's jurisdiction by the Centre for the Development of Enterprise (CDE)

Governing Body decision:

230. The Governing Body approved the recognition of the Tribunal's jurisdiction by the Centre for the Development of Enterprise (CDE), with effect from 30 March 2007. (GB.298/8/2, paragraph 38.)

(b) Composition of the Tribunal

Governing Body decision:

231. The Governing Body:

(a) conveyed to Mr Gentot its appreciation for the services he had rendered to the work of the Administrative Tribunal of the International Labour Organization over the past 15 years as judge, Vice-President and President of the Tribunal and recommended to the International Labour Conference that it also express its gratitude to Mr Gentot;

(b) decided to propose to the International Labour Conference at its 96th Session:

(i) the renewal of the term of office of Mr Gordillo and Mr Rouiller for three years;

(ii) the appointment of Mr Frydman for a term of office of three years;

through the adoption of the draft resolution below:

The General Conference of the International Labour Organization,

Decides, in accordance with article III of the Statute of the Administrative Tribunal of the International Labour Organization,

(a) to express to Mr Michel Gentot its appreciation for the services he has rendered to the work of the Administrative Tribunal over the past 15 years as judge, Vice-President and President of the Tribunal;

(b) to renew the appointments of Mr Agustín Gordillo (Argentina) and Mr Claude Rouiller (Switzerland) for a term of three years;

- (c) to appoint Mr Patrick Frydman (France) as judge in the Administrative Tribunal for a term of office of three years.

(GB.298/8/2, paragraph 41.)

Third report: Programme and Budget proposals for 2008–09
(GB.298/8/3(Rev.))

232. *The representative of the Government of the United States*, speaking also on behalf of the Governments of Australia, Canada, Mexico and the United Kingdom, drew attention to the fact that consensus had not been reached on the level of the budget presented to the Conference. He deeply regretted the situation and hoped that by June the Office would have examined the possibility of reaching genuine consensus.
233. *The Worker spokesperson in the Programme, Financial and Administrative Committee* supported the point for decision; he noted with regret that it had not been possible to reach consensus despite the concerted efforts of the Director-General and of the Workers' group, which wanted a growth budget. He supported the proposal by the Director-General that the Governing Body should organize, at a subsequent session and independently of any budget discussions, a debate on the position of the ILO in the United Nations system and more generally the position of the world of work.

Governing Body decision:

234. *The Governing Body decided to:*

- (a) *recommend to the International Labour Conference at its 96th Session (June 2007) a provisional programme level of US\$635,189,873, estimated at the 2006–07 budget exchange rate of 1.25 Swiss francs to the US dollar, the final exchange rate and the corresponding US dollar level of the budget and Swiss franc assessment to be determined by the Conference;*
- (b) *propose to the Conference at the same session a resolution for the adoption of the programme and budget for the 71st financial period (2008–09) and for the allocation of expenses among member States in that period in the following terms:*

The General Conference of the International Labour Organization, by virtue of the Financial Regulations, passes for the 71st financial period, ending 31 December 2009, the budget of expenditure for the International Labour Organization amounting to US\$... and the budget of income amounting to US\$..., which, at the budget rate of exchange of Swiss francs ... to the US dollar, amount to Swiss francs ..., and resolves that the budget of income, denominated in Swiss francs, shall be allocated among member States in accordance with the scale of contributions recommended by the Finance Committee of Government Representatives.

(GB.298/8/3(Rev.), paragraph 256.)

*Report of the Government members of the
Committee on Allocations Matters
(GB.298/8/4(Rev.))*

Assessment of the contributions of new member States

Governing Body decision:

235. *The Governing Body decided, in accordance with the established practice of harmonizing the rates of assessment of ILO member States with their rates of assessment in the United Nations, to propose to the Conference that the contribution of Montenegro to the ILO budget for the period of its membership in the Organization during 2006 and for 2007 be based on an annual assessment rate of 0.001 and that taking into account Montenegro's period of membership, its assessments for 2006 and 2007 be deducted from the assessments of the former Serbia and Montenegro, applicable to those years. (GB.298/8/4(Rev.), paragraph 3.)*
236. *The Governing Body decided, in accordance with the established practice of harmonizing the rates of assessment of ILO member States with their rates of assessment in the United Nations, to propose to the Conference that the contribution of Brunei Darussalam to the ILO budget for the period of its membership in the Organization during 2007 be based on an annual assessment rate of 0.026 per cent. (GB.298/8/4(Rev.), paragraph 5.)*

*Scale of assessment of contributions to the budget
for the 2008–09 financial period*

Governing Body decision:

237. *The Governing Body decided, in accordance with the established practice of harmonizing the rates of assessment of ILO member States with their rates of assessment in the United Nations, that it would propose to the Conference the adoption of the draft scale of assessments for 2008 and 2009 as set out in column 3 of the appendix to this paper, subject to such adjustments as might be necessary following any further change in the membership of the Organization before the Conference was called upon to adopt the recommended scale. (GB.298/8/4(Rev.), paragraph 8.)*

Ninth item on the agenda

**REPORT OF THE COMMITTEE ON LEGAL ISSUES AND INTERNATIONAL LABOUR
STANDARDS
(GB.298/9(Rev.))**

First part: Legal issues

I. Resolutions in the International Labour Conference: Additional considerations

238. *The Governing Body took note of this part of the report. (GB.298/9(Rev.), paragraphs 2–14.)*

*II. Standing Orders of the International Labour Conference:
Status of interim provisions concerning the
verification of credentials*

Governing Body decision:

- 239. *The Governing Body decided to invite the Conference, at its 96th Session (2007), to extend the validity of the Interim provisions concerning verification of credentials until the end of the 97th Session (2008). (GB.298/9(Rev.), paragraph 21.)***

*III. Other legal issues: Rules of Regional Meetings: 11th African Regional Meeting
(Addis Ababa, 24–27 April 2007)*

Governing Body decision:

- 240. *The Governing Body:***

- (a) approved the derogation to article 10 to the Rules applicable to the 11th African Regional Meeting to enable the Officers of the Governing Body to address the Meeting with the permission of the Chairperson; and*
- (b) authorized its Officers to invite observers to the 11th African Regional Meeting should the need arise in the interval between the present session of the Governing Body and the 11th African Regional Meeting.*

(GB.298/9(Rev.), paragraph 28.)

Second part: International labour standards and human rights

*IV. Improvements in the standards-related activities of the ILO:
From strategy to implementation*

Governing Body decision:

- 241. *The Governing Body invited the Office to consider the comments made during the discussion and to submit a paper at its 300th Session (November 2007), based on the present discussion and further consultations, on a proposed plan of action, including additional options for the streamlining of information and reports due under article 22, such as the examination of an intensified thematic approach to non-fundamental and non-priority Conventions. (GB.298/9(Rev.), paragraph 100.)***

*V. General status report on ILO action concerning discrimination
in employment and occupation*

- 242. *The Governing Body took note of this part of the report. (GB.298/9(Rev.), paragraphs 101–112.)***

VI. Form for reports on the application of unratified Conventions and Recommendations (article 19 of the Constitution): The Occupational Safety and Health Convention, 1981 (No. 155), the Protocol of 2002 to the Occupational Safety and Health Convention, 1981, and the Occupational Safety and Health Recommendation, 1981 (No. 164)

Governing Body decision:

243. *The Governing Body adopted the report form on the application of unratified Conventions and Recommendations (article 19 of the Constitution): the Occupational Safety and Health Convention, 1981 (No. 155), the Protocol of 2002 to the Occupational Safety and Health Convention, 1981, and the Occupational Safety and Health Recommendation, 1981 (No. 164), as amended (Appendix II of GB.298/9(Rev.)).* (GB.298/9(Rev.), paragraph 117.)

VII. Form for reports on the application of ratified Conventions (article 22 of the Constitution): the Promotional Framework for Occupational Safety and Health Convention, 2006 (No. 187)

244. *The Governing Body took note of this part of the report.* (GB.298/9(Rev.), paragraphs 118–130.)

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

Governing Body decision:

245. *The Governing Body:*

- (i) *took note of paragraphs 149–158 and Annex II of the report on the Ninth Session of the Joint ILO/UNESCO Committee of Experts on the Application of the Recommendations concerning Teaching Personnel, which concerned allegations submitted to it by teachers' organizations;***
- (ii) *authorized the Director-General to communicate the relevant parts of the annex to the Governments of Australia, Ethiopia and Japan and to the teachers' organizations concerned and, where appropriate, to invite them to take the necessary follow-up action as recommended in the report;***
- (iii) *decided to forward the report to the International Labour Conference at its 96th Session (May–June 2007) for examination in the first instance by the Committee on the Application of Standards.***

(GB.298/9(Rev.), paragraph 137.)

IX. Other questions

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

246. *The Governing Body took note of this part of the report.* (GB.298/9(Rev.), paragraph 138.)

Tenth item on the agenda

REPORT OF THE SUBCOMMITTEE ON MULTINATIONAL ENTERPRISES (GB.298/10)

I. Update on planning for the event to mark the 30th anniversary of the Tripartite Declaration of Principles concerning Multinational Enterprises and Social Policy

Governing Body decision:

- 247. *The Governing Body endorsed the draft programme for the 30th anniversary, as amended in light of the discussion in the Subcommittee on Multinational Enterprises.*** (GB.298/10, paragraph 12.)

II. Report on the modalities of a programme to give an orientation on international labour standards, the Tripartite Declaration of Principles concerning Multinational Enterprises and Social Policy and other related matters

Governing Body decision:

- 248. *The Governing Body approved the development by EMP/MULTI of an Office programme, in cooperation with relevant departments, on the conditions outlined by the Subcommittee on Multinational Enterprises and recorded in the report of the Subcommittee to the 297th and 298th Sessions of the ILO Governing Body, in order to provide companies with expert advice on the realization of international labour standards and the MNE Declaration and in order that the Office seek to augment this work by extra-budgetary financing.*** (GB.298/10, paragraph 27.)

III. Updates on corporate social responsibility-related activities: (a) within the ILO, including the InFocus Initiative on corporate social responsibility and the International Training Centre; and (b) within other organizations

Governing Body decision:

- 249. *The Governing Body requested the Office to finalize a report on the level of involvement and participation of ILO constituents in the Global Compact local networks.*** (GB.298/10, paragraph 37.)

IV. Update on strategic priorities for MULTI for 2006–07

Governing Body decision:

- 250. *The Governing Body endorsed the recommendation to reorient the strategic priorities in line with the priorities identified in the discussion of the Subcommittee on Multinational Enterprises.*** (GB.298/10, paragraph 44.)

Eleventh item on the agenda

REPORT OF THE COMMITTEE ON EMPLOYMENT AND SOCIAL POLICY (GB.298/11(Rev.))

A. An update on the implementation of the Global Employment Agenda (country presentations): (i) Pakistan; (ii) Burkina Faso; (iii) Global Employment Agenda implementation update

251. The Governing Body took note of these parts of the report. (GB.298/11(Rev.), paragraphs 1–44.)

B. Wages around the world: Developments and challenges

Governing Body decision:

252. Recognizing that wages were a major component of decent work and conscious of the knowledge gaps that existed in relation to wages and income issues, the Governing Body invited the Office to develop and implement, in consultation with constituents, a programme of work reflecting the availability of resources, the potential for mobilizing other actors and the need to build stronger partnerships with other institutions, which would initially address as a priority the following wage and income issues:

- (a) collection and dissemination of statistics;*
- (b) country-level assistance, including in Decent Work Country Programmes;*
- (c) wage-setting mechanisms and wage bargaining;*
- (d) wages, productivity and economic performance; and*
- (e) wage differentials and disparities.*

(GB.298/11(Rev.), paragraph 79.)

C. Portability of skills

253. The Governing Body took note of this part of the report. (GB.298/11(Rev.), paragraphs 80–103.)

D. The informal economy

254. The Governing Body took note of this part of the report. (GB.298/11(Rev.), paragraphs 104–130.)

Twelfth item on the agenda

REPORT OF THE COMMITTEE ON SECTORAL AND TECHNICAL MEETINGS AND RELATED ISSUES (GB.298/12(Rev.))

I. Future orientation of the Sectoral Activities Programme and proposals for activities in 2008–09

(a) Future orientation of the Sectoral Activities Programme

Governing Body decision:

255. The Governing Body:

- (a) recommended that the ILO's sectoral approach be improved in order to make its activities more meaningful to its constituents and better serve the ILO's four strategic objectives;*
- (b) encouraged the incorporation of sectoral considerations into the general activities of the Organization and into the DWCPs and related that work to the action programmes; and*
- (c) approved the setting of priorities through the creation of groupings of sectors and advisory bodies, taking into account available resources. Advisory bodies, composed of constituents and supported by the Office, would review the content and types of sectoral activities in order to assist the Office in its work with the STM Committee and the Governing Body.*

(GB.298/12(Rev.), paragraph 40.)

(b) Proposals for activities in 2008–09

Governing Body decision:

256. The Governing Body:

(a) endorsed the following main activities for 2008:

- meeting of experts to adopt a revised code of practice on safety and health in agriculture;*
- tripartite meeting on promoting social dialogue and good industrial relations from oil and gas exploration and production to oil and gas distribution;*
- meetings of experts to adopt guidelines on port State responsibilities for the inspection of labour conditions on board ships;*
- meetings of experts to adopt guidelines on flag State responsibilities under the Maritime Labour Convention, 2006; and*

- *a global dialogue forum on vocational education and skills development for commerce workers;*
- (b) *endorsed all the follow-up activities proposed in document GB.298/STM/1/1; and*
- (c) *instructed the Office that the governments of all member States should continue to be invited to participate in sectoral meetings held in 2008–09, for which the Standing Orders for Sectoral Meetings applied.*

(GB.298/12(Rev.), paragraph 51.)

II. Report of the Global Steering Group on ongoing Action Programmes

257. The Governing Body took note of this part of the report. (GB.298/12(Rev.), paragraphs 52–57.)

III. Effect to be given to the recommendations of sectoral meetings

*Tripartite Meeting on Labour and Social Issues Arising from Problems of Cross-border Mobility of International Drivers in the Road Transport Sector
(Geneva, 23–26 October 2006)*

Governing Body decision:

258. The Governing Body:

- (a) *authorized the Director-General to communicate the Note on the proceedings:*
 - (i) *to governments, requesting them to communicate this text to the employers' and workers' organizations concerned;*
 - (ii) *to the international employers' and workers' organizations concerned; and*
 - (iii) *to the other international organizations concerned;*
- (b) *requested the Director-General to bear in mind, when drawing up proposals for the future work of the Office, the wishes expressed by the Meeting in paragraph 20 of the conclusions regarding follow-up activities by the ILO.*

(GB.298/12(Rev.), paragraph 66.)

*IV. Joint ILO/UNESCO Committee of Experts on the Application of the Recommendations concerning Teaching Personnel (CEART),
(Ninth Session)
(Geneva, 30 October–3 November 2006)*

Governing Body decision:

259. The Governing Body requested that the Director-General:

- (a) *transmit the report of the Ninth Session of the Joint ILO/UNESCO Committee of Experts on the Application of the Recommendations concerning Teaching Personnel to the governments of member States and, through them, to the relevant employers' and workers' organizations, as well as to relevant intergovernmental and international non-governmental organizations concerned with education and teachers; and*
- (b) *take into consideration, where appropriate in consultation with the Director-General of UNESCO, the Joint Committee's proposals for future action by the ILO and UNESCO, which were contained in its report, in planning and implementing future ILO activities, due account being taken of the programme and budget approved for 2008–09 and decisions regarding the future orientation of the Sectoral Activities Programme.*

(GB.298/12(Rev.), paragraph 76.)

V. *Report on the 92nd Session of the IMO Legal Committee:*

- (a) *Progress report on the work of the Joint ILO/IMO Ad Hoc Expert Working Group on Liability and Compensation regarding Claims for Death, Personal Injury and Abandonment of Seafarers*

260. The Governing Body took note of this part of the report. (GB.298/12(Rev.), paragraphs 77–82.)

- (b) *Second meeting of the Joint ILO/IMO Ad Hoc Expert Working Group on the Fair Treatment of Seafarers in the Event of a Maritime Accident*

Governing Body decision:

261. The Governing Body:

- (a) *took note of the information provided;*
- (b) *approved the revised Terms of Reference for the Joint Working Group, as contained in the appendix to document GB.298/STM/5/2(Rev.); and*
- (c) *further approved, subject to the IMO incorporating the proposal noted in paragraph 7 of document GB.298/STM/5/2(Rev.), the amendment of the revised Terms of Reference accordingly.*

(GB.298/12(Rev.), paragraph 87.)

VI. *Strengthening information sharing and research capacity*

262. The Governing Body took note of this part of the report. (GB.298/12(Rev.), paragraphs 88–94.)

VII. Other questions

- (a) *Further developments in relation to the drafting of an international instrument on shipbreaking/ship recycling*

Governing Body decision:**263. The Governing Body:**

- (a) *took note of the developments;*
- (b) *requested the Office to report to the Committee on relevant developments; and*
- (c) *subject to the decision to be taken by the Marine Environment Protection Committee at its 56th Session, authorized the Office to host the Third Meeting of the Joint Working Group on Ship Scrapping, with terms of reference to be agreed.*

(GB.298/12(Rev.), paragraph 100.)

- (b) *Update on the ILO's participation in the development by IMO of safety recommendations for small fishing vessels*

- (c) *Information on the revision of the International Medical Guide for Ships*

- (d) *Update on the promotion of the Maritime Labour Convention, 2006*

264. The Governing Body took note of these parts of the report.

(GB.298/12(Rev.), paragraphs 101–111.)

Thirteenth item on the agenda

REPORT OF THE COMMITTEE ON TECHNICAL COOPERATION
(GB.298/13(Rev.))

- I. Women's entrepreneurship and the promotion of decent work:
A thematic evaluation*

Governing Body decision:**265. The Governing Body called upon the Office to:**

- (i) *ensure that all technical cooperation projects on women's entrepreneurship place their primary focus on decent and productive work, sustainability and the facilitation of systemic change, including removing the constraints for women entrepreneurs;*
- (ii) *strengthen and make more explicit the linkages between women's entrepreneurship and the Decent Work Agenda, including DWCP guidance, at all stages of the project cycle;*

- (iii) *facilitate efforts to support, identify and share lessons learned from its technical cooperation on women's entrepreneurship in all regions;*
- (iv) *involve constituents in the promotion of decent and productive employment through women's entrepreneurship development;*
- (v) *include technical cooperation projects on women's entrepreneurship that incorporate a strong HIV/AIDS-in-the-workplace dimension, and that specifically target young women; and*
- (vi) *ensure that all projects had robust indicators, which would form the basis for all project reporting.*

(GB.298/13(Rev.), paragraph 19.)

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

III. Public-private partnerships for technical cooperation

IV. Special technical cooperation programme for Colombia

V. Other questions

266. *The Governing Body took note of these parts of the report.* (GB.298/13(Rev.), paragraphs 20–67.)

Fourteenth item on the agenda

REPORT OF THE WORKING PARTY ON THE SOCIAL DIMENSION OF GLOBALIZATION
(GB.298/14(Rev.))

*Oral report of the Chairperson of the Working Group, Mr M. Mdladlana,
Government delegate, South Africa*

267. *The Governing Body took note of the Chairperson of the Working Group's oral report.*

Fifteenth item on the agenda

REPORT OF THE DIRECTOR-GENERAL

I. Membership of the Organization

II. Progress in international labour legislation

III. Internal administration

IV. Publications and documents

268. *The Worker Vice-Chairperson welcomed the accession of Brunei Darussalam and the number of ratifications which had been registered.*

269. *The Employer Vice-Chairperson* endorsed that statement.

270. *A Government representative of Kenya* congratulated the ILO which, through its excellent work, was attracting new member States. He expressed regret that none of the new ratifications concerned Africa and requested the ILO to increase its technical assistance to facilitate the application of ratified instruments. While he commended the Office for the new appointments among its staff, he underscored that none of the appointees were African nationals.

271. ***The Governing Body took note of the report.*** (GB.298/15, paragraphs 1–21.)

*First Supplementary Report: Report of the Committee of Experts
on the Application of Conventions and Recommendations
(Geneva, 21 November–8 December 2006)
(GB.298/15/1)*

272. *The Employer Vice-Chairperson* stated that his group had taken note of the information in question, which would be considered at the Conference.

273. *The Worker Vice-Chairperson* expressed regret that a number of countries were no longer mentioned by name on the shortlist prepared by the Committee of Experts because the Committee had not had time to consider them. He recalled that the Workers' group had, on many occasions, requested that the practice be discontinued and expressed the hope that the request would be followed up.

274. *A representative of the Director-General* explained that the document submitted to the Governing Body was the report of the Committee of Experts and not a report of the Office and that the applicable procedures had been strictly followed. The cases which featured on the long list but not on the final list had not been considered by the Conference Committee and therefore no conclusions had been drawn in their regard.

275. ***The Governing Body took note of the report.*** (GB.298/15/1, paragraph 4.)

*Second Supplementary Report: International Basic Safety Standards for Protection
against Ionizing Radiation and for the Safety of Radiation Sources
(GB.298/15/2)*

Governing Body decision:

276. ***The Governing Body took note of the information included in document GB.298/15/2; the Employers' and Workers' groups appointed the following individuals to participate in the meetings of the technical committee mandated to revise the International Basic Safety Standards for Protection against Ionizing Radiation and for the Safety of Radiation Sources:***

- ***Employers:*** ***Mr David Owen (expert); Mr Mike Gaunt (substitute);***
- ***Workers:*** ***Mr Tasos Zodiates; the substitute would be appointed at a later date.***

(GB.298/15/2, paragraph 9.)

*Third Supplementary Report: Promotion of ratification of the
Maritime Labour Convention, 2006
(GB.298/15/3)*

277. *A representative of the Director-General, the Director of the International Labour Standards Department*, explained that the proposed action plan had a very ambitious goal, namely the widespread ratification and effective implementation of the Maritime Labour Convention, 2006. The plan had already received significant financial support, both direct and indirect in the form of the participation of constituents at their own expense; moreover, a number of potential donors had come forward. Requests for conferences and information were being received from all over the world. Resources were needed for the development of training documents and the provision of experts for seminars.
278. *The Employer Vice-Chairperson* said that his group welcomed the efforts to promote ratification of the Convention. He noted that application was just as important as ratification and called for every effort to be made to carry out the necessary information activities. The Employers' group would monitor closely the evaluation of follow-up to ratification.
279. *The Worker Vice-Chairperson* agreed that every effort should be made to promote ratification of the Convention. He commended Liberia for having ratified the instrument and invited countries which were known for their register of flags of convenience to do the same. Lastly, he requested that some resources from the next budget period be used for the important task of promoting the Convention.
280. *A Government representative of Mexico* recalled that, in March 2006, GRULAC had noted that the ratification and application of the Convention were dependent on the availability of technical expertise and material resources in each ratifying State and had called for the establishment of cooperation programmes aimed at building national capacity, in particular with regard to inspection. He welcomed the fact that the Programme and Budget proposals for 2008–09 provided, in the section on regional and subregional tripartite meetings on the follow-up to decisions of Regional Meetings, the Governing Body and the Conference, for the promotion of the Maritime Labour Convention, 2006, thus responding to the request of GRULAC.
281. *A Government representative of Kenya* expressed the hope that the enthusiasm with which the Convention had been adopted would also prevail in the ratification phase, and welcomed the action plan prepared by the Steering Committee. He also supported parallel initiatives such as tripartite missions in countries which had not participated in the Conference. Recalling that the main objective of the Convention was to improve the lives of seafarers, he encouraged the Office to follow up on the proposal to create a joint IMO/ILO working group and to find the necessary financial support for the implementation of the action plan.
282. *A Government representative of India* commended the Office for the action plan to achieve widespread and rapid ratification of the Maritime Labour Convention. She asked the ILO to organize meetings and seminars on the Convention in her country, in which other countries of the region could participate.
283. ***The Governing Body took note of the report.*** (GB.298/15/3.)

*Fourth Supplementary Report: Incomplete delegations
at tripartite meetings
(GB.298/15/4)*

- 284.** *The Employer Vice-Chairperson* said that employers were very concerned by the issue in question and recalled that governments were obliged under the ILO Constitution to send complete tripartite delegations.
- 285.** *A representative of the Workers' group* agreed that it was a matter of concern; he explained that, when a delegation did not comprise a representative of one of the social partners, the representatives present lost their right to vote and could not, therefore, fulfil their role. Of the 55 countries to which a letter had been sent, only 18 had replied. For some countries, the situation could be explained by financial circumstances or difficulties, but a certain number of countries had simply never been involved in ILO activities. For others, it was questionable whether there really was the political will to send a complete tripartite delegation. Lastly, he asked what measures had been envisaged by the Office to rectify the situation.
- 286.** *A Government representative of Kenya* welcomed the fact that the scope of the survey had been extended to cover countries which had failed to send any delegations at all; he pointed out that the rate of response to the survey had been about 32 per cent, which was most unsatisfactory. The Office should examine the explanations which had been given and carry out capacity-building and training activities on the values of tripartism and social dialogue among constituents; it was equally important to ensure that the structures and fundamental instruments of the ILO, whether the Constitution or the Standing Orders of the Conference and Regional Meetings, were well understood. Questions on the issuance of visas could also be considered.
- 287.** *A Government representative of Burundi* noted that there was a distinction between countries which sent incomplete tripartite delegations and those which, because of a lack of funding, were unable to send delegations at all. Burundi, for example, had always endeavoured to participate in ILO activities but, for financial reasons, had not been able to attend either the 2003 session of the Conference or the 2006 Maritime Session of the Conference. The Office should look into ways of helping countries which did not have the economic means to participate in the Organization's meetings.
- 288.** *The Governing Body took note of the report.* (GB.298/15/4.)

*Fifth Supplementary Report: Collaboration between the International Labour
Organization and the International Organization for Standardization (ISO)
(GB.298/15/5)*

*General information on the International Organization for Standardization (ISO)
(GB.298/15/5(Add.))*

- 289.** *The Worker Vice-Chairperson* said that no discussion should take place in a context of force majeure and that the debate should not be based on the assumption that ISO would establish a standard in any case, whether in collaboration with the ILO or otherwise. He recalled that ISO had no authority over issues relating to the world of work and represented neither employers nor workers. It had a role to play in certain highly technical areas but there was no question of assuming that, if the ILO did not collaborate with ISO, the latter would nevertheless go ahead. During its consideration of the issue in November 2006, the Governing Body had given very clear instructions to the Office, reaffirming the mandate of the ILO in terms of occupational health and safety and inviting it to submit a document to the present session. That document did not, however, meet the expectations of the

Workers' group. The various possibilities set out in paragraph 20 of the document appeared more to be a concession to ISO than a reaffirmation of the authority of the ILO in that field. His group rejected the point for decision and requested the Office to hold further consultations with ILO constituents on the possibilities for cooperation between the ILO and ISO and to present recommendations based on those consultations to the Governing Body in November 2007.

- 290.** *The Employer Vice-Chairperson* recalled that the ILO produced standards and that ISO, within its own framework, also produced what was known as a standard. Consequently, no cooperation would be possible without a very precise definition of the spheres of action of the two organizations. ISO wanted to enter the sphere of social issues and that raised a policy question, which required a policy answer. The ILO should clearly reaffirm its mandate and sphere of action. The possibilities for collaboration in the context of the proposals set out in paragraph 20 of the document should be examined on a case by case basis, in order to uphold the system's credibility. Although there was no question of refusing to collaborate, the Employers' group did not want to write a blank cheque and emphasized that the concept of standard setting, as understood within the ILO, should be preserved. With regard to the point for decision, subparagraph (a) should make it clear that the decision in question was a Governing Body decision and subparagraph (b) should be reformulated in such a way as to invite the Director-General to reaffirm the mandate of the ILO in all of its contacts with ISO and to hold further consultations with constituents in order to propose recommendations to the Governing Body in November on the basis of those consultations. The Employers' group could accept a point for decision reformulated to that effect.
- 291.** *A Government representative of China*, speaking on behalf of the Asia-Pacific group, recalled that the group was opposed to the development by ISO of a standard relating to occupational health and safety; nevertheless, if such a development was inevitable, it would first be necessary to reach a formal cooperation agreement, setting out very clearly the terms of the collaboration and ensuring that it would not run counter to the objectives of the ILO. It was essential also to ensure that a future ISO standard would not undermine Chapter 2 of the *ILO Guidelines on occupational safety and health management systems (ILO-OSH 2001)*, which allowed countries to develop their own national guidelines.
- 292.** *A Government representative of Japan*, speaking on behalf of the IMEC group, expressed concern about the ISO initiative to develop unilaterally a standard on occupational safety and health management systems. If collaboration was inevitable, it would be necessary to adopt appropriate safeguards to guarantee ILO's primacy in that field.
- 293.** *A Government representative of Nigeria* called for the modification of the proposed amendment because, in his view, it would be difficult to prevent ISO from proceeding in a certain direction if that was what it wanted; it would be better, therefore, for the first paragraph of the point for decision to provide some guidance. It seemed contradictory to ask ISO to refrain from developing a standard and then propose further consultations.
- 294.** *The Worker Vice-Chairperson* said that, as he saw it, subparagraph (a) of the point for decision first reaffirmed the mandate of the ILO and then referred to an action that involved ISO; the point was to ask ISO to recognize that the two organizations had different roles and functions. Subparagraph (b) was intended to make the reaffirmation set out in subparagraph (a) a reality and called for consultations with constituents.

Governing Body decision:

- 295.** *Taking into account the Governing Body discussion of documents GB.298/PFA/15 and GB.298/PFA/15(Add.), the Governing Body:*

- (a) reaffirmed the mandate of the ILO in the field of occupational safety and health and, in that context, asked ISO to refrain from developing an international standard on occupational safety and health management systems;*
- (b) requested the Office to continue consultations with ILO constituents on possible collaboration between the ILO and ISO and to report back to the Governing Body at its November 2007 session with recommendations reflecting those consultations.*

(GB.298/15/5, paragraph 23.)

*Sixth Supplementary Report: Report of the Committee set up to
examine the representation alleging non-observance by Chile
of the Old-Age Insurance (Industry, etc.) Convention, 1933 (No. 35),
and the Invalidity Insurance (Industry, etc.) Convention, 1933 (No. 37),
made under article 24 of the ILO Constitution by the
College of Teachers of Chile AG
(GB.298/15/6)*

Governing Body decision:

296. The Governing Body approved the report and, in particular, in the light of the conclusions in paragraphs 45 to 53 of the report:

- (a) urged the Government to continue its efforts to ensure the application of Conventions Nos 35 and 37, specifically:*
 - by taking all the necessary measures to solve the problem of the social security arrears arising from non-payment of the further training allowance;*
 - by continuing and strengthening the supervision of the effective payment of the further training allowance by the employers in arrears;*
 - where necessary, by ensuring the effective application of deterrent sanctions in the event of non-payment of the further training allowance and, in that case, the adoption of measures to compensate the damages;*
- (b) invited the Government to present a report under article 22 of the ILO Constitution on the application of Conventions Nos 35 and 37, containing detailed information on all the measures taken or envisaged to secure effective payment of subsidies, including the further training allowance, to all the municipalities and on the manner in which the situation has evolved as a result of these measures, indicating in particular:*
 - the number of inspections carried out, in particular by the Ministry of Education, to verify payment of the further training allowance by the municipalities, the number and nature of violations registered and the number and nature of penalties imposed;*

- *the number of municipalities remaining in arrears with regard to the payment of the further training allowance, the amount of such arrears, the number of workers affected and the amount of arrears settled;*
 - *the outcome of the legislative procedure concerning the bill submitted in 2005 and aimed at solving the problem of social security arrears and, once the bill has been adopted, information on its implementation, including the number of municipalities requesting advances to enable them to pay the further training allowance;*
 - *the follow-up to the Protocol of Agreement adopted by the complainant organization and the Government in December 2003 to evaluate the further training allowance;*
 - *any agreement concluded with the aim of solving the problem of arrears; and*
- (c) *declared closed the procedure initiated before the Governing Body as a result of the representation alleging non-observance by Chile of the Old-Age Insurance (Industry, etc.) Convention, 1933 (No. 35), and the Invalidity Insurance (Industry, etc.) Convention, 1933 (No. 37), made under article 24 of the ILO Constitution by the College of Teachers of Chile AG.*

(GB.298/15/7, paragraph 54.)

*Seventh Supplementary Report: Report of the Committee set up
to examine the representation made by the
Confederation of Turkish Trade Unions (TÜRK-İS) under article 24
of the Constitution of the ILO, alleging non-observance
by the Netherlands of the Equality of Treatment
(Social Security) Convention, 1962 (No. 118)
(GB.298/15/7)*

Governing Body decision:

297. The Governing Body approved the report. (GB.298/15/7, paragraph 57.)

*Eighth Supplementary Report: Chief Internal
Auditor position – Recommendation
(GB.298/15/8)*

298. *The Employer Vice-Chairperson* said that his group supported the Director-General's proposal concerning the appointment of Ms Kamioka to the position of Chief Internal Auditor.

299. *The Worker Vice-Chairperson* expressed his support for the proposal.

300. *A Government representative of the Netherlands*, speaking also on behalf of Australia, Canada, China, Czech Republic, France, Germany, Greece, Hungary, Italy, Nordic countries, Poland, Romania, Spain, United Kingdom and the United States, underscored the role played by the internal audit function, which provided important safeguards to the Director-General and the Governing Body. It was important for all member governments to be involved in a transparent way in audit-related matters. According to the Staff Regulations, the Director-General was not obliged to consult the Officers of the Governing

Body on that appointment. The speaker asked for explanations concerning the length of the recruitment process, which had taken almost a year, and expressed regret that the document containing the recommendations for such an important position had not been submitted sufficiently early to allow all the members of the Governing Body to examine it closely.

301. *A Government representative of Kenya* expressed support for the recommendation set out in the document.
302. *A Government representative of the United States*, speaking also on behalf of the United Kingdom, emphasized the need to prevent any conflict of interest and to ensure that the Chief Internal Auditor would not be required to verify operations for which she had previously been responsible in her capacity as Chief of the Treasury and Accounts Branch.
303. *A Government representative of South Africa* said that he supported the recommendation and welcomed the appointment of a woman.
304. *A worker representative from France* stressed the importance of the internal audit; it was regrettable that certain selection processes were slow and he considered that it was now time to make a decision. He welcomed the appointment of a woman, who was an ILO official and therefore was already familiar with the internal machinery of the Office. The Workers' group supported the appointment of Ms Kamioka.
305. *The Worker Vice-Chairperson* expressed surprise about the reticence shown in the previous statements. The Workers' group noted that the process had been long and difficult and supported the resulting appointment.
306. *The Employer Vice-Chairperson* referred back to the issue of consulting the Officers of the Governing Body and asked to what extent the Chief Internal Auditor could carry out an audit of the operations for which she had previously been responsible. He underscored that the two issues were important in terms of enabling the Governing Body to assume its responsibilities in that area.
307. *The Legal Adviser* explained that, according to article 4.2(d) of the Staff Regulations and Financial Rule 14.20, consultation with the Officers of the Governing Body was not required for the appointment of the Chief Internal Auditor. The issue had been put before the Officers as a courtesy. She agreed that the independence of the Chief Internal Auditor was a crucial issue.
308. *A representative of the Director-General* explained that, for the first time, an internal and external competition had been held for the post and the Office had endeavoured to follow a transparent process, in accordance with the best practices in that regard; that was partly the reason why the process had been so slow. Consulting the Officers of the Governing Body was a matter of courtesy and good practice but was by no means an obligation. With regard to independence, she explained that, given the qualifications and experience required for the post, it was inevitable that internal candidates had at some point in their career been involved in the financial management of the Office, but emphasized that the Chief Internal Auditor was expected to carry out his or her functions with integrity and total independence.

Governing Body decision:

309. ***The Governing Body supported the proposal of the Director-General concerning the appointment of Ms Keiko Kamioka to the position of Chief Internal Auditor of the ILO.*** (GB.298/15/8, paragraph 4.)

Sixteenth item on the agenda

REPORTS OF THE OFFICERS OF THE GOVERNING BODY

Representation alleging non-observance by Mexico of the Labour Inspection Convention, 1947 (No. 81), the Labour Inspectorates (Non-Metropolitan Territories) Convention, 1947 (No. 85), the Labour Administration Convention, 1978 (No. 150), the Occupational Safety and Health Convention, 1981 (No. 155), the Chemicals Convention, 1990 (No. 170), the Prevention of Major Industrial Accidents Convention, 1993 (No. 174), and the Safety and Health in Mines Convention, 1995 (No. 176), by the Sindicato Nacional de Trabajadores de Caminos y Puentes Federales de Ingresos y Servicios Conexos
(GB.298/16)

Governing Body decision:

- 310. The Governing Body decided that the representation was receivable only in so far as the alleged non-observance by Mexico of the Labour Administration Convention, 1978 (No. 150), the Occupational Safety and Health Convention, 1981 (No. 155), and the Chemicals Convention, 1990 (No. 170) was concerned, and set up a committee for its examination.** (GB.298/16, paragraph 8.)

Seventeenth item on the agenda

COMPOSITION AND AGENDA OF STANDING BODIES AND MEETINGS (GB.298/17)

*Tripartite Meeting on the Production of Electronic Components for the IT Industries:
Changing Labour Force Requirements in a Global Economy
(Geneva, 16–18 April 2007)*

Invitation of an international non-governmental organization

Governing Body decision:

- 311. The Governing Body authorized the Director-General to invite GoodElectronics to be represented at the Meeting as an observer.** (GB.298/17, paragraph 2.)

*Eleventh African Regional Meeting
(Addis Ababa, 24–27 April 2007)*

Invitation of international non-governmental organizations

Governing Body decision:

- 312. The Governing Body authorized the Director-General to invite the following international non-governmental organizations to be represented at the Meeting as observers:**
- **East African Trade Union Council (EATUC); and**
 - **Southern African Trade Union Council (SATUC).**

(GB.298/17, paragraph 4.)

*Tripartite Meeting to Examine the Impact of Global Food Chains on Employment
(Geneva, 24–27 September 2007)*

Invitation of international non-governmental organizations

Governing Body decision:

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

- *International Union of Food, Agricultural, Hotel, Restaurant, Catering, Tobacco and Allied Workers' Associations (IUF); and*
- *Union Network International (UNI).*

(GB.298/17, paragraph 7.)

*International Symposium on the Role of Trade Unions in Workers' Education:
The Key to Trade Union Capacity Building
(Geneva, 8–12 October 2007)*

Governing Body decision:

314. The Governing Body approved the proposed composition formula and the proposed agenda for the Meeting. (GB.298/17, paragraphs 11 and 14.)

Invitation of international non-governmental organizations

Governing Body decision:

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

- *Building and Woodworkers' International (BWI);*
- *Education International (EI);*
- *European Trade Union Confederation (ETUC);*
- *International Confederation of Arab Trade Unions (ICATU);*
- *International Federation of Chemical, Energy, Mine and General Workers' Unions (ICEM);*
- *International Federation of Journalists (IFJ);*
- *International Federation of Workers' Education Associations (IFWEA);*
- *International Metalworkers' Federation (IMF);*

- *International Textile, Garment and Leather Workers' Federation (ITGLWF);*
- *International Transport Workers' Federation (ITF);*
- *International Union of Food, Agricultural, Hotel, Restaurant, Catering, Tobacco and Allied Workers' Associations (IUF);*
- *Public Services International (PSI);*
- *Trade Union Advisory Committee to the OECD (TUAC);*
- *Union Network International (UNI); and*
- *Union Syndicale des Travailleurs du Maghreb (USTMA).*

(GB.298/17, paragraph 16.)

*Symposium on the Labour and Social Aspects of Global Production Systems:
Issues for Business
(Geneva, 17–19 October 2007)*

Governing Body decision:

- 316. *The Governing Body approved the proposed composition formula for the Meeting.*** (GB.298/17, paragraph 18.)

*Tripartite Meeting of Experts on Labour Statistics
(Geneva, 3–6 December 2007)*

Governing Body decision:

- 317. *The Governing Body approved the proposed composition formula and proposed agenda for the Meeting.*** (GB.298/17, paragraphs 22 and 24.)

*Meeting of Experts to Examine Instruments, Knowledge, Advocacy,
Technical Cooperation and International Collaboration as Tools
with a view to Developing a Policy Framework for
Hazardous Substances
(Geneva, 10–13 December 2007)*

Invitation of international non-governmental organizations

Governing Body decision:

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

- *European Chemical Employers Group (ECEG);*
- *European Chemical Industry Council (CEFIC);*
- *International Chemical Employers Labour Relations Committee (LRC);*

- *International Council of Chemical Associations (ICCA);*
- *International Federation of Chemical, Energy, Mine and General Workers' Unions (ICEM); and*
- *International Occupational Hygiene Association (IOHA).*

(GB.298/17, paragraph 28.)

*Appointment of an ILO delegation to the 50th Session of the
IMO Subcommittee on Stability and Load Lines and on
Fishing Vessels' Safety
(London, 30 April–4 May 2007)*

Governing Body decision:

319. *The Governing Body appointed the ILO tripartite delegation which will participate in the work of the correspondence group and the above session of the IMO Subcommittee on Stability and Load Lines and on Fishing Vessels' Safety.*

- **Government representative:** *To be decided*
- **Employers' representative:** *Mr J. Hudson (United Kingdom)*
- **Workers' representative:** *Mr O.S. Mortensen (Denmark)*

(GB.298/17, paragraph 29.)

*Appointment of Governing Body representatives on various bodies:
Tripartite Meeting to Examine the Impact of Global Food Chains
on Employment
(Geneva, 24–27 September 2007)*

320. *The name of the Government representative responsible for representing the Governing Body and for chairing the Meeting would be communicated at a later stage.* (GB.298/17, paragraph 30.)

Information notes

PROGRAMME OF MEETINGS AS APPROVED BY THE
OFFICERS OF THE GOVERNING BODY
(GB.298/Inf.1)

APPROVED SYMPOSIA, SEMINARS, WORKSHOPS AND SIMILAR MEETINGS
(GB.298/Inf.2)

REQUESTS FROM INTERNATIONAL NON-GOVERNMENTAL ORGANIZATIONS WISHING
TO BE REPRESENTED AT THE 96TH SESSION (2007) OF THE
INTERNATIONAL LABOUR CONFERENCE
(GB.298/Inf.3)

321. *The Governing Body took note of this information.*

Bureau international du Travail – Conseil d’administration
International Labour Office – Governing Body
Oficina Internacional del Trabajo – Consejo de Administración

298^e session – Genève – mars 2007
298th session – Geneva – March 2007
298.^a reunión – Ginebra – marzo de 2007

Liste des personnes assistant à la session
List of persons attending the session
Lista de las personas presentes en la reunión

Membres gouvernementaux titulaires Regular Government members Miembros gubernamentales titulares	66
Membres gouvernementaux adjoints Deputy Government members Miembros gubernamentales adjuntos	74
Membres employeurs titulaires Regular Employer members Miembros empleadores titulares	80
Membres employeurs adjoints Deputy Employer members Miembros empleadores adjuntos	81
Membres travailleurs titulaires Regular Worker members Miembros trabajadores titulares	83
Membres travailleurs adjoints Deputy Worker members Miembros trabajadores adjuntos	84
Représentants d’autres Etats Membres Representatives of other member States Representantes de otros Estados Miembros	86
Représentants d’organisations internationales gouvernementales Representatives of international governmental organizations Representantes de organizaciones internacionales gubernamentales	91
Représentants d’organisations internationales non gouvernementales Representatives of international non-governmental organizations Representantes de organizaciones internacionales no gubernamentales	94
Mouvements de libération Liberation movements Movimientos de liberación	96

Membres gouvernementaux titulaires
Miembros gubernamentales titulares
Regular Government members

Président du Conseil d'administration: Chairperson of the Governing Body: Presidente del Consejo de Administración:	Mr M.M.S. MDLADLANA
--	----------------------------

Afrique du Sud South Africa
Sudáfrica

Mr M.M.S. MDLADLANA, Chairperson of the ILO Governing Body and Minister of Labour.

substitute(s):

Ms G. MTSHALI, Ambassador, Permanent Mission, Geneva.
 Mr L. KETTLEDAS, Deputy Director-General, Department of Labour.
 Mr S. NDEBELE, Counsellor (Labour), Permanent Mission, Geneva.

accompanied by:

Ms N. NONJONJO, Protocol Officer to the Minister of Labour.
 Ms N. PLATZMAN, Secretary, Permanent Mission, Geneva.

Allemagne Germany
Alemania

Mr W. KOBERSKI, Director for European Policy, Federal Ministry of Labour and Social Affairs.
 Mr G. ANDRES, Parliamentary Secretary of State, Federal Ministry of Labour and Social Affairs.

substitute(s):

Mr E. KREUZALER, Director, International Employment and Social Policy Department, Federal Ministry of Labour and Social Affairs.
 Ms B. ZEITZ, Deputy Head, ILO and UN Department, Federal Ministry of Labour and Social Affairs.
 Ms S. HOFFMANN, Counsellor, Permanent Mission, Geneva.

accompanied by:

Ms S. OVERKÄMPING, Head, ILO and UN Department, Federal Ministry of Labour and Social Affairs.
 Ms M. NIESSEN, Interpreter, Federal Ministry of Labour and Social Affairs.
 Ms M. BRAKALOVA, Junior Officer, Federal Ministry of Labour and Social Affairs.

Arabie saoudite Saudi Arabia
Arabia Saudita

Mr A. AL-GHORRI, Legal Adviser, International Organizations Directorate, Ministry of Labour.

substitute(s):

Mr A. GADHI, Specialist, International Organizations Directorate, Ministry of Labour.

Australie Australia
Australia

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

accompanied by:

Mr S. EVANS, Director, International Relations Branch, Department of Employment and Workplace Relations.
 Mr S. THOM, First Secretary, Permanent Mission, Geneva.

Bélarus Belarus Belarús

Mr A. KOPYAKOV, Deputy Prime Minister
of the Republic of Belarus.

substitute(s):

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

accompanied by:

Ms N. PETKEVICH, Deputy Head of the
Administration of the President.

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

Mr A. RUMAK, Deputy Head of the
Financial Relations Section of the Office of
the Council of Ministers.

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

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

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

Mr E. LAZAREV, First Secretary, Permanent
Mission, Geneva.

Brésil Brazil Brasil

Ms M. DE ANDRADE SIMÕES, Minister,
Head of Division of Social Issues, Ministry
of External Relations.

Mr C. DA ROCHA PARANHOS,
Ambassador, Alternate Permanent
Representative, Permanent Mission,
Geneva.

substitute(s):

Mr N. FREITAS, Special Adviser to the
Minister of Labour and Employment,
Ministry of Labour and Employment.

accompanied by:

Mr R. DE CARVALHO, Secretary,
Permanent Mission, Geneva.

Mr M. DOS SANTOS BARBOSA, Assessor
Especial.

Mr I. SANT'ANNA RESENDE, Secretary,
Division of Social Issues, Ministry of
External Relations.

**Cameroun Cameroon
Camerún**

M. R. NKILI, ministre du Travail et de la
Sécurité sociale.

suppléant(s) :

M. F. NGANTCHA, ministre conseiller,
mission permanente, Genève.

accompagné(s) de:

M. R. AKOLLA EKAH, chargé de mission à
la Présidence de la République du
Cameroun.

M. C. MOUTE A BIDIAS, directeur général
du Fonds national de l'emploi.

M. L. MOTAZE, directeur général de la
Caisse nationale de prévoyance.

M. C. EBOT AYUK, conseiller technique,
chef de division, Division des affaires
sociales, services du Premier ministre.

M. S. INACK INACK, chef de division,
études, prospective et coopération, ministère
du Travail et de la Sécurité sociale.

M^{me} M. EBODE KONOMI AMBASSA,
sous-directeur, ministère du Travail et de la
Sécurité sociale.

M^{me} M. KALATI LOBE, chef de cellule,
cellule de suivi, ministère du Travail et de la
Sécurité sociale.

M. E. ONDOUA, chargé d'études
assistant/cellule de coopération technique,
ministère du Travail et de la Sécurité
sociale.

M^{me} C. BOUBA, chef de service des normes,
ministère du Travail et de la Sécurité
sociale.

M. A. ETEKI NKONGO, premier secrétaire,
mission permanente, Genève.

M. P. FOU DA TSILLA, chef de service.

M^{me} N. FEUJIO VOUGMO DJUA, attachée
au secrétariat des services du Premier
ministre, ministère du Travail et de la
Sécurité sociale.

Canada Canada Canadá

Mr A. GILES, Director-General, International and Intergovernmental Labour Affairs, Human Resources and Social Development Canada.

accompanied by:

Ms D. ROBINSON, Director, International Labour Affairs, Labour Program, Human Resources and Social Development Canada.
Mr P. OLDHAM, Counsellor and Consul, Permanent Mission, Geneva.
Ms I. GAÉTAN, Senior Policy Analyst, International Labour Affairs, Human Resources and Social Development Canada.
Mr K. AMÉGAN, First Secretary, Permanent Mission, Geneva.
Ms N. STUEWER, Second Secretary, Permanent Mission, Geneva.

Chili Chile Chile

Sr. O. ANDRADE, Ministro de Trabajo y Previsión Social.

suplente(s):

Sr. J. MARTABIT, Embajador, Misión Permanente, Ginebra.

acompañado(s) de:

Sr. J. EGUIGUREN, Ministro Consejero, Misión Permanente, Ginebra.
Sra. R. CLARK, Encargada de Relaciones Internacionales, Ministerio de Trabajo y Previsión Social.
Sra. A. ESQUIVEL, Agregada Laboral, Misión Permanente, Ginebra.
Sr. B. DEL PICÓ, Segundo Secretario, Misión Permanente, Ginebra.
Sr. S. FARÍAS, Asesor, Departamento de Relaciones Internacionales, Ministerio de Trabajo y Previsión Social.

Chine China China

Mr Z. SHA, Ambassador and Permanent Representative, Permanent Mission, Geneva.

substitute(s):

Mr X. LIU, Director-General, Department of International Cooperation, Ministry of Labour and Social Security.
Ms X. LU, Counsellor, Permanent Mission, Geneva.

accompanied by:

Ms J. GUAN, Director, Department of International Cooperation, Ministry of Labour and Social Security.
Mr L. ZHANG, Director, Department of International Cooperation, Ministry of Labour and Social Security.
Mr S. RONG, Second Secretary, Permanent Mission, Geneva.
Ms R. XU, Official, Department of International Cooperation, Ministry of Labour and Social Security.

Cuba

Sr. J. FERNÁNDEZ PALACIOS, Embajador, Misión Permanente, Ginebra.

suplente(s):

Sra. V. THOMAS, Consejera, Dirección de Asuntos Multilaterales, Ministerio de Relaciones Exteriores.
Sra. G. HERNÁNDEZ, Especialista Principal de Relaciones Internacionales, Ministerio de Trabajo y Seguridad Social.
Sr. M. SÁNCHEZ OLIVA, Tercer Secretario, Misión Permanente, Ginebra.

acompañado(s) de:

Sr. C. HURTADO LABRADOR, Consejero, Misión Permanente, Ginebra.
Sra. M. HERRERA CASEIRO, Consejera, Misión Permanente, Ginebra.

El Salvador

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

suplente(s):

Sr. B. LARIOS LÓPEZ, Embajador, Misión Permanente, Ginebra.

Sra. E. ÁVILA DE PEÑA, Asesora del
Despacho Ministerial, Ministerio de Trabajo
y Previsión Social.

acompañado(s) de:

Sr. M. CASTRO GRANDE, Ministro
Consejero, Misión Permanente, Ginebra.
Sr. W. PALACIOS CARRANZA, Director de
Relaciones Internacionales de Trabajo,
Ministerio de Trabajo y Previsión Social.

Espagne Spain España

Sra. A. DOMÍNGUEZ GONZÁLEZ,
Subsecretaria del Ministerio de Trabajo y
Asuntos Sociales.

suplente(s):

Sr. J. MARCH, Embajador, Representante
Permanente, Misión Permanente, Ginebra.

acompañado(s) de:

Sr. J. DE ARÍSTEGUI LABORDE,
Embajador, Misión Permanente, Ginebra.
Sr. F. ARNAU NAVARRO, Consejero de
Trabajo y Asuntos Sociales, Misión
Permanente, Ginebra.
Sr. G. LÓPEZ MACLELLAN, Consejero
Diplomático, Misión Permanente, Ginebra.

Etats-Unis United States Estados Unidos

Mr J. CARTER, Deputy Undersecretary of
Labor for International Affairs, US
Department of Labor.
Mr R. SHEPARD, Director, Office of
International Organizations, Bureau of
International Labor Affairs, US Department
of Labor.

accompanied by:

Ms J. BARRETT, Manpower Analyst, Office
of International Organizations, Bureau of
International Labor Affairs, US Department
of Labor.
Mr J. CHAMBERLIN, Labor Attaché,
Permanent Mission, Geneva.

Ms J. CHAMMAS, Deputy Chief of Mission,
Permanent Mission, Geneva.

Ms A. CHICK, First Secretary, Permanent
Mission, Geneva.

Ms V. DE PIRRO, Political Counselor,
Permanent Mission, Geneva.

Mr J. GUTHRIE-CORN, Deputy Director,
Office of Technical Specialized Agencies,
Bureau of International Organization
Affairs, Department of State.

Mr S. JOHNSTON, Program Assistant,
Office of UN System Administration,
Bureau of International Organization
Affairs, Department of State.

Mr L. KARESH, Assistant United States
Trade Representative for Labor, Executive
Office of the President, Office of the United
States Trade Representative.

Ms J. MISNER, Senior Adviser for
International Labor Standards, Bureau of
International Labor Affairs, US Department
of Labor.

Mr K. SWINNERTON, Acting Chief,
Economic and Labor Research Division,
Bureau of International Labor Affairs, US
Department of Labor.

Mr C. WATSON, International Program
Analyst, Office of International
Organizations, Bureau of International
Labor Affairs, US Department of Labor.

France France Francia

M^{me} N. AMELINE, déléguée
gouvernementale de la France au Conseil
d'administration du BIT.

suppléant(s):

M. M. BOISNEL, délégué adjoint, délégation
aux affaires européennes et internationales
(DAEI).

accompagné(s) de:

M. C. GUILHOU, représentant permanent
adjoint, mission permanente, Genève.

M^{me} A. LECLERC, déléguée aux affaires
européennes et internationales, ministère de
l'Emploi, de la Cohésion sociale et du
Logement.

M^{me} P. RENOUL, conseillère, mission
permanente, Genève.

M^{me} L. BERNARDI, sous-direction des affaires économiques, ministère des Affaires étrangères.

M. E. RAVAUUX, direction des Nations Unies et des organisations internationales, ministère de l'Emploi, de la Cohésion sociale et du Logement.

M^{me} M. COENT, délégation aux affaires européennes et internationales, ministère de l'Emploi, de la Cohésion sociale et du Logement.

M^{me} C. PARRA, délégation aux affaires européennes et internationales, ministère de l'Emploi, de la Cohésion sociale et du Logement.

M. M. TAHERI, délégation aux affaires européennes et internationales, ministère de l'Emploi, de la Cohésion sociale et du Logement.

M^{me} V. BASSO, attachée aux affaires sociales, mission permanente, Genève.

M^{me} N. MATHIEU, mission permanente, Genève.

M^{me} S. SIFFERMANN, observatrice, délégation de la France auprès de l'OMC.

Inde India India

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

accompanied by:

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

Mr S.K. SRIVASTAVA, Joint Secretary, Ministry of Labour and Employment.

Mr M.S. GROVER, Deputy Permanent Representative, Permanent Mission, Geneva.

Mr A. SINGH, Director, Ministry of Labour and Employment.

Mr V.K. TRIVEDI, First Secretary, Permanent Mission, Geneva.

Ms K. MISHRA, Deputy Director, Ministry of Labour and Employment.

Italie Italy Italia

Mr F. GUARIELLO, Delegate from the Government of Italy to the ILO Governing Body.

accompanied by:

Mr L. FANTINI, Vice Permanent Delegate of the Italian Government to the ILO Governing Body, Ministry of Labour and Social Policy.

Mr P. D'AVINO, Minister Counsellor, Permanent Representative of Italy to the United Nations Office and other International Organizations at Geneva.

Ms R. BARBERINI, Counsellor, Permanent Representative of Italy to the United Nations Office and other International Organizations at Geneva.

Ms V. RUSSO, Expert, Ministry of Foreign Affairs.

Mr D. CICCARELLI, Expert, WTO, Permanent Representative of Italy to the United Nations Office and other International Organizations at Geneva.

Japon Japan Japón

Mr I. FUJISAKI, Ambassador Extraordinary and Plenipotentiary, Permanent Mission, Geneva.

substitute(s):

Mr K. MATSUI, Assistant Minister for International Affairs, Minister's Secretariat, Ministry of Health, Labour and Welfare.

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

Mr H. MINAMI, Minister, Permanent Mission, Geneva.

Mr M. HAYASHI, Counsellor, Permanent Mission, Geneva.

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

accompanied by:

Mr N. TAGAYA, Vice-Director for Industrial Relations, Ministry of Labour and Welfare.

Mr O. YAMANAKA, Counsellor, Permanent Mission, Geneva.

Mr K. KAMAE, Deputy Director for International Cooperation, International Affairs Division, Ministry of Health, Labour and Welfare.

Mr Y. HIKASA, First Secretary, Permanent Mission, Geneva.

Mr S. YASUI, Technical Assessment Officer, Safety Division, Industrial Safety and Health Department, Labour Standards Bureau, Ministry of Health, Labour and Welfare.

Ms K. ROKUMOTO, Deputy Director, International Affairs Division, Minister's Secretariat, Ministry of Health, Labour and Welfare.

Mr A. TANIKAWA, Unit Chief, Elementary and Secondary Education Planning Division, Ministry of Education, Culture, Sports, Science and Technology.

Mr S. SUDO, Section Chief, International Affairs Division, Minister's Secretariat, Ministry of Health, Labour and Welfare.

Ms E. KAMISUGI, Official, International Affairs Division, Minister's Secretariat, Ministry of Health, Labour and Welfare.

Kenya

Mr N. KULUNDU, Minister for Labour and Human Resource Development.

substitute(s):

Mr M. BOR, Permanent Secretary, Ministry of Labour and Human Resource Development.

Ms M. NZOMO, Ambassador, Permanent Mission, Geneva.

Mr P. OWADE, Ambassador and Deputy Permanent Representative, Permanent Mission, Geneva.

Mr J. KAVULUDI, Labour Commissioner, Ministry of Labour and Human Resource Development.

accompanied by:

Mr G. OMONDI, Counsellor – Labour, Permanent Mission, Geneva.

Mr P. WAMOTO, Assistant Labour Commissioner, Ministry of Labour and Human Resource Development.

Ms J. YONGA, Deputy Director, Human Resource Management.

Malawi

Mr J. KHUMBO CHIRWA, Minister of Labour and Social Development.

accompanied by:

Mr A. DAUDI, Principal Secretary, Ministry of Labour and Social Development.

Mr E. ZIRIKUDONDO, Labour Commissioner, Ministry of Labour and Social Development.

Mr H. NYANGULU, Director of Occupational Safety and Health, Adviser.

Maroc Morocco Marruecos

M. M. MANSOURI, ministre de l'Emploi et de la Formation professionnelle.

accompagné(s) de:

M. M. LOULICHKI, ambassadeur, mission permanente, Genève.

M^{me} S. FAHEM, chef du service des organismes internationaux du travail, ministère de l'Emploi et de la Formation professionnelle.

M. A. BENOSMANE, conseiller du ministre de l'Emploi et de la Formation professionnelle, ministère de l'Emploi et de la Formation professionnelle.

M. N. HALHOUL, conseiller des affaires étrangères, mission permanente, Genève.

Nigéria Nigeria Nigeria

Mr H. LAWAL, Minister of Labour and Productivity.

substitute(s):

Ms T. KORIPAMO-AGARY, Permanent Secretary, Federal Ministry of Labour and Productivity.

accompanied by:

Ms I. AJAYI, Deputy Director, Employment and Wages.

Ms V. EGHOBAMIEN, Director, TUSIR.

Ms I. NWANKWO, Deputy Director (Factories).

Mr W.I. SALAMI, Assistant to the Director (Kaduna State).
 Ms O. AIMIUWU, Chief Labour Officer.
 Mr D. NEBURAGHO, Chief Labour Officer.
 Mr I.O. OFOEDU, Assistant Chief Administration Officer.
 Mr S. GADAU, Prin. Labour Officer.
 Mr P. BDLIYA, Assistant Director-General.
 Mr J. OLANRENWAJU, Director of Labour Institute.
 Mr V. TUKURA, Special Assistant to the Minister.
 Mr J. SULE, Personal Assistant to the Minister of Labour.
 Mr S.O. ADELODUN, Director-General, National Directorate of Employment.
 Mr A. RAMALN, Chairman, National Maritime Administration and Safety Agency.

Pérou Peru Perú

Sr. E. VIVANCO, Embajador, Representante Permanente del Perú, Misión Permanente, Ginebra.

acompañado(s) de:

Sr. C. CHOCANO, Representante Permanente Alterno, Misión Permanente, Ginebra.
 Sr. I. ZEVALLOS, Segundo Secretario, Misión Permanente, Ginebra.

Philippines Philippines Filipinas

Mr D. CRUZ, Undersecretary, Department of Labor and Employment.

substitute(s):

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

accompanied by:

Mr M. IMSON, Labour Attaché, Permanent Mission, Geneva.
 Ms M. EASTWOOD, Welfare Officer, Permanent Mission, Geneva.
 Mr J. DOMINGO, Consul, Permanent Mission, Geneva.

Mr A. ALVAREZ, Overseas Labour Office, Permanent Mission, Geneva.
 Mr E. AREVALO, Overseas Labour Office, Permanent Mission, Geneva.

Roumanie Romania Rumania

M. V. BINDEA, secrétaire d'Etat, ministère du Travail, de la Solidarité sociale et de la Famille.

suppléant(s) :

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

accompagné(s) de:

M^{me} C. DUMITRIU, conseillère, direction des relations externes et organisations internationales, ministère du Travail, de la Solidarité sociale et de la Famille.
 M^{me} E. ISPAS, expert, ministère du Travail, de la Solidarité sociale et de la Famille.
 M^{me} N. BIRLADIANU, deuxième secrétaire, mission permanente, Genève.

Royaume-Uni United Kingdom Reino Unido

Mr S. RICHARDS, Head of ILO & UN Employment 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.

Ms P. TARIF, Second Secretary, Permanent Mission, Geneva.

accompanied by:

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

Mr F. MACDONALD, Policy Adviser,
International Relations Division, Joint
International Department, Department for
Work and Pensions and Department for
Education and Skills.

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

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

Mr G. OTOO, Institutional Manager,
Specialized Agencies, Department for
International Development.

Ms S. BALDWIN, Deputy Head, Specialized
Agencies, Department for International
Development.

Ms H. THOMAS, Attaché, Permanent
Mission, Geneva.

Ms S. CHUBBS, Attaché, Permanent
Mission, Geneva.

Ms H. UPTON, Legal Adviser, Permanent
Mission, Geneva.

Fédération de Russie Russian Federation Federación de Rusia

Mr V. LOSHCHININ, Ambassador,
Permanent Mission, Geneva.

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

accompanied by:

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

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

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

Ms L. MIKHAILOVA, Head, Division of
Employment, Federal Labour and
Employment Service, Ministry of Health
and Social Development.

Ms E. ALEHINA, Deputy Head, Legal
Department, Federal Labour and
Employment Service.

Mr V. STEPANOV, Head of Section,
Department of Labour Relations, Ministry
of Health and Social Development.

Mr A. KUDRYAVTSEV, Counsellor,
Department of Labour Relations, Ministry
of Health and Social Development.

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

Mr I. DUDOLADOV, Head of Section, Legal
Department, Federal Labour and
Employment Service.

Ms L. BEHTEREVA, Head of Section,
Finance Department, Federal Labour and
Employment Service.

Mr A. URIN, First Secretary, Department of
Economic Cooperation, Ministry of Foreign
Affairs.

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

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

Ms V. ZAHAROVA, Senior Expert,
Department of Labour Relations, Ministry
of Health and Social Development.

Sri Lanka

Mr A. SENEVIRATNE, Minister of Labour
Relations and Foreign Employment.

substitute(s):

Mr M. MADIHAHEWA, Secretary, Ministry
of Labour Relations and Foreign
Employment.

Ms S. FERNANDO, Ambassador, Permanent
Mission, Geneva.

Mr U. ATHUKORALA, Senior Assistant
Secretary, Ministry of Labour Relations and
Foreign Employment.

accompanied by:

Mr P. ATHAUDA, Private Secretary to the
Minister.

Mr O.L. AMEERAJWAD, Counsellor,
Permanent Mission, Geneva.

Membres gouvernementaux adjoints
Miembros gubernamentales adjuntos
Deputy Government members
Miembros gubernamentales adjuntos
Argentine Argentina
Argentina

Sra. N. RIAL, Secretaria de Trabajo,
Ministerio de Trabajo, Empleo y Seguridad Social.

suplente(s):

Sr. A. DUMONT, Embajador, Misión Permanente, Ginebra.

Sr. E. MARTÍNEZ GONDRA, Ministro, Representante Permanente Alterno, Misión Permanente, Ginebra.

acompañado(s) de:

Sr. J. ROSALES, Coordinador de Relaciones Internacionales, Ministerio de Trabajo, Empleo y Seguridad Social.

Sr. D. CELAYA ALVAREZ, Consejero, Misión Permanente, Ginebra.

Sr. G. CORRES, Subcoordinador de Asuntos Internacionales, Ministerio de Trabajo, Empleo y Seguridad Social.

Barbade Barbados
Barbados

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

substitute(s):

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

accompanied by:

Ms K. MCCONNEY, Deputy Permanent Representative, Permanent Mission, Geneva.

Ms E. MARCUS-BURNETT, Counsellor, Permanent Mission, Geneva.

Burundi

M. J. NGORWANUBUSA, ministre de la Fonction publique, du Travail et de la Sécurité sociale.

suppléant(s) :

M. A. NDIKUMWAMI, conseiller au Cabinet, ministère de la Fonction publique, du Travail et de la Sécurité sociale.

accompagné(s) de:

M. P. MAHWERA, représentant permanent, mission permanente, Genève.

M. N. NKUNDWANABAKE, premier conseiller, mission permanente, Genève.

Cambodge Cambodia
Camboya

Mr H. VENG, Director of Child Labour, Ministry of Labour and Vocational Training.

substitute(s):

Mr V. HEANG, Director of International Cooperation Department, Ministry of Labour and Vocational Training.

Mr R. NGUY, Chief of ILO Office, International Cooperation Department, Ministry of Labour and Vocational Training.

accompanied by:

Mr V. HOU, Deputy Director-General, Ministry of Labour and Vocational Training.

Mr P. PHAN, Second Secretary, Permanent Mission, Geneva.

Corée, Rép. de
Republic of Korea
República de Corea

Mr H. CHOI, Ambassador, Permanent Mission, Geneva.

substitute(s):

Mr D. CHANG, Ambassador and Deputy Permanent Representative, Permanent Mission, Geneva.

Mr S. YI, Director, Ministry of Labour.

accompanied by:

Mr M. JUNG, Permanent Mission, Geneva.

Mr H. KIM, Senior Deputy Director, International Negotiation Team, Ministry of Labour.

Ms Y. KIM, Deputy Director, International Labour Policy Team, Ministry of Labour.

Ms E. PARK, Assistant Director, International Labour Policy Team, Ministry of Labour.

Côte d'Ivoire

M. H. OULAYE, ministre de la Fonction publique, de l'Emploi et de la Réforme administrative.

suppléant(s):

M. G. GAUZE, ambassadeur, mission permanente, Genève.

accompagné(s) de:

M. D. BOLLOU BI DJEHIEFE, expert.

M. F. GLEGLAUD, premier conseiller, mission permanente, Genève.

M. B. LOBA KIESSEY, directeur, réglementation du travail, ministère de la Fonction publique, de l'Emploi et de la Réforme administrative.

M. K. PORQUET, conseiller.

Ethiopie Ethiopia Etiópía

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

substitute(s):

Mr F. YIMER, Ambassador, Permanent Mission, Geneva.

accompanied by:

Ms E. TEFERA, Acting Head, International Relations and Public Relations, Ministry of Labour and Social Affairs.

Mr A. SHIKETA ANSA, First Secretary, Permanent Mission, Geneva.

Finlande Finland Finlandia

Mr M. SALMENPERÄ, Director, Working Environment Policy Department, Ministry of Labour.

accompanied by:

Ms R. KANGASHARJU, Ministerial Adviser, Ministry of Labour.

Ms E. MYLLYMÄKI, Ambassador for Global Governance, Ministry for Foreign Affairs.

Ms S. MATTILA, Minister-Counsellor, Permanent Mission, Geneva.

Ms S. MODEEN, Counsellor, Permanent Mission, Geneva.

Mr N. BRUUN, Professor, Helsinki School of Economics.

Ms A. KONTTINEN, First Secretary, Ministry of Foreign Affairs.

Grèce Greece Grecia

Mr F. VERROS, Ambassador, Permanent Mission, Geneva.

Ms M. VOZIKI KOSMATOPOULOU, Attorney-at-Law, Ministry of Employment and Social Protection.

accompanied by:

Ms E. CHRYSSANTHOU, Head of Section, Ministry of Employment and Social Protection.

Ms S. KYRIAKOU, Attaché, Permanent Mission, Geneva.

Ms M. GKOUVA, Ministry of Employment and Social Protection.

Mr C. VOUSVOURAS, Junior Officer, Permanent Mission, Geneva.

Honduras

Sr. M. J. Delmer URBIZO PANTING,
Embajador, Misión Permanente, Ginebra.

acompañado(s) de:

Sra. G. BU FIGUEROA, Consejera
Encargada de Negocios, *a.i.*, Misión
Permanente, Ginebra.

Hongrie Hungary Hungría

Mr L. HÉTHY, Deputy Director-General,
Central Employment Office.

substitute(s):

Mr G. SZELEI KISS, Ambassador
Extraordinary and Plenipotentiary,
Permanent Mission, Geneva.

accompanied by:

Mr P. KLEKNER, Chief Adviser to the
Minister, Ministry on Social Affairs and
Labour.

Ms D. BLAZSEK, Second Secretary,
Permanent Mission, Geneva.

Iran, Rép. islamique d' Islamic Republic of Iran República Islámica del Irán

Mr J. FARSHBAF MAHERIAN, Deputy
Minister for Human Resources Planning and
Entrepreneurship Development, Ministry of
Labour and Social Affairs.

substitute(s):

Mr A. MOAIYERI, Ambassador, Permanent
Mission, Geneva.

accompanied by:

Mr V. RAYAT, Member of Parliament.
Mr S. HOSSEINI, Member of Parliament.
Mr M. ABBASPOUR, Member of
Parliament.
Mr M. MANSOURI RAZI, Member of
Parliament.

Mr H. PAAPY, Member of Parliament.
Mr F. HEMMATI, Member of Parliament.
Mr H. NOURI, Adviser to Minister and
Director-General for International Affairs,
Ministry of Labour and Social Affairs.
Mr A.H. SHAHMIR, Labour Attaché,
Permanent Mission, Geneva.
Mr H. TALA, Dean of the Faculty of Labour
Safety and Health at Work, Ministry of
Labour and Social Affairs.
Mr H. MOHAMMAD ZADEH, Deputy
Director, General Labour Inspection,
Ministry of Labour and Social Affairs.
Ms H. AGHAJANI, Expert, International
Affairs, Ministry of Labour and Social
Affairs.
Ms S. FOULADVAND, Labour Affairs
Expert, Ministry of Labour and Social
Affairs.
Ms N. RAHGOZAR, Labour Affairs Expert,
Ministry of Labour and Social Affairs.
Mr R. MOTAZEDI, IT Expert, Ministry of
Labour and Social Affairs.

Irlande Ireland Irlanda

Mr M. CUNNIFFE, Principal, Department of
Enterprise, Trade and Employment,
Ministry for Labour Affairs.
Mr P. KAVANAGH, Ambassador,
Permanent Mission, Geneva.

substitute(s):

Mr E. LAIRD, Deputy Permanent
Representative, Permanent Mission,
Geneva.
Ms C. SAVAGE, Higher Executive Officer,
Department of Enterprise, Trade and
Employment, Ministry for Labour Affairs.

accompanied by:

Mr F. DOHENY, Assistant Principal,
Department of Enterprise, Trade and
Employment.
Ms O. MAHER, Third Secretary, Permanent
Mission, Geneva.
Ms D. KENNAN, Third Secretary, Permanent
Mission, Geneva.
Mr M. BARTON, Permanent Mission,
Geneva.

Jordanie Jordan Jordania

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

accompanied by:

Mr S. DAJANI, Special Counsellor for ILO
Affairs, Permanent Mission, Geneva.

Mr H. AL-HUSSEINI, First Secretary,
Permanent Mission, Geneva.

Koweït Kuwait Kuwait

Mr S. ALI AL SHEIKH, Assistant
Undersecretary of Labour Affairs.

accompanied by:

Mr M. AL SUMAIT, Director, Labour
Coordination Department.

Mr S. SULTAN, Supervisor of Evaluation,
Department of Labour Inspection.

Ms S. AL SHABAAN, First Legal
Researcher, Foreign Relations Department.

Mexique Mexico México

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

acompañado(s) de:

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

Sr. J. RODRÍGUEZ, Jefe de la Unidad de
Asuntos Internacionales, Secretaría de
Trabajo y Previsión Social, Misión
Permanente, Ginebra.

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

Sr. J. MORALES, Director para la OIT,
Secretaría de Trabajo y Previsión Social.

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

Sr. J. SÁNCHEZ, Segundo Secretario,
Misión Permanente, Ginebra.

Mozambique

M. M. CARLOS, deuxième secrétaire,
mission permanente, Genève.

Ouganda Uganda Uganda

Pakistan Pakistan Pakistán

Mr G. KHAN, Minister for Labour,
Manpower and Overseas Pakistanis.

substitute(s):

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

accompanied by:

Ms T. JANJUA, Deputy Permanent
Representative, Permanent Mission,
Geneva.

Mr A. MOHIUDDIN, Senior Joint Secretary,
Labour and Manpower Division.

Mr S. GHAYUR, Chairman, Policy Planning
Cell (PPC).

Mr R. HASSAN FAIZ, Central Labour
Adviser, Labour and Manpower Division.

Mr M. ATHAR, Central Labour Adviser,
Labour and Manpower Division.

Mr S. AHMED, Adviser.

Mr A. ISMAIL, First Secretary, Permanent
Mission, Geneva.

Mr N. AWAN, Political Secretary to the
Minister, Ministry of Labour, Manpower
and Overseas Pakistanis.

**Pays-Bas Netherlands
Países Bajos**

Mr L. BEETS, Director for International
Affairs, Ministry of Social Affairs and
Employment.

substitute(s):

Mr B. VAN EENENNAAM, Ambassador,
Permanent Mission, Geneva.

Ms A. VAN LEUR, Deputy Director for
International Affairs, Ministry of Social
Affairs and Employment.

accompanied by:

Mr W. BEL, Deputy Head of the
International Department, Ministry of Social
Affairs and Employment.

Mr G. BUISMAN, Policy Adviser, Ministry
of Social Affairs and Employment.

Ms C. VAN DER LOUW, Senior Policy
Adviser, Ministry of Social Affairs and
Employment.

Ms L. SIPOS, Senior Policy Adviser,
Ministry of Social Affairs and Employment.

Ms Y. STIEGELIS, Policy Adviser, Ministry
of Social Affairs and Employment.

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

Mr V. RODRIGUES, Senior Policy Adviser,
Ministry of Social Affairs and Employment.

Ms L. VAN TONGEREN, Adviser,
Permanent Mission, Geneva.

Pologne Poland Polonia

Mr K. KUBERSKI, Undersecretary of State,
Ministry of Labour and Social Policy.

substitute(s):

Mr Z. RAPACKI, Ambassador, Permanent
Mission, Geneva.

Ms R. LEMIESZEWSKA, Counsellor,
Permanent Mission, Geneva.

accompanied by:

Ms M. KOSTULSKA, Senior Expert, Social
Partnership Department, Ministry of Labour
and Social Policy.

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

Sénégal Senegal Senegal

M. A. BABOU, ministre de la Fonction
publique, du Travail, de l'Emploi et des
Organisations professionnelles.

accompagné(s) de:

M. M. LY, ambassadeur, mission
permanente, Genève.

M. M. DIAGNE, inspecteur du travail,
ministère de la Fonction publique, du
Travail, de l'Emploi et des Organisations
professionnelles.

M. O. SARR, inspecteur du travail et de la
sécurité sociale, ministère de la Fonction
publique, du Travail, de l'Emploi et des
Organisations professionnelles.

M. E. BOYE, conseiller, mission permanente,
Genève.

**Singapour Singapore
Singapore**

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

substitute(s):

Mr J. RATNAM, Deputy Permanent
Representative, Permanent Mission,
Geneva.

Mr C. FOO, Registrar of Trade Unions,
Industrial Relations Branch, Ministry of
Manpower.

Mr C. LIM, Policy Analyst, Workplace
Policy and Strategy Division.

Ms K. CHING, First Secretary, Permanent
Mission, Geneva.

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

**Tchèque, Rép.
Czech Republic
República Checa**

Ms O. ROZSÍVALOVÁ, Head of
Department for European Union and
International Cooperation, Ministry of
Labour and Social Affairs.

substitute(s):

Ms J. JESLÍNKOVÁ, Head of Department of Multilateral Economic Relations, Ministry of Foreign Affairs.

Ms B. LISTÍKOVÁ, Head, International Cooperation Unit, Ministry of Labour and Social Affairs.

Mr P. POKORNÝ, Department for European Union and International Relations, Ministry of Labour and Social Affairs.

Ms J. VLACHOVÁ, Department for European Union and International Relations, Ministry of Labour and Social Affairs.

accompanied by:

Mr J. BLAZEK, Second Secretary, Permanent Mission, Geneva.

Trinité-et-Tobago
Trinidad and Tobago
Trinidad y Tabago

Ms M. HUGGINS, First Secretary, Permanent Mission, Geneva.

Tunisie Tunisia Túnez

M. M. CHEBBI, chef de cabinet du ministre des Affaires Sociales, de la Solidarité et des Tunisiens à l'étranger.

suppléant(s) :

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

M. H. LANDOULSI, conseiller, mission permanente, Genève.

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

Sr. O. CARVALLO, Embajador, Misión Permanente, Ginebra.

suplente(s):

Sr. J. ARIAS PALACIOS, Embajador, Misión Permanente, Ginebra.

acompañado(s) de:

Sr. R. HANDS, Representante ante el Comité de Libertad Sindical, Ministerio de Trabajo y Seguridad Social.

Sr. C. FLORES, Consejero, Misión Permanente, Ginebra.

Sra. V. SIERRAALTA, Consejera, Misión Permanente, Ginebra.

Viet Nam

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

accompanied by:

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

Mr V. VU, First Secretary, Permanent Mission, Geneva.

Membres employeurs titulaires Regular Employer members
Miembros empleadores titulares

Vice-président du Conseil d'administration: Vice-Chairperson of the Governing Body: Vicepresidente del Consejo de Administración:	Sr. D. FUNES DE RIOJA (Argentina)
Secrétaire du groupe des employeurs: Secretary of the Employers' group: Secretario del Grupo de los Empleadores:	Sr. A. PEÑALOSA (IOE)
Secrétaire adjoint du groupe des employeurs: Deputy Secretary of the Employers' group: Secretario Adjunto del Grupo de los Empleadores:	Mr B. WILTON (IOE)

Mr P. ANDERSON (Australia), Director, Workplace Policy, Australian Chamber of Commerce and Industry.

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

Sr. D. FUNES DE RIOJA (Argentina), Vicepresidente del Consejo de Administración de la OIT, Funes de Rioja y Asociados.

Ms R. GOLDBERG (United States), Executive Vice-President and Senior Policy Officer, United States Council for International Business.

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

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

M. E. JULIEN (France), directeur adjoint, affaires sociales, européennes et internationales, Mouvement des entreprises de France (MEDEF).

Mr D. LIMA GODOY (Brazil), Presidente del Consejo de Relaciones Laborales, Confederación Nacional de la Industria (CNI).

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

Mr A. MOORE (United Kingdom), Director, Confederation of British Industry (CBI).

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

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

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

Mr G. TROGEN (Sweden), Senior Adviser, International Affairs, Confederation of Swedish Enterprise.

Ms A. GERSTEIN, accompanying Ms Hornung-Draus.

Mr A. GREENE, accompanying Ms Goldberg.

Membres employeurs adjoints	Deputy Employer members
Miembros empleadores adjuntos	

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

M^{me} F. AWASSI ATSIMADJA (Gabon), représentante, Confédération patronale gabonaise.

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

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

Sr. B. DE ARBELOA (República Bolivariana de Venezuela), Presidente, Comisión OIT/OIE, FEDECAMARAS.

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).

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

Mr S. GOH HOCK LI (Singapore), Council Member, Singapore National Employers' Federation.

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

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

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

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

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

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

Mr B. PIRLER (Turkey), Secretary-General, TURKIYE ISVEREN SENDIKALARI KONFEDERASYONU, TISK.

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

Sr. G. RICCI MUADI (Guatemala), c/o Mosquera & Ricci, Comité Coordinador de Asociaciones Agrícolas, Comerciales, Industriales y Financieras (CACIF).

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

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

Mr O. KOVALEV, accompanying Mr Eremeev.

Ms E. LEZINA, accompanying Mr Eremeev.

Mr A. POLOUEKTOV, accompanying Mr Eremeev.

Membres suppléants assistant à la session:

Substitute members attending the session:

Miembros suplentes presentes en la reunión:

Mr M. PILIKOS (Cyprus), Director-General, Cyprus Employers' and Industrialists' Federation.

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

Mr P. TOMEK (Austria), Representative, Federation of Austrian Industry.

Membres travailleurs titulaires Regular Worker members
Miembros trabajadores titulares

Vice-président du Conseil d'administration: Vice-Chairperson of the Governing Body: Vicepresidente del Consejo de Administración:	Sir Roy TROTMAN (Barbados)
Secrétaire du groupe des travailleurs: Secretary of the Workers' group: Secretaria del Grupo de los Trabajadores:	Ms A. BIONDI (ITUC)
Secrétaire adjointe du groupe des travailleurs: Deputy Secretary of the Workers' group: Secretaria adjunto del Grupo de los Trabajadores:	Sra. R. GONZÁLEZ (ITUC)

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.

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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, All Pakistan Federation of Trade Unions.
- Mr M. AL-MA'AYTA (Jordan), President, General Federation of Jordanian Trade 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.
- M. M. BLONDEL (France), Confédération générale du travail Force ouvrière (CGT-FO).
- Ms C. BRIGHI (Italie), Assistant Director International, C.I.S.L.
- Mr B. CANAK (Serbia), President, United Branch Trade Unions – Nezavisnost.
- M. A. DJIBRINE (Tchad), secrétaire général, Union des syndicats du Tchad (UST).
- Mr T. ETTY (Netherlands), International Department, Netherlands Trade Union Confederation, FNV.
- M^{me}. A. GARCIA (Angola), secrétaire générale, Centrale générale des syndicats indépendants et libres de l'Angola.
- Sra. N. GOULART (Brazil), Vice-Presidente, Força Sindical nacional.
- M. B. HOSSU (Roumanie), président, Confédération nationale syndicale.
- Mr A. HUSAIN (Bahrain), General Federation for Bahrain Workers' Trade Unions.
- Sr. G. MARTÍNEZ (Argentina), Confederación General del Trabajo.
- M. A. PALANGA (Togo), secrétaire général, Confédération nationale des travailleurs du Togo (CNTT).
- Ms C. PANDENI (Namibia), Treasurer, National Union of Namibian Workers (NUNW).
- Mr E. PATEL (South Africa), National Labour Convenor, COSATU.
- Mr J. SITHOLE (Swaziland), General Secretary, Swaziland Federation of Trade Unions.
- Mr S. SYED SHAHIR (Malaysia), President, Malaysian Trade Union Congress (MTUC).
- Ms H. YACOB (Singapore), Assistant Secretary-General, National Trade Unions Congress.

Membres suppléants assistant à la session:

Substitute members attending the session:

Miembros suplentes presentes en la reunión:

Mr K. GYÖRGY (Hungary), International Secretary, National Confederation of Hungarian Trade Unions.

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

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

Représentants d'autres Etats Membres de l'Organisation assistant à la session
Representatives of other member States of the Organization present at the session
Representantes de otros Estados Miembros de la Organización presentes en la reunión

Algérie Algeria Argelia

M. I. JAZAÏRY, ambassadeur, mission permanente, Genève.
 M. H. KHELIF, secrétaire diplomatique, mission permanente, Genève.
 M. M. ABBANI, attaché diplomatique, mission permanente, Genève.

Autriche Austria Austria

Ms I. DEMBSHER, Head of Branch, Federal Ministry of Economic Affairs and Labour.
 Mr C. LASSMANN, Minister, Federal Ministry for Foreign Affairs.
 Mr M. WEIDINGER, Second Secretary, Permanent Mission, Geneva.
 Ms M. REICH-ROHWIG, Deputy Permanent Representative to the WHO, Permanent Mission, Geneva.
 Mr R. PROCHAZKA, Counsellor, Permanent Mission, Geneva.

Bangladesh

Mr T. ALI, Ambassador, Permanent Mission, Geneva.
 Mr M. MOWLA, Counsellor, Permanent Mission, Geneva.
 Mr N. AHMED, Second Secretary, Permanent Mission, Geneva.

Belgique Belgium Bélgica

M. F. VANDAMME, conseiller à la Division des Affaires internationales, Service public Fédéral emploi, Travail et Concertation sociale.
 M. J. CLOESEN, conseiller, division des Affaires internationales, Service public Fédéral emploi, Travail et Concertation sociale.

M^{me} L. EVEN, attachée, division des Affaires internationales, Service public Fédéral emploi, Travail et Concertation sociale.
 M. A. VAN MEEUWEN, ambassadeur, mission permanente, Genève.
 M^{me} B. MINART, représentante permanente adjointe, mission permanente, Genève.
 M. J. DE PRETER, premier conseiller, mission permanente, Genève.
 M. J. DE VYLDER, attaché, mission permanente, Genève.
 M. D. MAENAUT, délégué du gouvernement flamand auprès des organisations multilatérales à Genève.
 M^{me} M. TIMMERMANS, déléguée de la communauté française de Belgique et de la région wallonne à Genève.
 M. E. MAES, délégué de la région Bruxelles capitale.
 M^{me} R. BALEDDA, assistante.
 M^{me} A. GAKIMA, stagiaire.

Bosnie-Herzégovine
Bosnia and Herzegovina
Bosnia y Herzegovina

Ms J. KALMETA, Ambassador, Permanent Mission, Geneva.
 Ms D. ANDELIC, Counsellor to the Permanent Mission of Bosnia and Herzegovina.

Botswana

Mr B. MOKGOTHU, Ambassador, Permanent Mission, Geneva.
 Mr M. BONANG, First Secretary, Permanent Mission, Geneva.

Bulgarie Bulgaria Bulgaria

Mr P. DRAGANOV, Ambassador,
Permanent Mission, Geneva.
Ms J. POPOVA, State Expert, Human Rights
and International Humanitarian Affairs
Department, Ministry of Foreign Affairs.
Ms B. VESSELINOVA, Head of the
International Relations Unit, Ministry of
Labour and Social Policy.
Ms M. YOTOVA, Third Secretary,
Permanent Mission, Geneva.

Burkina Faso

M. J. KOUTABA, ministre de la Jeunesse et
de l'Emploi
M^{me} L. ZOMBRE, secrétaire générale du
ministère du Travail et de la Sécurité
sociale.
M^{me} P. YAMEOGO, représentante du Conseil
national du patronat burkinabé.
M. R. COULIBALY, représentant des
organisations syndicales des travailleurs.

Colombie Colombia Colombia

Sra. C. FORERO UCROS, Embajadora,
Misión Permanente, Ginebra.
Sra. L. ARANGO DE BUITRAGO, Ministra
Consejera, Misión Permanente, Ginebra.
Srta. A. MENDOZA AGUDELO, Ministra
Consejera, Misión Permanente, Ginebra.

Congo

M^{me} D. BIKOUTA, première conseillère,
mission permanente, Genève.

Costa Rica

Sr. L. VARELA QUIRÓS, Embajador,
Misión Permanente, Ginebra.
Sr. C. GARBANZO BLANCO, Ministro
Consejero, Misión Permanente, Ginebra.

Danemark Denmark Dinamarca

Mr O. CHRISTENSEN, Head of Division,
Ministry of Employment.
Ms V. WESTH, Head of Section, Ministry of
Employment.
Ms R. HARHOFF, Head of Section, Ministry
of Employment.
Ms R. USSING, Attaché, Permanent Mission,
Geneva.
Ms H. KNUDSEN, Assistant Attaché,
Ministry of Employment.

Egypte Egypt Egipto

Mr S. SHOUKRY, Ambassador, Permanent
Mission, Geneva.
Mr A. MELEIKA, Deputy Permanent
Representative, Permanent Mission,
Geneva.
Ms S. EL ERYAN, Labour Counsellor,
Permanent Mission, Geneva.
Mr O. SHALABY, Second Secretary,
Permanent Mission, Geneva.
Mr O. EL DANDARAWY, Second
Secretary, Permanent Mission, Geneva.
Mr T. KHALLAF, Third Secretary,
Permanent Mission, Geneva.

Equateur Ecuador Ecuador

Sr. M. MONTALVO, Embajador, Misión
Permanente, Ginebra.
Sr. A. CABRERA, Consejero, Misión
Permanente, Ginebra.
Sr. C. SANTOS, Funcionario, Misión
Permanente, Ginebra.
Sr. L. VAYAS, Primer Secretario, Misión
Permanente, Ginebra.
Sr. J. THULLEN, Asesor, Ministerio de
Trabajo.

Estonie Estonia Estonia

Ms K. SIBUL, Third Secretary, Permanent
Mission, Geneva.

Gabon Gabon Gabón

M^{me} M. ANGONE ABENA, conseillère,
chargée des relations avec le BIT, mission
permanente, Genève.

Guatemala

Sr. C. MARTÍNEZ ALVARADO,
Embajador, Misión Permanente, Ginebra.
Srta. A. CHÁVEZ BIETTI, Ministra
Consejera, Misión Permanente, Ginebra.
Srta. I. MARTÍNEZ GALINDO, Primera
Secretaria, Misión Permanente, Ginebra.
Sra. E. DE SPERISEN, Tercera Secretaria,
Misión Permanente, Ginebra.

Haïti Haiti Haití

M. J. ALEXANDRE, ministre conseiller,
mission permanente d'Haïti auprès de
l'Office des Nations Unies à Genève.

**Indonésie Indonesia
Indonesia**

Mr H. HERIAWAN SALEH, Secretary-
General, Ministry of Manpower and
Transmigration.
Mr G. SUGANDI, Director for Dispute
Settlement, Department of Manpower and
Transmigration.
Mr I. PUJA, Deputy Permanent
Representative, Permanent Mission, Geneva.
Mr A. SUWONDO, Head of Section of
Employment Norms Inspection, Department
of Manpower and Transmigration.
Ms T. SINAGA, Senior Adviser of
Inter-Institutions and International Affairs,
Department of Manpower and
Transmigration.
Mr Y. SUSANTO, Head of Law and
Overseas Employment Relation, Department
of Manpower and Transmigration.
Mr H. AGAH, Official, Department of
Manpower and Transmigration.
Mr S. SUWARNA, Head of Centre for
Administration of the International
Cooperation, Department of Manpower and
Transmigration.

Mr S. SOEMARNO, Minister Counsellor,
Permanent Mission, Geneva.
Mr A. SOMANTRI, Second Secretary,
Permanent Mission, Geneva.

Israël Israel Israel

Mr I. LEVANON, Ambassador, Permanent
Mission, Geneva.
Ms N. FURMAN, Counsellor, Permanent
Mission, Geneva.

Lituanie Lithuania Lituania

Mr E. BORISOVAS, Ambassador,
Permanent Mission, Geneva.
Ms R. KAZRAGIENE, Counsellor,
Permanent Mission, Geneva.

Malaisie Malaysia Malasia

Mr A. AB RAHAMAN, Labour attaché,
Permanent Mission, Geneva.

Malte Malta Malta

Mr S. BORG, Ambassador, Permanent
Mission, Geneva.
Mr C. MERCIECA, Senior Counsellor,
Permanent Mission, Geneva.
Mr R. SARSERO, Counsellor, Permanent
Mission, Geneva.

Norvège Norway Noruega

Mr W. STROMMEN, Ambassador,
Permanent Mission, Geneva.
Mr O. VIDNES, Deputy Director, Ministry of
Labour and Social Inclusion.
Ms G. YTTERDAL, Ministry of Labour and
Social Inclusion.
Mr T. STENVOLD, Senior Adviser, Ministry
of Foreign Affairs.
Ms G. WAAGE, First Secretary, Permanent
Mission, Geneva.

Nouvelle-Zélande
New Zealand
Nueva Zelândia

Mr M. HOBBY, Senior Adviser, International Services, Department of Labour.
 Mr P. DOHERTY, Adviser, International Services, Department of Labour.
 Mr N. KIDDLE, Deputy Permanent Representative, Permanent Mission, Geneva.
 Ms N. HICKS, Attaché, Ministry of Foreign Affairs and Trade.

Panama Panama Panamá

Sr. J. CASTILLERO, Embajador, Misión Permanente, Ginebra.
 Sra. L. LESCURE DE FRUHLING, Consejera, Misión Permanente, Ginebra.
 Sra. U. DE REYES, Embajadora, Representante Permanente Adjunta, Misión Permanente, Ginebra.

Portugal

M^{me} M. SOARES, directeur général, Direction générale d'études, statistique et planification, ministère du Travail et de la Solidarité Sociale.
 M. J. DE SOUSA FIALHO, conseiller, mission permanente, Genève.

Qatar

Mr A. AL-KHULAIFI, Expert in International Relations, Permanent Mission, Geneva.

République dominicaine
Dominican Republic
República Dominicana

Sr. W. GONZÁLEZ NINA, Director General de Trabajo de la Secretaría de Estado de Trabajo.

Sr. N. REYES UREÑA, Director de Relaciones Internacionales, Secretaría de Estado de Trabajo.
 Sra. Y. ROMÁN MALDONADO, Ministra Consejera, Misión Permanente, Ginebra.
 Sr. F. TORRES DOTEL, Asistente Técnico de la Secretaría de Estado de Trabajo.

Saint-Siège The Holy See
Santa Sede

Mgr. M. TOMASI, Nonce Apostolique, Mission permanente, Genève.
 M. M. CHICA ARELLANO, Conseiller, Mission permanente, Genève.
 Mgr. M. DE GREGORI, Mission permanente, Genève.
 Dr. P. GUTIÉRREZ, membre, Mission permanente, Genève.

Slovaquie Slovakia
Eslovaquia

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

Slovénie Slovenia
Eslovenia

Ms M. DEISINGER, Adviser, Ministry of Labour, Family and Social Affairs.
 Ms D. SARCEVIC, Adviser, Ministry of Labour, Family and Social Affairs.
 Mr J. GASPARIC, Minister Plenipotentiary.

Suède Sweden Suecia

Mr C. ERIKSSON, Director, Special Expert, Ministry of Employment
 Mr J. STRÖM, Deputy Director, Department for Global Development, Ministry of Foreign Affairs.

Suisse Switzerland Suiza

M. J. ELMIGER, ambassadeur, chef des affaires internationales du travail, secrétariat d'Etat à l'économie (SECO).

M^{me} B. SCHAER BOURBEAU, deuxième secrétaire, mission permanente, Genève.

M^{me} S. GRATWOHL, collaboratrice diplomatique, Section organisations internationales et politique d'accueil, Département fédéral des affaires étrangères.

M^{me} M. MARCHAND, Direction du développement et de la coopération(DDC), section ONU-Développement, Département fédéral des affaires étrangères.

M^{me} M. SAKKAL, mission permanente, Genève.

M. C. SIEBER, affaires internationales du travail, secrétariat d'Etat à l'économie (SECO).

M. K. AKERMANN, affaires internationales du travail, secrétariat d'Etat à l'économie (SECO).

**Thaïlande Thailand
Tailandia**

Mr V. THANGHONG, Minister Counsellor (Labour), Permanent Mission, Geneva.

Mr S. SUWANDAMRONG, Labour Section, Permanent Mission, Geneva.

Turquie Turkey Turquía

Mr H. OYMAN, Expert, Permanent Mission, Geneva.

Uruguay

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

Sra. A. ROCANOVA, Segunda Secretaria, Misión Permanente, Ginebra.

Sr. C. PEREIRA, Misión Permanente, Ginebra.

Zambie Zambia Zambia

Mr L. MTESA, Ambassador, Permanent Mission, Geneva.

Mr A. KAYAMBA, Director, Human Resources and Administration, Ministry of Labour and Social Security.

Mr M. DAKA, Deputy Permanent Representative, Permanent Mission, Geneva.

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

**Représentants d'organisations internationales gouvernementales
Representatives of international governmental organizations
Representantes de organizaciones internacionales gubernamentales**

**Nations Unies
United Nations
Naciones Unidas**

Mr T. INOMATA, Inspector, Joint Inspection Unit.

**Haut Commissariat des Nations Unies pour les réfugiés
Office of the United Nations High Commissioner for Refugees
Oficina del Alto Comisionado de las Naciones Unidas para los Refugiados**

Ms C. LINNÉR, Head of the Inter-Organization Desk.
Mr R. POuwELS, Senior Adviser, Community Development Gender Equality and Children Section.
Ms J. JANZ, Associate Inter-Organization Officer.
Ms A. BARCELO, Inter, Community Development Gender Equality and Children Section.
Ms D. ARANGO, Inter, Community Development Gender Equality and Children Section.

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

Mr T. MASUKU, Director, FAO Liaison Office with the United Nations in Geneva.
Mr P. KONANDREAS, Senior Liaison Officer.
Mr P. PAREDES-PORTELLA, Liaison Officer, Geneva Office.

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

Mr L. TILLFORS, External Relations Officer, Governing Bodies and External Relations.

**Agence internationale de l'énergie atomique
International Atomic Energy Agency
Organismo Internacional de Energía Atómica**

Ms R. MAZZANTI, Policy Officer.

Organisation mondiale du commerce
World Trade Organization
Organización Mundial del Comercio

Mr P. LAMY, Director-General.
Ms V. KULAÇOĞLU, Director, Trade and Environment Division.
Mr P. RATA, Counsellor, Trade and Environment Division.
Ms G. MARCEAU, Counsellor, Office of the Director-General.
Ms M. JANSEN, Counsellor, Economic Research and Statistics Division.

Organisation internationale de la francophonie
Organización Internacional de la Francofonía

M. L. BARARUNYERETSE, ambassadeur, représentant permanent.
M^{me} S. COULIBALY LEROY, représentante permanente adjointe.
M^{me} N. ODOUNLAMI, assistante du représentant permanent.

Union africaine
African Union
Unión Africana

Ms K. MASRI, Ambassador and Permanent Observer.
Ms B. NAIDOO, First Secretary.
Mr A. OWANA, Personal Assistant.

Organisation arabe du travail
Arab Labour Organization
Organización Árabe del Trabajo

Mr A. HUMSI, Head of the Permanent Delegation in Geneva.
Ms A. HILAL, Permanent Delegation in Geneva.
Mr K. AL KAABI, Employers' Delegate from the United Arab Emirates.

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, Member.

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

Mr R. TORRES, Head, Employment Analysis and Policies Division, Directorate for Employment, Labour and Social Affairs.

Commission européenne
European Commission
Comisión Europea

Mr T. BECHET, Head of UN Section of the European Commission Delegation.

Mr R. DELARUE, Official, DG Employment, Brussels.

Mr C. DUFOUR, UN Section, Permanent Delegation Office, Geneva.

Mr E. GUTH, Head of the European Commission Delegation, Geneva.

Mr T. HAAHR, Official, DG Development, European Commission, Brussels.

Ms M. KOMINARECOVA, Official, DG Trade.

Mr X. PRATS MONNE, Director, DG Employment and Social Affairs.

Mr J. TRICART, Head of Unit, DG Employment and Social Affairs.

Mr G. HOUTTUIN, Head, Liaison Office of the General Secretariat, Geneva, Council.

Mr J. LILLIEHÖÖK, Counsellor, Liaison Office of the General Secretariat, Geneva, Council.

Mr S. VAN THIEL, Counsellor, Liaison Office of the General Secretariat, Geneva, Council.

Mr A. GRIMAUD, Adviser, Liaison Office of the General Secretariat, Geneva, Council.

**Représentants d'organisations internationales non gouvernementales
assistant à titre d'observateurs
Representatives of international non-governmental organizations as observers
Representantes de organizaciones internacionales no gubernamentales
presentes con carácter de observadores**

**Alliance coopérative internationale
International Co-operative Alliance
Alianza Cooperativa Internacional**

Mr I. MACDONALD, Director-General.
Ms M. CHAVEZ HERTIG, Deputy Director-General.

**Fédération syndicale mondiale
World Federation of Trade Unions
Federación Sindical Mundial**

Ms O. OVIEDO DE LA TORRE, Representative, Geneva Office.
Ms A. AVELLA, Adviser, Geneva Office.
Mr J. AVELLA GARCIA, Collaborator, Geneva Office.

**Organisation internationale des employeurs
International Organisation of Employers
Organización Internacional de Empleadores**

Mr A. PEÑALOSA, Secretary-General.
Mr B. WILTON, Deputy Secretary-General.

**Organisation de l'Unité syndicale africaine
Organization of African Trade Union Unity
Organización para la Unidad Sindical Africana**

Mr H. SUNMONU, Secretary-General.
Mr D. DIOP, Assistant Secretary-General.
Mr A. DIALLO, Permanent Representative in Geneva.

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

Mr H. KONKOLEWSKY, Secretary-General.
Mr A. BONILLA-GARCIA, Chief, Studies and Operations Branch.
Mr J. THIRION, Chief of Finance and Administration.

Confédération syndicale internationale
International Trade Union Confederation
Confederación Sindical Internacional

Mr G. RYDER, General Secretary.

Mr J. WIENEN, Deputy General Secretary.

Ms A. BIONDI, Director, Geneva Office.

Mr J. DWIGHT, Multinationals, Organising and Recruitment.

Mr J. KUCZKIEWICZ, Director, Trade Union Rights Department.

Ms R. GONZALEZ, Assistant Director.

M. H. SEA, représentant permanent à Genève.

Ms E. BUSSER, Assistant, Geneva Office.

Ms E. BLUMER, Secretary, Geneva Office.

**Mouvement de libération
Liberation movement
Movimiento de Liberación**

Palestine Palestine Palestina

Mr M. ABU-KOASH, Ambassador, Permanent Observer, Mission of Palestine in Geneva.
Mr O. MOHAMMED, Counsellor, Permanent Observer, Mission of Palestine in Geneva.
Mr I. MUSA, First Secretary, Permanent Observer, Mission of Palestine in Geneva.