



FIFTEENTH ITEM ON THE AGENDA

**Report of the Committee on Technical  
Cooperation**

**Contents**

	<i>Page</i>
I. Thematic evaluation report: Strengthening institutions, processes, legal frameworks and capacity of tripartite constituents for tripartism and social dialogue.....	1
II. On-the-spot review in Africa .....	4
III. Technical cooperation – Resource allocation mechanism .....	6
IV. Operational aspects of the International Programme on the Elimination of Child Labour (IPEC).....	8
V. Special Technical Cooperation Programme for Colombia .....	12
VI. Other questions .....	13

1. The Committee on Technical Cooperation met on 18 and 19 March 2004, chaired by Mr. Yimer Aboye (Government, Ethiopia). The Employer and Worker Vice-Chairpersons were Mr. Jeetun and Mr. Attigbe, respectively.
2. The Committee had the following agenda items:
  - Thematic evaluation report: Strengthening institutions, processes, legal frameworks and capacity of tripartite constituents for tripartism and social dialogue;
  - On-the-spot review in Africa;
  - Technical cooperation – Resource allocation mechanism;
  - Operational aspects of the International Programme on the Elimination of Child Labour (IPEC);
  - Special Technical Cooperation Programme for Colombia;
  - Other questions.
3. At the outset, Mr. Skerrett provided a brief on the ILO's technical cooperation programme during the 2002-03 biennium. The Office had received US\$327 million as extra-budgetary funds, compared to US\$289 million during 2000-01 – an increase of 13 per cent. The Standards and Fundamental Principles and Rights at Work Sector had received 53 per cent of the resources, the Employment Sector 22 per cent, the Social Protection Sector 15 per cent and the Social Dialogue Sector 8 per cent. Activities on cross-cutting issues, such as gender, received 2 per cent. In terms of regional distribution, Africa had received 27 per cent of the funds, Asia 29 per cent, the Americas 23 per cent, Europe 9 per cent, and the Arab States 1 per cent. Eleven per cent had gone to inter-regional projects. The Office had improved the delivery of its technical cooperation programme compared to the previous biennium, as extra-budgetary expenditures had increased by 23 per cent, with all of the sectors and regions improving the delivery rates of their respective programmes. The overall delivery rate of the Office reached nearly 69 per cent.
4. The Worker Vice-Chairperson, Mr. Attigbe, reminded the Committee of its mandate and role in providing guidance and direction to the ILO's technical cooperation programmes. Pointing out that the reports that were generally submitted to the Committee did not have points for decision, he called upon the Office to take this issue into account for future sessions.
5. The Employer Vice-Chairperson, Mr. Jeetun, endorsed this position.

## **I. Thematic evaluation report: Strengthening institutions, processes, legal frameworks and capacity of tripartite constituents for tripartism and social dialogue**

6. A representative of the Director-General, Ms. Paxton, introduced the item.<sup>1</sup> She noted the relevance of the present discussion in light of the Office's follow-up to the resolution

<sup>1</sup> GB.289/TC/1.

concerning tripartism and social dialogue adopted by the International Labour Conference in 2002, notably ensuring that the ILO's strategic objectives and shared policy objectives were achieved through tripartism and social dialogue. The document examined projects aimed at enhancing the capacity of the tripartite partners to dialogue and also at using social dialogue in substantive areas. They demonstrated the value of social dialogue as an instrument of policy formulation and delivery and they were thus an important component of ILO technical cooperation. Although social dialogue was fundamental to the ILO, she suggested that there were possibly instances where it had been marginalized. Its value in addressing a number of developmental situations needed to be better understood and demonstrated. The present discussion was a welcome opportunity to address strategic issues concerning technical cooperation related to tripartism and social dialogue in order that these might be more effective tools in the delivery of the Decent Work Agenda.

7. The Employer Vice-Chairperson, Mr. Jeetun, welcomed the emphasis on the fundamental nature of tripartism and on operating within the context of the resolution concerning tripartism and social dialogue, adopted in 2002. He underlined however that social dialogue and tripartism must permeate the work of the Office as a whole. This was especially important for technical cooperation. The resolution was clear in this regard. Social dialogue should be used to deliver the whole Decent Work Agenda. Equally, support and assistance to the social partners were the responsibility of all departments in the ILO. The Employers' group was concerned that certain ILO departments appeared to work with other stakeholders at the expense of employers' and workers' organizations. He stressed the importance of evaluations being independent from project implementation and raised the issue of project sustainability. He strongly endorsed the use of social dialogue on issues such as HIV/AIDS.
8. The Worker Vice-Chairperson, Mr. Attigbe, appreciated the focus of the thematic evaluation but regretted that it only covered projects executed by the Social Dialogue Sector. He recalled that, at the Committee's November 2003 session, the Workers' group had re-emphasized the need for full, dynamic involvement of the social partners, ACTRAV and ACT/EMP in all stages of ILO technical cooperation activities, including design, resource mobilization, implementation, and follow up. The resolution concerning tripartism and social dialogue had emphasized the unique role of the social partners, ACTRAV and ACT/EMP in all ILO activities, including technical cooperation, to promote and strengthen tripartite activities that enhanced the capacities, services and representation of the social partners and governments. He deplored the exclusion of ACTRAV and ACT/EMP in the decision-making process concerning funding and distribution mechanisms. He suggested that, since social dialogue was important in achieving the ILO's strategic objectives, specific ACTRAV and ACT/EMP projects and joint ACTRAV-ACT/EMP projects should be considered.
9. He noted that the evaluation provided little information on how projects had contributed to strengthening social dialogue through collective bargaining and agreements entered into by workers and employers. Concrete measurements of progress were needed, rather than general comments on strengthening tripartism and social dialogue. He proposed that a plan of action giving effect to the resolution concerning tripartism and social dialogue be prepared for the next session of the Committee, with a point for decision for submission to the Governing Body.
10. The representative of the Government of Malawi, speaking on behalf of the African group, welcomed the references to longer-term projects since there were inevitable delays during project initiation and longer projects would achieve more sustainable impacts. He supported the strategy described under section III of the document, "The way forward". He asked why the project on strengthening labour administrations in Southern Africa (SLASA) had not been included in the evaluation.

11. The representative of the Government of Kenya requested clarification on the distinction between internal and independent evaluations. According to his analysis of the projects included in the evaluation by key themes, target groups and the different donors involved, lessons could be learned on the importance of ownership and of certain projects being demand-driven.
12. The representative of the Government of Italy, speaking on behalf of the IMEC group, requested clarification of the criteria used for project selection and on the impact of projects as measured by indicators comparing the situation in specific countries before and after an ILO intervention. He mentioned the specific interest of his country in projects involving the Balkan region.
13. The representative of the Government of the United States also requested information on selection criteria and impact measurement. She asked what percentage of total ILO technical cooperation the 21 projects in the thematic evaluation represented. She suggested that a random sample of projects might have provided a more objective assessment of technical cooperation in the area of tripartism and social dialogue.
14. The representative of the Government of Spain emphasized the importance of labour legislation and labour administration, and the positive impact of the project on modernizing the labour administrations in Central America (MATAC) in eight Central American countries. This had encouraged his Government to finance a new labour administration project in Andean countries. His Government was requesting that decentralized technical cooperation resources in the regions provide technical assistance in the modernization of labour administrations.
15. The representative of the Government of the United Kingdom encouraged the work of the ILO in building the capacity of social partners to contribute effectively to the development of national poverty reduction strategies (PRSs), notably in Cambodia, Ghana, or Ethiopia. PRSs were an important vehicle to enhance the role of social partners.
16. The representative of the Government of China considered that social dialogue could assist economic development and emphasized China's readiness to develop cooperation with the ILO in this respect. He also recognized that problems related to poverty reduction existed in China. He expressed appreciation for the workers' education project sponsored by the Danish Agency for Development Assistance (DANIDA).
17. The representative of the Government of Mexico appreciated the thematic evaluation's focus on tripartism and social dialogue. Mexico had set up a Council for Social Dialogue in productive sectors, as a permanent consultative body, for a better coordination between the Government and the social partners. A workshop being organized by the ILO Regional Office for Latin America and the Caribbean in April 2004 would provide useful inputs for future technical cooperation.
18. The representative of the Government of Nigeria questioned the criteria for inclusion in the thematic evaluation. She thanked the United States Department of Labor (USDOL) for their support regarding projects in Nigeria. She emphasized Nigeria's need for assistance in the field of HIV/AIDS. She referred to the participation of her Government in the preparatory work on the consolidated maritime labour Convention and pointed out that Nigeria had ratified the Dock Work Convention, 1973 (No. 137), and the Recruitment and Placement of Seafarers Convention, 1996 (No. 179). Her country would benefit from technical cooperation in the areas of labour inspection on board ships, training of the social partners on the implementation of the future maritime labour Convention, and port development programmes.

19. The representative of the Government of Germany emphasized the importance of projects aimed at strengthening labour ministries and labour legislation, and queried why such projects accounted for a minority of those covered by the evaluation. He welcomed the Office's new sectoral action programme on textiles and suggested that it be implemented in cooperation with the InFocus Programme on Social Dialogue, Labour Law and Labour Administration (IFP/DIALOGUE) in its implementation.
20. Ms. Paxton thanked the delegates for the many substantive contributions and the heartening interest shown in technical cooperation and social dialogue, as well as their support for the resolution concerning tripartism and social dialogue. The Office was developing a follow-up plan of action, which included not only strengthening the processes and capacities of social dialogue but also its value-added as a tool to address substantive issues facing constituents.
21. Referring to some specific observations and queries, Ms. Paxton pointed out that only a representative sample of projects could be included in the thematic evaluation as described in the document. It was difficult to calculate the percentage of these projects over total ILO technical cooperation. While individual projects had achievement measures, it was not possible to aggregate these across the thematic evaluation. Many projects addressed collective bargaining. The SLASA project was not included because the mid-term evaluation had not been completed at the time. She stressed that internal evaluations were independent of project management in order to ensure impartiality. She agreed that capacity and institution building and the development of trust required time, thus social dialogue projects required sufficient duration in order to be sustainable. Employers and workers had been involved in the development and testing of an IFP/DIALOGUE training manual. While the South Asia and Viet Nam project on tripartism and social dialogue (SAVPOT) had included both employers and workers, DANIDA project activities in Madhya Pradesh, India, focused only on workers' activities.
22. The Worker Vice-Chairperson, Mr. Attigbe, noted that there was a need for more detailed information, which would have facilitated the discussion of the report.

## II. On-the-spot review in Africa

23. Providing the background to the item,<sup>2</sup> the Chairperson, Mr. Yimer Aboye (Government, Ethiopia) recalled that at its 285th Session (November 2002), the Governing Body approved the conduct, during the 2002-03 biennium, of an on-the-spot review of a project on the topic of the thematic evaluation report to be submitted to the March 2004 session of the Governing Body. The Officers of the Committee on Technical Cooperation selected for review the Kenya component of the project on Strengthening Labour Relations in East Africa (SLAREA). The review was conducted in Nairobi in November 2003 by a tripartite team comprising Mr. Martin M. Mononga (Government representative, Malawi), Ms. Rose Karikari Anang (Employer member), and Mr. Guillaume Attigbe (Worker Vice-Chairperson).
24. Mr. Mononga, team leader for the review, highlighted some of the positive findings with regard to the project's contribution to strengthening labour administration, reform of labour laws, strengthening employers' and workers' organizations and the expansion of the membership of those organizations. Commenting on the future challenges, he pointed out that the resources available were inadequate to address the problem and that the time span

<sup>2</sup> GB.289/TC/2.

for project implementation had been too short for sustained results. Thanking the United States Department of Labor (USDOL) for their support for the project, Mr. Mononga indicated that further funding from the USDOL and other donors would be required.

25. The Employer Vice-Chairperson, Mr. Jeetun, supported the recommendations of the on-the-spot review and thanked the USDOL for their support to the project. He reiterated the Employers' group's interest in the on-the-spot reviews, and stated that they would like to see the exercise continue.
26. The Worker Vice-Chairperson, Mr. Attigbe, expressed satisfaction with the report, and his belief that the project was an excellent example of close partnership between the ILO and the social partners. He recommended that the project be extended to 2006, and asked the Office to seek necessary resources. Mr. Attigbe suggested that steps be taken to address the current gender imbalance in the project.
27. Ms. Karikari Anang (Employer member) highlighted some of the salient findings of the review team. She thanked the USDOL for funding the project. Stating that the project would form the basis of economic development in the region, she encouraged the ILO to approach the World Bank for their collaboration in the continuation of project activities.
28. The representative of the Government of Kenya spoke as one of the beneficiaries of the project. He considered the project as pertinent and demand-driven. The project had successfully supported labour law reform and had increased the capacity of labour officials. The participation and ownership of the social partners had also contributed to the achievements of the project. To ensure sustainability he felt that the project should be extended until the end of 2006.
29. The representative of the Government of South Africa endorsed the recommendations in the report and was of the view that the on-the-spot reviews were important, as they provided an important channel of information between the constituents and the Governing Body. He underlined that sustainability should be built into project planning, and to that end projects needed to be executed over longer periods of time. He appreciated the involvement of the social partners in the planning, implementation and monitoring, and was of the opinion that, should regional projects be chosen for on-the-spot reviews, financial resources should be made available to undertake the exercise in all the participating countries.
30. Mr. Anand (Employer member) wanted to know the extent to which the project had been subjected to monitoring and evaluation during its two-and-a-half years of existence. Noting that the social partners had been involved throughout the project implementation, he stressed the importance of "high-quality" involvement. On the recommendation in the report concerning training, Mr. Anand was of the opinion that a time frame for it should be established.
31. The representative of the Government of United Kingdom inquired how the work of the review team fitted in with other reviews envisaged in the project and whether there would be cause for duplication. On a more general note, he was of the opinion that project reviews, including on-the-spot reviews, should be combined to save costs.
32. The representative of the Director-General, Mr. Skerrett, responded to the deliberations. He stated that the comments made on the project, including the question of gender issues, would be brought to the attention of the relevant project management. On the question of extension of the project, he informed the committee that USDOL did not have any funds earmarked for it during the current year but there could be a possibility in the following year. The ILO would try to mobilize funds through donors at the local level in the three

countries where the project was being implemented. Collaboration with the World Bank would be pursued. Emphasizing that the Bank normally required a request from the Government, he suggested that the social partners should join the Government in making the request, as that would strengthen the case.

33. Responding to the question of future on-the-spot reviews, Mr. Skerrett informed the meeting that the Officers of the Committee on Technical Cooperation could take up the issue during their forthcoming consultations during the International Labour Conference in June and that proposals could be made for consideration at the November 2004 session of the Governing Body.

### **III. Technical cooperation – Resource allocation mechanism**

34. The representative of the Director-General, Mr. Skerrett, introducing the agenda item,<sup>3</sup> highlighted the differences and similarities between the Technical cooperation – Resource allocation mechanism (TC-RAM) and traditional partnership agreements between the ILO and some of its key donors. He pointed out that allocation of funds from two donors, the United Kingdom and the Netherlands, through the TC-RAM process accounted for 15 per cent of all extra-budgetary allocations for the ILO during the biennium.
35. Outlining the key steps in the process, Mr. Skerrett emphasized that the TC-RAM was the most rigorous and transparent project development and approval process in the ILO technical cooperation programme. All stakeholders, including the social partners, had been kept informed at all stages during the process; information was posted on the ILO Intranet and updated at regular intervals. Mr. Skerrett concluded by informing the Committee that the exercise had already been reviewed on two occasions, that there was room for improvement, and that an independent external evaluation would be undertaken in 2006.
36. The Employer Vice-Chairperson, Mr. Jeetun, emphasized the need to view the TC-RAM process in the broader context of the Organization's policy directions – including the conclusions concerning the role of the ILO in technical cooperation adopted by the Conference in 1999, and the 2002 resolution on tripartism and social dialogue. Due regard needed to be paid to the Committee's role and responsibility in shaping ILO technical cooperation policies and programmes, regardless of the sources of funding. In that context, the document submitted to the Committee offered a fair account of the rationale for the TC-RAM mechanism, namely the need to move from an ad hoc approach to a more strategic orientation; however, it fell short of the Committee's expectations with regard to concrete application of the ILO's principles and policies on tripartism and the social partners' involvement in technical cooperation.
37. Mr. Jeetun proposed that both ACT/EMP and ACTRAV should be much more closely associated in the conception, design, evaluation and implementation of projects financed through the TC-RAM. Whilst the focus on poverty reduction was acceptable and consistent with the social partners' concerns, the process should have been more demand-driven and less dictated by the donors' own priorities and interpretation of the ILO's values and approaches. Since ACT/EMP and ACTRAV had not been involved in the final review process, only a few of the approved proposals addressed the real needs of ILO constituents. The Employers' group did not share the report's positive assessment as to the participatory process and believed that more communication and dialogue would be required in future

<sup>3</sup> GB.289/TC/3.

exercises. Unless the mechanism was improved, the Employers' group would not recommend the extension of the TC-RAM to other donor programmes.

38. The Worker Vice-Chairperson, Mr. Attigbe, recognized that the TC-RAM concept responded to a need to enhance the coherence, effectiveness and transparency of the ILO's technical cooperation. However, owing to the lack of ACTRAV's and ACT/EMP's involvement in the process, the TC-RAM had missed the opportunity to give concrete meaning to the 2002 resolution on tripartism and social dialogue and had disregarded the social partners' needs and priorities. Contrary to the statement made by the Director-General's representative to the Committee in November 2003, Mr. Attigbe considered that ACT/EMP and ACTRAV should play more than an advisory role in making sure that the 2002 resolution was translated into practice and technical cooperation became a vehicle for promoting tripartism. Therefore, they should participate in the decision-making process. He regretted that the paper submitted to the Committee did not even mention the resolution.
39. The Workers' group had identified four problem areas: (a) limited number of approved projects responding to social partners' concerns; (b) insufficient consultation with ACT/EMP and ACTRAV throughout the process; (c) lack of ACTRAV's and ACT/EMP's representation in the review panel; and (d) excessive donor orientation of the process, leading to a distorted interpretation of the ILO's values and principles. The Workers' group recommended the following improvements to the TC-RAM: (a) concept notes should be prepared by Office-wide working groups comprising ACT/EMP and ACTRAV; (b) ACTRAV and ACT/EMP should be represented in the review panel; (c) proposals should respond to the social partners' priorities; and (d) regional departments should be instructed to apply the provisions of the 2002 resolution to the design and implementation of TC-RAM proposals.
40. Mr. Attigbe requested that a new document be presented in November for the Committee's decision on proposals for improving TC-RAM. He thanked the donor Governments for their support and urged them to increasingly address tripartite needs and priorities. He made a special appeal to the Government of Denmark to renew its technical assistance to employers' and workers' organizations through the ILO.
41. The representative of the Government of Ecuador stated that he found the TC-RAM a novel, transparent and efficient mechanism for allocating resources, and requested information about the percentage of funding allocated for the Americas, as well as of the impact of TC-RAM-funded projects in the region.
42. The representative of the Government of China found the TC-RAM process an interesting experience, as it helped reflect the priorities of donors as well as those of the member States of the ILO. He further emphasized the need for a strong focus on job creation and employment as central themes in the TC-RAM process.
43. The representative of the Government of the Republic of Korea was of the opinion that TC-RAM could serve as an important tool to help small donor countries allocate resources to appropriate projects. He proposed extending the process to other donors, including his own Government.
44. The representative of the Government of the United Kingdom acknowledged that mobilization of resources could, in some instances, distort the priorities of United Nations agencies. He was of the opinion that the TC-RAM empowered the ILO to design and select technical cooperation in line with its own priorities. He was pleased that some of the early difficulties encountered in the TC-RAM process had been ironed out and expressed satisfaction with the quality of the projects approved. Noting that liaison between ILO

headquarters and the Regional Offices continued to be a challenge, he stated that the Department for International Development (DFID) would like to see a stronger focus on dissemination and cross-regional learning. The representative appreciated some of the concerns on tripartism, but believed that the process allowed for full involvement of the social partners in project preparation. He did not consider it necessary for the Committee to further review this issue at its November session.

45. The representative of the Government of the Netherlands fully supported the views expressed by the representative of the United Kingdom and added that TC-RAM was an important contribution to results-based management and programming in the ILO. It brought about transparency, integrated programming and increased mainstreaming of gender issues. She welcomed the emphasis on project proposals that were demand-driven and came from the field; she felt that TC-RAM had resulted in higher quality project proposals. The representative indicated that the TC-RAM had contributed to a more meaningful dialogue between the ILO and the Netherlands on implementing a coherent set of activities; she felt there was no need for further discussion on this matter at the November session of the Committee.
46. Responding to the debate and to some of the questions raised, the representative of the Director-General, Mr. Skerrett, informed the Committee that field offices had been instructed to consult with the social partners at local levels when developing proposals. Many of the approved projects were directed at improving the conditions of workers. Employers' and workers' organizations did participate in the implementation of several projects.
47. Referring to the statement made by the Worker Vice-Chairperson, Mr. Skerrett mentioned that his own statement to the Committee in November 2003 did not reflect a personal opinion. He pointed out that, in accordance with the ILO Constitution and Staff Regulations, only the Director-General was accountable to the Governing Body; all other officials were appointed by the Director-General and were accountable to him.
48. Mr. Skerrett regretted that in the report no reference had been made to the 2002 resolution on tripartism and social dialogue. He proposed that ACTRAV and ACT/EMP should participate in the preparation of concept notes in future TC-RAM rounds, and encouraged them to submit proposals for funding through it. He invited ACTRAV and ACT/EMP to attend future donor meetings.
49. The representative of the Director-General concluded by thanking the United Kingdom and the Netherlands for their support and all the Committee members for their constructive criticism. He stated that continuous efforts would be made to improve the technical quality of projects and the involvement of the social partners in the TC-RAM process. He invited other donors to join the mechanism.

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

50. The representative of the Director-General, Mr. Kari Tapiola, introducing the agenda item, recalled that the International Steering Committee of IPEC had met on 10 November 2003 to discuss the preliminary results of the programme during 2003 and new developments in the field of child labour. This had been reported to the Committee on Technical

Cooperation on 14 November, as reflected in the report (Appendix II).<sup>4</sup> The final results of IPEC for 2003 were contained in the updated report, *IPEC action against child labour 2002-03: Progress and priorities* (Appendix I to the report), distributed to the members of this Committee. Total expenditure of the programme during 2003 had exceeded the target, and the accounts had been closed at US\$47.2 million. This, together with the expenditure figure of \$40.8 million achieved in 2002, represented a 56 per cent increase over the previous biennium, and a quadrupling of expenditure during the period 1999-2003. New ratifications of the Worst Forms of Child Labour Convention, 1999 (No. 182), numbered 34 during the biennium (15 in 2003), and those of the Minimum Age Convention, 1973 (No. 138), totalled 15 (ten in 2003), so that the targets for the 2002-03 biennium had not been met, but there had still been a record ratification pace, and at present 147 ratifications for Convention No. 182, and 132 for Convention No. 138 had been registered. At the end of 2002, five time-bound programmes (TBPs) were fully funded. At the end of 2003, such ambitious programmes were operational in 14 countries worldwide, while a number of other member States were undertaking equivalent efforts, often with less technical assistance and no external financial support. In November of last year, the TBP planning manual in English had been presented to the Committee and a promise had been made that French and Spanish versions would now be available. This had been done, with the support of the Turin Centre, and sufficient copies of all three versions were available in the meeting room. Twenty-eight countries had undertaken national child labour surveys or various other surveys during the biennium. As announced last November, IPEC had completed and published a major research outcome, *Investing in every child: An economic study of the costs and benefits of eliminating child labour*. It had been well received and favourably reviewed by constituents, the media and by partner organizations such as the World Bank (which proposed joint dissemination and follow-up). Over 1 million children had benefited directly or indirectly through IPEC's services over the last two years, and many more had been reached through awareness-raising activities in the countries where IPEC operated. The report pointed out that IPEC was further shifting from primarily executing programmes to a facilitating and advisory role, aimed at sustainably reducing the incidence of child labour, with priority attached to the urgent eradication of the worst forms of child labour. In doing so it had made systematic efforts to mainstream its work at the country and global levels as well as, of course, in relation to the ILO's Decent Work Agenda. IPEC had also identified elements and opportunities mentioned in the report of the World Commission on the Social Dimension of Globalization to which the programme could contribute.

**51.** Follow-up action had already been taken on many of the points and proposals made by the members of the Committee on Technical Cooperation:

- Activities involving workers' and employers' organizations, nationally and globally, would be stepped up and strengthened, as would support to global sectoral alliances; new modalities had already been discussed with the respective groups, and fresh funding was forthcoming from the Norwegian and Finnish Governments, which continued supporting these actions. Modules on cooperation with employers and workers had been included in a series of IPEC regional staff training workshops over the coming months.
- As several Committee members had emphasized the importance of evaluation and impact measurement, the representative of the Director-General was glad to report that IPEC had carried out or commissioned a total of 45 evaluations during 2002-03 and feedback from those had been given to programmes and projects.

<sup>4</sup> GB.289/TC/4.

- Inter-agency cooperation, especially with UNICEF, the World Bank and UNESCO, had been given new impetus in several ways. Four examples were quoted: jointly promoting the education-child labour nexus, e.g. in New Delhi, November 2003; ensuring the continuation of the ILO/UNICEF/World Bank research effort entitled “Understanding children’s work”; a joint event to highlight the lessons learned through the Bangladesh Garment Manufacturers and Exporters Association (BGMEA) project; and a dialogue with all UNICEF representatives in the Middle East and North Africa (Marrakech, early April 2004).
  - Last, but not least, as an insert in the IPEC action report, a flyer had been provided summarizing in pictures and press clippings what had been achieved so far by the Red Card to Child Labour campaign that had been launched in Bamako in January 2002.
- 52.** The spokesperson for the Employers’ group appreciated the information provided and said that the revised version of IPEC’s implementation report should be widely disseminated so that everyone could learn about success stories in the field of elimination of child labour. The Employers would like to be involved in IPEC’s projects, from the design stage as well as during implementation. Annex B of the IPEC report showed that Employers were conspicuous by their absence. They were happy to see that ministries of labour were involved, but most of the implementing partners were NGOs. The capacity of the social partners had to be strengthened so that they could also participate actively in the elimination of child labour.
- 53.** Another Employer member, who had been spokesperson for the Employers’ group in the IPEC International Steering Committee, addressed four ideas. First, he stressed the importance of cooperation between Employers, Workers, ACTRAV and ACT/EMP all the way to the execution of projects. Tripartism was essential, and NGOs needed to respect this. Second, the Employers wished to emphasize that the root of the problem needed to be addressed, namely poverty. Third, an excessively legalistic approach was to be avoided. Not only was ratification of Convention No. 182 important, but also the concrete ways in which countries could address the problem by developing relevant legislation. Finally, the priority objective needed to remain the elimination of the worst forms of child labour.
- 54.** The Worker spokesperson noted that document GB.289/TC/4 contained rich information, especially in IPEC’s implementation report in Appendix I. It included important political and strategic dimensions, as well as information on resources for the elimination of child labour that should be discussed by the Governing Body for decision. The Worker spokesperson deplored the fact that IPEC still operated outside the Governing Body decision-making and supervisory mechanisms. He requested that this situation be reversed. On page 10 of the French version it was stated that “IPEC” was considered as the lead United Nations agency on child labour issues. He hoped that this was a mistake, and the report should be corrected since it should have stated “ILO” rather than “IPEC”. Last November, the Workers had asked for the implementation report to mention the activities undertaken jointly with ACTRAV and ACT/EMP. The Workers were happy to see that this information was now included and hoped that collaboration would be even further reinforced on strategic issues, as well as the utilization of resources. The Workers had also asked IPEC to supply a list of NGOs that collaborated with IPEC and indicate the amount of resources allocated to NGOs. They were happy to see this information in Appendix B of the report. However, the distribution of action programmes and commitments by the implementing agency in the table on page 92 of the English version gave reasons for concern. The Workers could not see a distinction between NGOs and “other organizations” and “research/educational institutions”. The contributions to NGOs thus appeared to be increasing. This contradicted the statement on page 91, fifth paragraph of the English version to the effect that the percentage was only about 25 per cent for the period 1999-2003. The Workers also had to conclude that when it came to involving trade unions, their

share in implementing the programme was only 11 per cent, and only 9 per cent for expenditure. This contrasted with the rather optimistic statements on page 91, sixth paragraph. The Workers requested further explanations on these contradictions. Involvement of the social partners needed to increase substantially.

55. The Government representative of Malawi, speaking on behalf of the Africa group, welcomed document GB. 289/TC/4 and its appendices. He said that equal attention needed to be given to all four areas of fundamental rights. If this was not done, child labour could not be effectively addressed.
56. The Government representative of Ecuador, speaking on behalf of the Group of Latin American and Caribbean States (GRULAC), recognized that the ILO was leading the way in efforts to eliminate child labour. There was indeed a clear link between the work of IPEC and what was being done by other agencies in research, education and awareness raising, including the media and specialized organizations. Countries in the region had stepped up activities against child labour in recent years, and he reaffirmed the importance of IPEC for education and encouraged IPEC to continue its collaboration with UNICEF. There were clear concerns in Latin America and the Caribbean, where one out of five children worked. It was absolutely vital for the region that the strategies adopted yielded conclusive results. His group therefore urged IPEC to further work towards its objectives and to encourage parents to send their children to school. There was a need to think about how to support families so that children had access to education, and good infrastructure was needed in terms of indirect costs of education, as well as the status and working conditions of teachers. The group was happy with the results of the collaboration between IPEC, UNESCO and UNICEF, and stressed the importance of developing programmes for teachers.
57. The representative of the Government of the United Kingdom wanted to build briefly on the statement made last November. His Government welcomed IPEC's work in moving more upstream. He also recalled the statement by the UNICEF spokesperson last November that child labour was still not being integrated into PRSPs. He wanted to know what was being done to address this situation.
58. The representative of the Government of Germany welcomed the IPEC implementation report. His Government had strongly supported IPEC from the very beginning with both programmes and staff. IPEC was a very good programme, supported not only by Germany but many other donors, including the United States, followed by Spain, France and a number of others. He was interested to learn what was happening to the children who used to work and should now be in school. Figures were needed on which children were going to school and obtaining vocational training. He welcomed the developments described in boxes 12, 13 and 14, but noted that these were just a few examples. He would appreciate it if the ILO could provide more examples on a systematic basis. He also agreed with the spokesperson for the GRULAC countries concerning the need to have enough teachers who enjoyed decent working conditions. In this regard, he encouraged IPEC to increase its cooperation with the education activities undertaken by the Sectoral Activities Programme (SECTOR). His Government would continue to support IPEC, even if it was unable to provide as much support as in the past. Finally, he drew attention to the fact his Government had constantly argued that IPEC should be integrated into the regular budget of the ILO.
59. The Employer spokesperson endorsed the statement of the Worker spokesperson.
60. The representative of the Director-General, Mr. Tapiola, responding to the discussion, first noted the point raised by the Worker spokesperson, who had referred to incorrect use of the acronym "IPEC". He said that this was a translation error in the French version. As to

the involvement of workers and employers in programme delivery, he could hear loud and clear what the employers' and workers' representatives were saying. Maybe they could accept that, although the participation of their organizations was not yet sufficient, the trend was right. The share of the programmes by employers' and workers' organizations was indeed still too low. It was necessary to see how these organizations could be more effectively involved in the delivery of programmes, and discussions had already been held on the means of improving the situation. As regards work with NGOs, page 91 of the English version contained the observation that the share of NGOs had decreased over time from 41 to 27 per cent. If there were inconsistencies in the figures, these would be looked at. He mentioned the world's largest ILO/IPEC project for the elimination of worst forms of child labour in India and noted that employers' and workers' organizations had organized themselves to work closely with the projects there. On the question of mainstreaming child labour in PRSPs, he quoted as examples Pakistan, the United Republic of Tanzania, Nepal and Indonesia, where child labour was explicitly targeted in the PRSPs. It should of course be understood that IPEC was very much about poverty reduction as well as the informal economy. In response to the question from the representative of the Government of Germany on what had happened to the children who had benefited from IPEC projects, he referred to the information on pages 37 and 38. As regards education, IPEC had been working very closely with the education unit in SECTOR and ACTRAV. He reiterated the commitment to continue the work of IPEC as an integral part of tripartite work of the ILO.

## **V. Special Technical Cooperation Programme for Colombia**

- 61.** A representative of the Director-General, Mr. Augustin Muñoz, Regional Director of the ILO Office for Latin America and the Caribbean, introducing the agenda item maintained that despite the delicate social and political conditions, the Government and the social partners were committed in their support to the Special Technical Cooperation Programme for Colombia.
- 62.** The Employer Vice-Chairperson, Mr. Jeetun, acknowledged the relevance of the content of the report<sup>5</sup> and the programme achievements.
- 63.** Mr. Ricci (Employer member) made specific reference to certain activities to which priority was given: training of judges, state officials and the social partners in collaboration with the American Federation of Labor and Congress of Industrial Organisations (AFL-CIO) and selected foundations; and training provided to 1,648 people on broader labour and socio-economic issues such as gender, small enterprise development and child labour. He was of the opinion that the impact of such activities was particularly important for conflict resolution, and believed that the decrease in killings of teachers, trade union leaders and journalists by an average of 50 per cent was a direct result of the new culture of social dialogue.
- 64.** The Worker Vice-Chairperson stressed that the human rights situation in Colombia was still a matter of concern, with an increase in law and human rights violations. Trade unionists continued to be killed (90 in 2003 and six in 2004) were victims of death threats, were disappearing or being kidnapped. According to trade union sources, 91 per cent of those violations were committed in response to trade union activities. He pointed out that in 2003, the Inter-institutional Commission for the Promotion and Protection of Workers'

<sup>5</sup> GB.289/TC/5.

Human Rights had not submitted any action plan or funding for the promotion and defence of trade union rights.

65. He urged the Office to ensure that the Special Technical Cooperation Programme took into consideration the recommendations of the Committee on Freedom of Association and worked with the Government and social partners in its implementation. He reiterated that trade unions were still victims of collective bargaining violations in both the public and private sectors. The Labour Relations (Public Service) Convention, 1978 (No. 151), was not being applied in the public sector; an official document issued by the National Economic and Social Policy Council (CONPES) asked the public authorities not to take measures to implement it. He appealed for the continuation of the Special Technical Cooperation Programme.
66. Mr. Attigbe stressed that the signing of the national agreement by social partners and the Government in December 2003, which could be considered as a historic event, had opened the way to social dialogue. He asked the Office to report on the progress of the activities at the next meeting of the Committee on Technical Cooperation.
67. The representative of the Government of Ecuador, speaking on behalf of the GRULAC States, stressed the need for pursuing human security and social protection as part of the programme activities. He supported the focus of the programme on labour rights, collective bargaining and freedom of association. He also expressed his appreciation for the IPEC activities in Colombia, and particularly the agreement signed with the Mayor of Bogotá.
68. The representative of the Government of Venezuela appreciated the technical cooperation programme put in place in Colombia and the technical support of the ILO Regional Office in Lima. He hoped other countries in the region would not have to go through the suffering experienced by Colombia.
69. The representative of the Government of the United States expressed satisfaction with the achievements of the programme and referred to the recently signed agreement on the increased minimum wage. While concerned about the current level of violence, she had noted that there had been a decrease in the killing of trade unionists. She acknowledged the commitment of the Colombian Government, employers and workers, in making the programme a success and reaffirmed the need for the ILO to reconsider appointing a representative in Colombia.
70. The representative of the Government of Colombia thanked the Office for the information provided in the report and for the support given to the social partners through the programme. She cited seminars and workshops that had been organized, and recognized the positive impact of the agreement on minimum wage on labour relations as a whole. The Government had reinforced efforts to protect trade union leaders by allocating more than 55 per cent of the national budget to their security. While admitting that a great deal remained to be done, she observed that violence was decreasing in all sectors.

## VI. Other questions

71. The representative of the Government of Italy, speaking on behalf of the IMEC countries, raised the issue of improving the working methods of the Committee on Technical Cooperation. He referred to a paper presented by IMEC some time back, and reiterated some of the issues raised in it: ways and means of ensuring more interactive discussions, disseminating more specific information at the country and regional levels; integration of ILO activities in national decent work plans that would fit into wider United Nations

assistance frameworks and national policies; gathering data for impact evaluation; and involvement of regional directors in discussions of the Committee. The representative proposed that the Committee should continue to focus on the issue and looked forward to substantive discussions on the subject.

- 72.** There being no other issue under this agenda item, the Chairperson closed the meeting, informing the Committee that in accordance with the standard procedures, the report of the meeting would be approved on its behalf by the Officers of the Committee. They would also agree on the agenda for the next meeting.

Geneva, 23 March 2004.