



FOURTEENTH ITEM ON THE AGENDA

Report of the Committee on Sectoral and Technical Meetings and Related Issues

1. The Committee on Sectoral and Technical Meetings and Related Issues met on 15 March 2004. The Chairperson was Mr. Rimkunas (Government, Lithuania) and the Employer and Worker Vice-Chairpersons were Ms. Sasso Mazzufferi and Mr. Zellhoefer, respectively.
2. In the course of the meeting, the Committee paused for a minute of silence in honour of those killed and injured in the terrorist attacks in Madrid on 11 March 2004.

Report on sectoral activities in 2002-03 and progress in the implementation of the programme for 2004-05

3. The Committee had before it a paper¹ on sectoral activities.
4. Ms. Paxton, Executive Director of the Social Dialogue Sector, introduced the document which comprised: a report on activities in the previous biennium; a broad outline of activities planned for 2004-05; and an overview of the 22 sectors covered on a regular basis by the programme. The first part focused on follow-up to recent meetings, 23 of which were held in 2002-03. The seven action programmes were an important component of this biennium's activities that were set out in Part II. Part III of the paper was an overview of the 22 sectors under five broad headings. A more comprehensive picture was to be found on the Department's one-stop web site. In the light of the already full programme in 2004-05, the Committee had agreed in November to forgo a twelfth activity.² Accordingly, the resources that would have been spent on this had been divided among the seven action programmes. Even with this extra money, the resources for the action programmes were spread thinly, so the Department was engaging other departments and the field in a material way. The recent six planning meetings had enabled agreement to be reached on the broad thrust and objectives of each of the programmes, notably the national focus of activities. Notwithstanding different priorities, all were aimed squarely at

¹ GB.289/STM/1.

² GB.288/13, para. 18.

the Decent Work Agenda. A list of countries for each action programme was being finalized and each major developing region was represented in each programme. The planning meeting for the HIV/AIDS cross-sectoral action programme would be held in late April. Thus, the Department was moving forward as planned and would soon be contacting governments to seek their agreement and commitment. The composition and role of the national and sectoral steering groups were set out in a draft text that had been circulated. National steering groups could involve a range of relevant employers' and workers' organizations depending on the sector concerned. At the international level, seven small tripartite steering groups would be set up and meet once or twice a year at no cost to the Office. They would provide the basis of progress reports to the Committee during the biennium. The Committee was invited to agree on the modalities for steering groups along the lines of the draft text.

5. Ms. Sasso Mazzufferi highlighted the importance of a more coordinated and productive programme of activities. The focus of the paper on what had been done and what was already agreed and under way was regrettable. The Committee should also be informed about provisional activities and preliminary ideas for projects. The independent nomination by each group of members of action programme steering groups was a prerequisite for their success. Moreover, in view of the important role of private employers in the education sector, this action programme should be fully tripartite.

6. Mr. Zellhoefer reiterated the Workers' group's support for the new sectoral approach. The time invested in the six intensive planning meetings was important to the action programmes' success. A good start had been made in choosing criteria for tailor-made solutions for the different sectors. Proper coordination at the national and international levels was essential, with relevant participants coming from the three groups. At the international level, steering group participants should be nominated through the group secretariats and the government regional coordinators. At the national level, a fair representation of the groups should be maintained, with the initial union participants being nominated through the secretariat of the Workers' group. The Office should organize the first meeting of each national steering group, including inviting the participants. In any case, there needed to be a means to communicate progress and report to the Committee. Arrangements for the action programme for the education sector should mirror those in previous sectoral meetings. In other words, the activity should be essentially a joint government-worker one with an agreed level of private employer involvement. Deviation from this would contradict previous Governing Body decisions and, since the principal employers were governments, would not be logical. The programme should focus on standards and conditions of employment in education, relating to but not duplicating the broader work on education of other agencies. The Global Union Federations were positive about the action programme on HIV/AIDS in the workplace, and the joint IOE/ICFTU initiative on HIV/AIDS could benefit from links to sector-specific activities under the action programme. In Part III of the paper, information on the level of unionization in sectors was useful, but should have been complemented by information on employer structures and concentration of MNEs. The Workers' group had agreed to a shorter, smaller meeting on transport equipment manufacture in 2005 on the clear understanding that the savings be channelled into creating a sectoral database. There were considerable benefits, including for the ILO, from such a database and the Office should commit to proceeding with it. As for the database on EPZs referred to in the paper, the Workers' group had long sought a significant ILO programme on EPZs. The restricted distribution of a questionnaire was not what they had had in mind. Beyond data, there needed to be close scrutiny of labour and social issues in EPZs and the Office should launch without delay a programme to alleviate the enormous decent work deficit in EPZs. SECTOR should participate in this work.

7. The representative of the Government of India, speaking on behalf of the Asia-Pacific group, called for wider consultations with each of the regional groups to inform them of all aspects of the action programmes and to request countries to convey their interest within a deadline. Shortlisted countries should attend the planning meetings. Progress should be monitored every six months by the relevant sectoral steering group. In addition to seeking extra funds, the Office should ensure that the relatively small existing resources for each programme were optimized.
8. The representative of the Government of China added that the Office should devote sufficient resources so that it could examine the labour and social impact of emergency situations, as had been the case with the tourism sector.
9. The representative of the Government of Germany, speaking on behalf of the IMEC group, emphasized the need for effective follow-up and for a coherent and integrated approach to sectoral activities, as set out in paragraph 6 of the document. The outline used in Part III of the document could be applied within the context of the broader strategic framework of the Office. The action programmes should start without delay, with consultations with the governments concerned, not solely the regional coordinators. The representative of the Government of Canada asked about the availability on the Internet of documents published under the sectoral activities programme and stressed the need for her Government to be kept informed, particularly of any activities that involved Canada.
10. The representative of the Government of Kenya felt that there should be a means to ascertain how conclusions and resolutions from sectoral meetings were followed up at the national level and by the Office. Without it, there was little point in adopting such texts. The planning meetings had successfully identified relevant issues and means of action. Criteria for country selection should include acceptance of core labour standards, an enabling environment and the capacity to deliver.
11. The representative of the Government of the United States said that the success of the action programmes depended on a constructive evaluation at each stage. In most countries, government played the predominant role in the development and administration of education, but the role of private employers should not be ignored. Cross-sectoral activities, such as the HIV/AIDS action programme, were welcome. Collaboration with other ILO programmes not only maximized resources, but would also benefit the programme and the results. If the information in the document, including on the action programmes, was not already on the web site, it should be added without delay.
12. The representative of the Government of Germany was concerned about having a cumbersome, over-bureaucratic approach to the steering groups, and the resource implications if the costs of participation were not largely borne by the participants. Activities should be confined as far as possible to countries where there was an ILO presence. Lessons from IPEC's approach should be taken into account. Recalling earlier discussions in the Governing Body regarding the joint character of certain sectors, such as education, it was clear that if, at the national level, it was appropriate for private employers to be included in the steering committees, the means to do so existed. Due account should be taken of activities of other groups, such as UNESCO in education, and relevant NGOs, and their participation sought, where appropriate.
13. Ms. Sasso Mazzufferi reiterated that the principle of tripartism should be respected and that the support and involvement of governments and the social partners on an equal footing was essential if the action programmes were to succeed; this included the education programme. There were no grounds for employers' exclusion. If national employer federations did not wish to be involved, it was for them to decide. More generally, countries without an ILO office could well benefit from action programmes too.

14. Mr. Zellhoefer said that certain sectors were joint and recalled several Government representatives' statements concerning the primary responsibility of government for education. Globally, less than 1 per cent of education activity was carried out by the private sector. Nonetheless, private employers could provide useful inputs and should have a fair level of representation on the steering groups. Going further could lead to all sectoral meetings being fully tripartite; this was not appropriate. The potential contribution of other organizations like UNESCO was recognized, but in the light of the constituent-driven nature of the action programmes, the initial input should come from them.
15. Several Government representatives (Argentina, Cameroon, Ecuador, Mexico) sought answers to a range of questions and suggested changes to the draft decision text, which was subsequently considered by the Officers of the Committee. In reply, Ms. Paxton and Ms. Doumbia-Henry (Director, Sectoral Activities Department) stressed that government participation was clearly important. All means to stimulate it would be pursued, including at the global level by having representatives of governments with action programmes take part in the sectoral steering group meetings. As much information as possible would be posted on the web site. Country selection criteria were contained in the Office's strategy paper, which had been circulated to regional coordinators and the group secretariats in advance of the planning meetings. It was being translated and would be posted on the web site shortly. The nomination of Employer and Worker participants in both types of steering group was contained in the draft decision text before the Committee. Depending on the sector concerned, having ministries other than the labour ministry involved would enhance the chances of success. The planning meetings saw a need to involve all relevant government agencies. The Office would contact them through the ministry of labour. Following the convening of each first national steering group meeting by the Office, on ILO premises if possible, an appropriate government official would subsequently assume responsibility for it and report to the Director-General, providing input to the relevant sectoral steering group and thence to the Committee. This would be part of each government's commitment to the programme. While national meetings would normally be held at no cost to the programme, there would need to be flexibility to ensure that relevant participation was ensured, particularly in large countries. If there were several employers' or workers' organizations at the national level, this would be dealt with by the secretariats of the groups, who would consult at the national level before making nominations to the Office. The Office was seeking the Committee's agreement to a consistent, constituent-driven approach and to the launching of the action programmes in the countries already identified and in the others to be identified in the near future, including the structure of the steering groups.
16. The Committee agreed that oversight of the action programmes at the national level would be the responsibility of national steering groups. Each group would be chaired by a representative with the relevant expertise from the ministry of labour or other ministry if appropriate, and comprise relevant government ministries and agencies, and Employer and Worker members nominated by the Governing Body secretariats of the respective groups. Each steering group should take all decisions concerning the action programme by consensus. They should meet as often as they deemed necessary, but at least every two months. Each steering group might invite or co-opt additional Government, Employer, Worker or other members as appropriate. The Chairperson was responsible for organizing steering group meetings and for reporting on the action programme to the Director-General of the ILO. In principle, participants should meet their own costs of participation. In each case, the first meeting of a national steering group would be convened by the ILO who would invite all participants on the basis of nominations provided to it by the government and the secretariats of the respective groups. In the case of the action programme on education, the national steering groups would be joint with significant private sector participation as agreed in the document submitted to the Governing Body at its

286th Session.³ In the case of the action programme on HIV/AIDS, existing national tripartite steering groups for ILO/AIDS activities would be used.

17. At the programme level, seven ILO sectoral steering groups would be set up. They would meet in Geneva at no cost to the Office. Government membership would be a mix of regional government coordinators of the Governing Body, representatives of governments of countries where the action programme was taking place and other interested governments. Employer and Worker members would be nominated by the secretariats of the respective groups. In view of their overlapping membership, these steering groups would, as far as possible, meet in a one- or two-day period every six months or so.
18. Ms. Paxton added that it was the understanding of the Office that, in the case of the action programme on education, if there was no private employer interest, participation in national steering groups would be joint. If private employers participated, they would be full participants.

Meetings of experts: Purpose, function and lessons learned

19. The Committee had before it a paper⁴ on meetings of experts.
20. Ms. Paxton introduced the document, which focused on meetings that considered a draft and adopted a text on a specific, often technical, topic. It had been prepared in response to concern over the conduct of a recent meeting of experts. Although this was the only meeting in the last ten years to have been so questioned, lessons had been learnt. The document highlighted the differences between sectoral meetings and meetings of experts, recognizing that experts nominated by each group were bound to reflect their group's broad views. Meetings of experts provided significant benefits to the Office and the Organization's constituents and it was important to ensure these were fully realized by having the output disseminated widely and promoted. Using external consultants to draft technical texts and having them present at meetings had proved worthwhile. There had also been positive experience with knowledgeable external chairpersons. The last section of the document made suggestions on these and other issues. It did so without interfering with the autonomy of the groups in nominating experts. The objective was to ensure that noted experts played a full part in such meetings and enabled the Office and the constituents to benefit fully from their expertise. Two important conclusions were the benefits of disseminating and promoting codes of practice and guidelines in more languages, and the value in reviewing existing codes and proposing, through the Governing Body, to update them, as was being done in the case of the iron and steel code. The Office proposed that the following governments be invited to nominate an expert for the meetings of experts in 2005.
 - Meeting of Experts to Develop Guidelines for Labour Inspection in Forestry (Geneva, 24-28 January 2005): Bolivia, Cameroon, New Zealand, Poland, Sweden.
 - Meeting of Experts to Develop a Revised Code of Practice on Safety and Health in the Iron and Steel Industry (Geneva, 1-9 February 2005): China, Germany, India, Republic of Korea, Mexico, Russian Federation, South Africa, United States.

³ GB.286/STM/1.

⁴ GB.289/STM/2.

21. The Committee agreed with this proposal.
22. Mr. Zellhoefer was concerned about some of the underlying proposals for change that were presented. The specific focus of meetings of experts made them different from sectoral meetings. Codes of practice were important ILO instruments that should be used in legislation and collective agreements. The proposals on the selection of experts and an outside chairperson were valid. But paragraph 27 on reviewing existing codes of practice did not fully reflect the Workers' views. It was important not to dilute existing protective Conventions by replacing them with non-binding instruments. Some aspects of paragraph 28 gave cause for concern. The integrity of experts should not be questioned and the Office should not be involved in their selection. Having resource persons take part could have benefits; they should be selected in consultation with the groups. The issue of preliminary consultations was not clear. An outside chairperson may be appointed, in consultation with the experts and the group secretariats, rather than "should".
23. Ms. Sasso Mazzufferi said that meetings of experts and sectoral meetings were similar in several ways, notably as far as group meetings were concerned. It was only natural that experts nominated by the groups would be aware of their groups' broad positions in the ILO. Understanding these positions was important to ensure acceptance of agreed outcomes by the Governing Body. Group meetings enhanced coordination and led to a better result. They did not take place at the expense of plenary sittings, but on the contrary contributed to positive outcomes there. In the Employers' view, guidelines were not the same as codes of practice; the latter were more binding. In all cases, the selection of experts was a matter for the groups. The Governing Body should be required to approve the content of documents coming from meetings of experts, not merely authorize their publication. To the extent possible, it was important that the Office use its own internal expertise rather than systematically engage outside experts in the drafting process. There could be cost implications of having an outside chairperson, who in any case should be selected in consultation with the groups, or possibly nominated by each group in turn. There could be a problem in nominating experts too far in advance of a meeting as their time commitments were often subject to change. The reason for and the means of prior consultation were not clear. The document proposed some changes, but there was no point for decision. Any change in the functioning of meetings should be approved by the Governing Body.
24. The representative of the Government of Germany said the document clarified the differences between meetings of experts and other meetings that the IMEC group had sought. The 1980 decision of the Governing Body on the role of experts was still valid and should be adhered to, recognizing, however, that the ILO was a political organization that worked to achieve compromise between different views. But meetings of experts should always comprise noted experts in their field. Their independence could be demonstrated by seating them alphabetically as used to be the case. The proposals for a way forward in paragraph 28 were welcome and should be adopted.
25. The representative of the Government of the United States agreed and added that discussions should not be filtered through spokespersons in striving for an optimum output.
26. The representatives of the Governments of Kenya, Mexico and Nigeria agreed with the proposals in the document and asked that sufficient experts from developing countries be included in each meeting in order to ensure a balanced outcome.
27. Ms. Paxton said that the document had been submitted for discussion and there was no intention to change existing rules concerning the appointment and role of experts. The description of guidelines in paragraph 7 reflected the advice of the Office of the Legal Adviser. The Office engaged outside experts only when it was necessary and added value

to its own input. There was no intention to dilute existing protective standards. Rather, the intention was to review old codes of practice and revise them where necessary to reflect current practice. There seemed to be significant potential benefits of enabling experts to consult among themselves or more widely in advance of a meeting, particularly if it led to a more constructive discussion. These exchanges would be informal. When appointing an external chairperson, it was important he or she was knowledgeable about the topic. It was always important to ensure developing country representation in ILO activities. The countries proposed by the Office for the two meetings in 2005, which the Committee had accepted, had two developing countries out of five, and three out of eight respectively.

Effect to be given to the recommendations of sectoral meetings

(a) Tripartite Meeting on Best Practices in Work-Flexibility Schemes and their Impact on the Quality of Working Life in the Chemical Industries (Geneva, 27-31 October 2003)

28. The Committee had before it the *Note on the proceedings*⁵ of the Tripartite Meeting on Best Practices in Work-Flexibility Schemes and their Impact on the Quality of Working Life in the Chemical Industries.
29. Mr. Klotz, Government member of the Governing Body and Chairperson of the abovementioned Meeting, was pleased that all the Meeting participants were experts in the chemical industries. The Meeting had held practical discussions on aspects of work flexibility schemes and their impact on the quality of working life in the chemical industries. It had adopted a set of conclusions and a resolution concerning the future ILO work programme for the chemical sector.
30. Ms. Sasso Mazzufferi congratulated Mr. Klotz and the Office on the successful outcome of the Meeting. She echoed the view that flexibility would be of mutual benefit to workers and employers. Flexibility, especially with regard to working time, would be of particular benefit to women, enabling them to achieve the difficult balance of work and family responsibilities.
31. Mr. Zellhoefer reported news of repressive and violent measures taken against the son of Mr. Mikhail Volynets. Mr. Volynets was a substitute Executive Board member of the ICEM affiliate Miners' Independent Trade Union of Ukraine, and a founder of the national centre Confederation of Free Trade Unions of Ukraine. The speaker expressed deep concern over these flagrant acts of intimidation that appeared to have been perpetrated by the Government. Turning to the agenda item, Mr. Zellhoefer expressed satisfaction that participants had reached agreement on one of the most contentious current issues in labour relations. Flexibility was defined as a tool to increase competitiveness while assuring continued, quality employment. Flexibility should not erode workers' rights nor undermine occupational safety and health. Working time was one of the keys to establishing work-life balance. Other important factors included conditions of work, work organization, maximizing potential, health and safety, equality, training and development opportunities, and adequate remuneration. The Meeting had requested practical tools, notably a survey of

⁵ TMWFCI/2003/11, appended to GB.289/STM/3/1.

successful employment creation measures, a comparative survey of industrial relations systems, and a report on industrial relations practices.

32. *The Committee on Sectoral and Technical Meetings and Related Issues recommends that the Governing Body:*

(a) authorize the Director-General to communicate the Note on the proceedings:

(i) to governments, requesting them to communicate these texts to the employers' and workers' organizations concerned,

(ii) to the international employers' and workers' organizations concerned,

(iii) to the other international organizations concerned;

(b) request 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 paragraphs 24 to 31 of the conclusions and in the relevant parts of the resolution.

**(b) Tripartite Meeting of Experts on Security, Safety and Health in Ports
(Geneva, 8-17 December 2003)**

33. The Committee had before it the code of practice on security in ports⁶ as well as the reports⁷ of the Tripartite Meeting of Experts on Security, Safety and Health in Ports.

34. Mr. Trelawny, the representative of the International Maritime Organization (IMO), conveyed to the Committee the IMO Secretary-General's support for continued close cooperation between the ILO and the IMO in many vital areas, including port security. In December 2002, the Conference of Contracting Governments to the International Convention for the Safety of Life at Sea, 1974 (SOLAS), had adopted a resolution on the enhancement of security in cooperation with the ILO. The fruitful collaboration between the two Organizations was evident in the series of formal and informal working groups that had resulted in the code of practice on security in ports. Recent events had highlighted the need for a coordinated approach to security. The ILO/IMO code of practice on security in ports, which was complementary to the maritime provisions of SOLAS, Chapter XI-2, and the IMO International Ship and Port Facility Security (ISPS) code, had as a cornerstone this coordinated approach to security. The IMO welcomed this code of practice as an extremely useful tool for the protection of life, the continuation of international maritime trade and the safeguarding of the livelihood of portworkers and seafarers. The Maritime Safety Committee of the IMO was expected to adopt the code in May 2004.

35. Mr. Zellhoefer expressed his group's satisfaction with the Tripartite Meeting of Experts on Security, Safety and Health in Ports and its results. The code of practice should become the basis for all safety and health policies in ports. Trade unions were committed to work to implement the code, both through national legislation and agreements with employers. The

⁶ MESSHP/2003/14, appended to GB.289/STM/3/2.

⁷ MESSHP/2003/13 and MESSHP/2003/15, both appended to GB.289/STM/3/2.

ILO should promote the ratification of Convention No. 152. The paragraphs in the code on medicals, the introduction of new technologies and the obligation for consultation and agreement among the parties before proceeding in any direction were particularly apt. The Workers' group supported the points for decision in paragraphs 4 and 5.

36. Ms. Sasso Mazzufferi supported the points for decision in paragraphs 4 and 5. The document was of a high standard and clear. The two codes of practice would be of great assistance to a very important sector of the economy.

37. *The Committee on Sectoral and Technical Meetings and Related Issues recommends that the Governing Body:*

(a) *take note of the report of the Tripartite Meeting of Experts on Security, Safety and Health in ports and authorize the Director-General to publish:*

(i) *the ILO/IMO code of practice on security in ports; and*

(ii) *the ILO code of practice on safety and health in ports;*

(b) *request 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 paragraphs 1 to 5 of the resolution in the appendix of the final report – Safety and health in ports.*⁸

Joint ILO/UNESCO Committee of Experts on the Application of the Recommendations concerning Teaching Personnel (CEART): Report of the Eighth Session (Paris, 15-19 September 2003)

38. The Committee had before it a paper⁹ prepared by the Office providing a summary, as well as the full report¹⁰ of the Joint Committee's September 2003 session.

39. On behalf of the Employers' group, Mr. Anand noted the importance of the report. Teaching personnel were at the core of shaping the development of future generations and the Decent Work Agenda. Nevertheless, they should be progressive and open-minded in their pedagogical approaches to change the rote learning and ideological orientation that prevailed in many schools. Without retraining, and greater teacher professionalism leading to a different teaching and learning culture in schools and universities, outmoded and undemocratic learning approaches would prevail: a source of fundamentalist thought and ultimately terrorism. The challenge existed in an increasing number of countries on several continents. Unfortunately, the CEART report did not adequately deal with these questions, which were also relevant to the proposed education sector action programme. The ILO and the work of CEART should focus on changes in the roles, pedagogical approaches and quality of future teachers, devoting the necessary resources to such work. With these points

⁸ MESSHP/2003/15.

⁹ GB.289/STM/4.

¹⁰ CEART/8/2003/11.

in mind, Ms. Sasso Mazzufferi stated that the Employers' group approved the point for decision contained in paragraph 4.

40. Mr. Zellhoefer said the report showed excellent collaboration between the ILO and UNESCO. The Workers' group supported the CEART recommendations, including the proposals made for further activities, such as undertaking studies, and the promotion of recommendations to member States concerning employment structures and tenure in higher education (point (xiii) of the Executive summary). Social dialogue in education constituted another important issue, notably the specific recommendations in the Executive Summary (point (vi)) whereby:
- member States should create effective bipartite and, where appropriate, tripartite structures for dialogue between the principal stakeholders to improve quality of education; and
 - the ILO and UNESCO should assist teachers' organizations and educational management to improve their capacity for dialogue with promotional materials and other tools on the provisions of the 1966 and 1997 Recommendations.
41. The informal session between CEART and representatives of teachers' organizations was excellent and should continue and be expanded at future sessions.
42. The representative of the Government of Germany said that the proposed education sector action programme could be enriched by the analysis and recommendations contained in the CEART report. The Office should take key parts, such as employment and social dialogue, into account in its efforts to implement the action programme. He supported the positions of the Employers' and Workers' groups and the point for decision.
43. *The Committee on Sectoral and Technical Meetings and Related Issues recommends that the Governing Body request that the Director-General:*
- (a) *transmit the report of the Eighth 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;*
 - (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 are contained in its report, in planning and implementing future ILO activities, due account being taken of the programme and budget approved for 2004-05.*

Report of the Interregional Tripartite Meeting of Experts on Safety and Health in Shipbreaking for Selected Asian Countries and Turkey (Bangkok, 7-14 October 2003)

44. The Committee had before it the guidelines on safety and health in shipbreaking¹¹ (to be called *Safety and health in shipbreaking: Guidelines for Asian countries and Turkey*) as well as the report of the discussion.¹²
45. Mr. Zellhoefer referred to the very fruitful meeting with all the experts having played an active role. The Office draft and technical inputs were highly appreciated. As the guidelines provided comprehensive preventive and protective measures, countries would need support to develop enforcement mechanisms. Since many workers were migrants, translations were needed, as well as supportive materials and the training of trainers for trade unions. As shipbreaking was often not recognized as an industry, labour legislation was often not applied. Governments needed to recognize it as one of the most hazardous industries.
46. Ms. Sasso Mazzufferi said the Employers' group supported the decision paragraph. In order to have a real impact, the Meeting should have been international, rather than interregional.
47. The representative of the Government of Germany said the guidelines contained a number of provisions, which needed to be addressed specifically, such as Chapter 17.4 on child labour. He fully supported the point for decision.
48. The representative of the Government of the United Kingdom also supported the decision to endorse the guidelines, encouraged their publication and felt that they should be updated as necessary in the light of developments.
49. *The Committee on Sectoral and Technical Meetings and Related Issues recommends that the Governing Body take note of the report of the Meeting of Experts and authorize the Director-General to publish the abovementioned guidelines.*

Report of the Seventeenth International Conference of Labour Statisticians (Geneva, 24 November-3 December 2003)

50. The Committee had before it the report¹³ of the Seventeenth International Conference of Labour Statisticians.
51. Ms. Sasso Mazzufferi emphasized the importance of the ICLS for statisticians worldwide. The Employers had always supported the ILO's work in this field and the Conference

¹¹ MESHS/2003/1, appended to GB.289/STM/5.

¹² MESHS/2003/2, appended to GB.289/STM/5.

¹³ ICLS/17/2003/4, appended to GB.289/STM/6.

discussions had been of a high technical level. They supported the three resolutions adopted by the Conference. In addition, the revision of international standards on working time was a key issue and it was essential to associate employers and workers in the developmental work in order to ensure tripartism. Similarly, developmental work on statistics of trade union membership and collective bargaining coverage, as part of the statistics on social dialogue, should be carried out in close consultation with representatives from the Bureaux of Employers' and Workers' Activities, the International Confederation of Free Trade Unions and the International Organization of Employers. As regards decent work, it was still difficult to define and therefore measure this concept in various countries. Proposals had been made to change the terminology and there was no definition generally agreed upon. The Employers confirmed the reservation expressed in paragraph 23 of the report of the ICLS. Therefore, the Employers' group supported the recommendations contained in subparagraph 14(a) and (c) of the points for decision. As regards subparagraph (b), it recommended that the issue of the concept and measurement of decent work be the subject of a debate at a future session of one of the Committees of the Governing Body, as a precondition to the convening of a tripartite meeting of experts. Priority should also be given to the organization of a meeting of experts on working time.

- 52.** Mr. Zellhoefer expressed the Workers' group's support for the resolutions adopted by the Conference on consumer price indices and household income and expenditure statistics, as well as the work envisaged on gender mainstreaming, informal employment, working time, social protection and social dialogue, including trade union density and collective bargaining coverage, and the International Standard Classification of Occupations (ISCO). A key agenda item was the development of decent work indicators. It was suggested by many that a better description would be "quality of work" indicators. The idea of developing an aggregate decent work index had been dropped in favour of an array of decent work indicators, some of them, such as statistical measures of social dialogue, social protection, trade union density, and freedom of association were difficult to measure and needed to be discussed. A tripartite meeting of experts should determine a clear conceptual framework, as well as the dimensions and boundaries for the statistical measurement of decent work. The Workers' group strongly supported such a meeting. Cuts in ILO resources for its statistical activities might weaken its capacity to set the statistical standards required in all these fields. The Office should support this work and strengthen its statistical mandate. There should be transparency in the communication of national statistics to the ILO, and training in labour statistics and research for trade unionists should be given priority by the ILO. The Workers' group supported paragraph 14 of the points for decision.
- 53.** A Worker member (Ms. Byers, Canada) emphasized that support should be given to the work done by the ILO to build up and strengthen its statistical operations regarding issues such as conditions of work, unemployment, and gender analysis. Governments should make a commitment to strong, credible, independent statistical systems. Good collaborative work was being done between the Canada Labour Congress and Statistics Canada, such as on the economic ramifications of cutting unemployment benefits.
- 54.** The representative of the Government of Germany stressed the importance of the work of the ICLS for all member States and the tripartite constituents. Special support was given to the recommendation that a tripartite meeting of experts be convened on the issue of decent work. Adequate resources should be allocated to implement activities mentioned in the report and further budgetary cuts avoided. His Government supported paragraph 14 of the points for decision.
- 55.** The representative of the Government of Cameroon emphasized the importance of reliable labour statistics for Africa. He supported resolution III and the recommendations in paragraph 5 of the document before the Committee. Further diversification of labour

statistics was needed. The development of decent work indicators would lead to a more coherent understanding of decent work.

56. The Committee took note of the Employers' group's recommendations contained in paragraph 51 above.

57. *The Committee recommends that the Governing Body:*

- (a) take note of the report of the Conference;*
- (b) consider the recommendations of the Conference in carrying out the future programme of work of the Office, and in doing so, take note of the Employers' group's recommendations that:*
 - (i) the issue of decent work indicators be the subject of a debate at a future session of one of the committees of the Governing Body, as a precondition to the convening of a tripartite meeting of experts, and*
 - (ii) priority be given to the organization of a meeting of experts on working time;*
- (c) authorize the Director-General to distribute the report of the Conference to:*
 - (i) the governments of member States and, through them, to the national employers' and workers' organizations concerned, drawing particular attention to the three resolutions contained in Appendix I to the report and to the guidelines and checklist contained in the report,*
 - (ii) the international employers' and workers' organizations concerned, and*
 - (iii) the United Nations and the other intergovernmental organizations and non-governmental organizations represented at the Conference.*

Report of the Thirteenth Session of the Joint ILO/WHO Committee on Occupational Health (Geneva, 9-12 December 2003)

58. The Committee had before it a report¹⁴ of the Joint ILO/WHO Committee on Occupational Health, including in the appendix the conclusions and recommendations adopted.

59. Mr. Zellhoefer observed that the ILO/WHO meeting had been long overdue. The last such meeting had been in 1995. He hoped that collaboration between the two organizations would resume on a more regular basis and result in more policy coherence at all levels. The Workers' group supported the preparation of a joint statement by the Directors-General of the ILO and the WHO addressed to ministers of labour and health to ensure implementation of the global occupational safety and health strategy at country level

¹⁴ GB.289/STM/7.

adopted at the 91st Session of the International Labour Conference. Two areas for future work were the banning of asbestos and psychosocial issues, including stress.

60. Ms. Sasso Mazzufferi supported the point for decision regarding the work of the Joint ILO/WHO Committee on Occupational Health. Close collaboration between the ILO and WHO in the field of occupational safety and health was useful and desirable.
61. The representative of the Government of China stated that his Government took note of the conclusions and recommendations of the Joint ILO/WHO Committee and considered them both timely and useful as a reference for member States in their work on occupational safety and health.
62. *The Committee recommends that the Governing Body:*
 - (a) *take note of the conclusions and recommendations of the Thirteenth Session of the Joint ILO/WHO Committee on Occupational Health;*
 - (b) *authorize the Director-General to communicate the conclusions and recommendations to governments and, through them, to employers' and workers' organizations, to the non-governmental organizations with consultative status and to other institutions and services as appropriate;*
 - (c) *invite the Director-General to prepare, distribute and implement policy guidance to the ILO's field structures in respect of cooperation between the ILO and WHO in occupational safety and health; and*
 - (d) *invite the Director-General to bear in mind, when drawing up the future programme of work of the Office, the conclusions and recommendations made by the Joint Committee at its Thirteenth Session.*

Other questions

Report of the meeting on ship scrapping between the International Labour Office (ILO), the secretariat of the Basel Convention (SBC) and the secretariat of the International Maritime Organization (IMO)
(Geneva, 13-14 January 2004)

63. The Committee had before it a paper¹⁵ on ship scrapping.
64. Ms. Sasso Mazzufferi indicated that the Employers had taken careful note of paragraph 10.
65. Mr. Zellhoefer felt that the collaboration among the three organizations was essential and demonstrated the cooperation and coherence needed to approach international financial institutions, as referred to in paragraph 7. Shipbreaking and the environmental degradation and poor working conditions that accompanied it were akin to the dumping of hazardous waste. Appropriate regulation and political will were required to solve the problem and to determine where financial responsibility lay. There was a need for a global action

¹⁵ GB.289/STM/8/1.

programme and the development of infrastructure to implement it. This was an important question and the Workers' group looked forward to receiving a report on the first meeting of the Joint ILO/IMO/Basel Convention Working Group.

66. The Committee took note of the progress towards a collaborative approach to ship scrapping.

Report of the Fifth Session of the Joint IMO/ILO Ad Hoc Expert Working Group on Liability and Compensation regarding Claims for Death, Personal Injury and Abandonment of Seafarers
(Geneva, 12-14 January 2004)

67. The Committee had before it a report¹⁶ of the Joint IMO/ILO Ad Hoc Expert Working Group on Liability and Compensation regarding Claims for Death, Personal Injury and Abandonment of Seafarers.
68. Mr. Zellhoefer recommended the report for adoption by the Governing Body. The issues addressed were of fundamental importance for the provision of decent work at sea. The number of reported cases of abandonment without means clearly showed that the issue was substantial and could only be addressed through a mandatory solution ensuring that a financial security system would be set in place against such eventualities. Strict liability instruments had already been adopted concerning oil pollution, noxious substances, bunker oil, and passengers and their baggage. The only area where there was no adequate liability regime was crew claims. Since the ILO/IMO Ad Hoc Expert Working Group had recognized that the current guidelines were having no impact on the situation, a mandatory solution was needed to see that crew claims were met in a full and timely manner. The last International Labour Conference had adopted a resolution concerning decent work for seafarers, who required special protection. Having observed that the IMO had acquired considerable experience with regard to financial security in the sector, the Workers' group considered that the IMO should be involved and take a leading role in the suggested process.
69. Ms. Sasso Mazzufferi indicated that the Employers' group approved the document and the conclusions contained in its paragraph 7.
- 70. *The Committee on Sectoral and Technical Meetings and Related Issues recommends that the Governing Body approve the recommendations of the Working Group.***

Geneva, 19 March 2004.

Points for decision: Paragraph 32;
Paragraph 37;
Paragraph 43;
Paragraph 49;
Paragraph 57;
Paragraph 62;
Paragraph 70.

¹⁶ GB.289/STM/8/2.