



FOURTH ITEM ON THE AGENDA

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

1. At the 288th (November 2003) Session of the Governing Body, the Committee on Technical Cooperation was apprised of the proceedings of the IPEC International Steering Committee's thirteenth meeting held on 10 November 2003, and agreed that a written report on the operational aspects of IPEC would be submitted to the Committee's meeting in March 2004, as in previous years.
2. The report on the operational aspects of IPEC is made up of the following appendices:
 - Appendix I: IPEC action against child labour, 2002-03;
 - Appendix II: Summary record of the thirteenth meeting of the IPEC International Steering Committee, 10 November 2003.

Geneva, 26 January 2004.

Submitted for information.

Appendix I

IPEC action against child labour, 2002-03

Given the need for this section of the document to reflect the most up-to-date results, Appendix I will be presented later as a separate publication.

Appendix II

Summary record of the thirteenth meeting of the IPEC International Steering Committee (10 November 2003)

1. The thirteenth meeting of the IPEC International Steering Committee was held at the International Labour Office, Geneva, on 10 November 2003 at 3 p.m.
2. The meeting was opened by Mr. Kari Tapiola, Executive Director of the Standards and Fundamental Principles and Rights at Work Sector. He welcomed the participants, and invited them to view a video introducing the newly developed *Time-Bound Programme Manual for Action Planning*.
3. *Mr. Tapiola* apologized to the non-Anglophone members that the video and the MAP were at this stage only available in English and informed them that French and Spanish versions would be ready by March 2004.
4. After the video presentation, Mr. Tapiola welcomed participants representing over 85 recipient countries and 30 donors and thanked them for their confidence in the IPEC programme. Mr. Tapiola informed the meeting that the ratifications of Conventions Nos. 138 and 182 stood currently at 130 and 147 (up from 132 almost a year ago). Three-quarters of the member States had thus ratified Convention No. 138 and four-fifths had ratified Convention No. 182. The evaluation of the global IPEC programme was currently under way. The evaluation was being conducted by PROGRAM with the help of external consultants and would examine IPEC programme accomplishments and measure them against the ILO's priorities and objectives. The evaluation would provide constituents, the Office and partners the opportunity to reflect on IPEC programmes and activities. The evaluation would follow a participatory approach and the evaluation team would meet with constituents during the Governing Body. Draft terms of reference would be circulated before the discussions and members of the Governing Body and other constituents were urged to cooperate fully with the evaluation team.
5. The agenda of the meeting was approved as proposed.
6. The summary of proceedings of the twelfth meeting of the IPEC International Steering Committee (held on 11 November 2002) was approved without comments.
7. *Mr. Röselaers*, Director of the InFocus Programme on Child Labour, welcomed the representatives of donors and participating countries, as well as representatives of workers' and employers' organizations. He summarized IPEC's achievements, measured against the objectives, indicators and targets set in the Programme and Budget for 2002-03, bearing in mind that the figures presented were provisional since the biennium was not yet over. The programme had benefited a total of 1.2 million children, directly or indirectly, exceeding the set target by 20 per cent. Many more children had been reached in this period through national campaigns and awareness-raising activities. Since 17 June 1999, when Convention No. 182 had been adopted, a total of 202 ratifications of the two child labour Conventions had been registered. Ratifications explained, in part, the continued high demand for assistance and advice that IPEC had tried to accommodate. The programme delivery in 2003 was projected at US\$48-50 million, making a total for the biennium of around \$90 million, representing an increase of 58 per cent as compared to 2000-01. There was also a positive evolution of the delivery rate, which went from 30 per cent in 1999 to an expected figure of 60 per cent by the end of 2003. Mr. Röselaers noted that IPEC would be implementing 14 ambitious Time-Bound Programmes by the end of 2003, up from three in the last biennium. Methodologies for design and implementation of such programmes had been developed and tested with the constituents and partners. Similarly, methodologies for investigating child labour had been further developed and codified in two manuals. A major global study on the costs and benefits of child labour elimination was forthcoming, while many other publications, reports and policy tools had been produced during this biennium. On management improvements, Mr. Röselaers mentioned the continuous efforts to decentralize selected functions from headquarters to the regional and field structures. A large number of IPEC staff had received training and improvements in efficiency and accountability of contracts and procurement had been made in consultation with FINANCE, PROCUREMENT and JUR. IPEC's Programme Operations Manual had been finalized and was

available online. Global and national advocacy for action against child labour had been pursued actively during 2003. Mr. Röselaers mentioned the celebration of the World Day Against Child Labour (12 June) with the participation of H.M. Queen Rania of Jordan, the development of the campaign “Red Card to Child Labour” in numerous major sporting events, and the programme “Supporting Children’s Rights through Education, the Arts and the Media (SCREAM)”, which had been taken up by many institutions and groups throughout the world. Mr. Röselaers noted the recent EU meeting of ministers responsible for Childhood in Lucca, Italy, where the presentation of IPEC programmes and initiatives had been warmly received. He also welcomed the representatives of two new donors, the International Cocoa Initiative and the ECLT Foundation (Eliminating Child Labour in Tobacco Growing). Finally, Mr. Röselaers expressed his hope that IPEC would receive guidance from ILO constituents, participating countries, donor agencies, employers’ and workers’ organizations during the debate of the implementation report, in order to help the programme meet the challenge of reducing child labour and, especially, eradicate the worst forms of child labour as quickly and completely as possible.

8. *The spokesperson for the Employers’ group* congratulated IPEC for the report and welcomed the conceptual distinction between legal and acceptable work for children, child labour that should be eliminated and the worst forms of child labour. He also welcomed the importance given to setting priorities in order to effectively eradicate the worst forms. He expressed satisfaction about ratification and the concrete steps being taken by the ratifying countries. He stressed the importance of national level consultations to include child labour in national agendas. Although small-scale pilot projects were important, he expressed support for the evolution of IPEC’s role as a facilitator and adviser in national processes. He took note of success stories presented in the report and supported compilation and sharing of good practices between countries. He also welcomed the section on the costs and benefits of eliminating child labour. He noted that costs were borne in the short term by individuals in very hard circumstances and benefits were reaped by society as a whole in the long term. He expressed appreciation for the cocoa and tobacco initiatives since the participation of social actors guarantees success in the long term. He emphasized the importance of the participation of social actors in action against child labour. He noted the need to incorporate child labour in countries’ development agendas and the importance of providing economic alternatives to families. He pointed out that the Employers fully supported IPEC’s work at both macro and micro levels. At the macro level, many employers’ organizations had produced national projects for poverty elimination; at the micro level, employers could provide information about local productive alternatives. Although the Employers did not oppose strengthening national legislation so that it was in conformity with international norms, such as Conventions Nos. 138 and 182, some countries pretended to solve the problem merely by legislating against it. This might have negative effects and make the problem more invisible and difficult to combat. He was pleased to note that countries had developed good employment policies and measures that could be shared with other countries. As HIV/AIDS was one of the causes of child labour, it was important for IPEC to collaborate with UNAIDS since it was the international organization mandated to deal with the pandemic. The International Organisation of Employers (IOE) had developed guidelines for employers concerning HIV/AIDS in employment and on ways in which employers could contribute in this area. In 2004, the Employers were going to examine how to increase their action against child labour through a Norwegian-funded project. He noted with satisfaction the progress made by IPEC and the new donors that had joined during the biennium but was concerned about the sustainability of the action. According to the report the regular funding for IPEC was being reduced. It was important that project documents identify clearly the participation of all social actors. He hoped in the future that the report could be produced in a more timely manner and suggested that the International Steering Committee meeting could be organized for a whole day in order to facilitate the exchange and have a more interactive meeting.
9. *The spokesperson for the Workers’ group* noted with satisfaction that the current report included many of the issues raised by the Workers at the last meeting. He regretted having received the report only a few days before and suggested that the report be made available earlier in the future. He started with some general points. The discussion that took place at the Governing Body Committee on Technical Cooperation was not far-reaching enough for a full partnership and a real integration of IPEC into the ILO’s technical cooperation. When IPEC started, with German funding, it had had an exceptional nature but now that the ILO has adopted the Declaration and Convention No. 182, the elimination of child labour has become a priority of the ILO; therefore, IPEC and the ILO should not be separate. A more definite contribution could be sought from member States; any duplication between the ILO and IPEC’s work should be avoided; and more transparency of IPEC’s work could be achieved. He considered that the direction of IPEC was mainly determined by donors

and the secretariat which might have a negative impact on the effectiveness of the organization. Dealing with child labour outside the Governing Body weakened tripartism. IPEC's aim of eliminating child labour was very close to the other fundamental objectives of the ILO such as strengthening trade unions, combating forced labour, and discrimination. IPEC should work in close cooperation with other ILO programmes, thus contributing to the realization of the Organization's strategic objectives. Since 2000, member States had become increasingly interested in IPEC and had come forward to improve the effectiveness of IPEC. Proposals had been made to improve the operation of the International Steering Committee. He said that it would be desirable for the International Steering Committee to meet twice a year instead of once. If this would not be possible, it would be preferable to have a full day meeting in March. He requested the Office to give serious consideration to proposals to improve the work of the International Steering Committee.

10. As to the contents of the report "IPEC action against child labour 2002-03", the spokesperson for the Worker members was pleased to note that Part II, Chapter 2, explicitly considered the importance of education for eliminating child labour, since the Workers had stressed this point in previous meetings. He also noted Part II, Chapter 3, on the costs and benefits of eliminating child labour as a positive approach. More specific and down-to-earth measures should be put in place to address the economic aspects of the fight against child labour. He welcomed Annex B containing information on IPEC's implementing agencies that had been requested previously. He noted that IPEC still spent more than one-quarter of its budget with NGOs. There was a need to clarify which NGOs these were, what they did and what were the results or outcomes of these expenditures. He noted that the collaboration with ACTRAV was moving in the right direction but the effort should be intensified. The participation of social partners should continue when IPEC programmes were implemented. Norway had made funds available to do so. Sectoral alliances, such as the ones with the chocolate and tobacco industries, made the participation of social partners possible, which is commendable. He congratulated IPEC on the increase in the number of ratifications and emphasized the need to reinforce legal capacities and experts. The Workers had requested this improvement in the past and this had not been included – either in the regular ILO or IPEC's budget. Elimination of child labour had become one of the pillars of the work of the ILO. Many NGOs and other international organizations also worked on child labour, which might result in some sort of competition between all these partners. The ILO needed to ensure there was adequate alliance building and collaboration with all those working on child labour. He welcomed the implementation of Time-Bound Programmes but noted the need to ensure the longevity of these programmes by seeking complementary funding or funding from the ILO regular budget. IPEC country programmes needed to stress the importance of education and work with other organizations developing education programmes such as Education for All. Annex D gives a summary of various evaluations but more detailed information was needed. He reiterated the link between the elimination of child labour and the Decent Work Agenda. He also stressed that ACTRAV and ACT/EMP should collaborate with IPEC. IPEC and ACTRAV needed to have official meetings to discuss how trade unions could participate in the work against child labour in all countries. Guidelines were needed for IPEC staff in the field on this collaboration as well as an annual report of the collaboration between trade unions and IPEC. IPEC should work more closely with the Workers and ACTRAV.
11. *The Government representative of South Africa* welcomed the comprehensive report, particularly the emphasis on assessment and analytical policy tools and surveys and the level and extent of advocacy work. South Africa has made significant progress in the elimination of child labour, as summarized in box 10 of the report. The Government representative showed appreciation towards IPEC and the United States Department of Labor for their support to the Time-Bound Programme in South Africa, although continuous support would be needed to effectively tackle this problem.
12. *The Government representative of France* congratulated the Office and IPEC's team for the high-quality, exemplary, concrete and informative report. The design and implementation of 14 Time-Bound Programmes was not enough considering the magnitude of the problem, but could be considered as an excellent start. The Government representative highlighted three concerns: (1) Concerning coherence and synergies, it would be necessary to strengthen the linkages between IPEC activities and other ILO programmes and the sharing of tools and instruments developed by IPEC and others (under the Decent Work Agenda). In order to increase synergies it would be necessary to enhance the scope of TBPs and collaboration of IPEC and other departments, for example with projects on occupational safety and health and education. More work should also be done in the area of the minimum age for admission to employment. (2) The increasing number and diversification of partnerships was welcomed, but more information on financial arrangements and rules was needed. (3) By now, IPEC should be better integrated in regular activities of the ILO,

especially through an increase in the participation of ILO's regular budget in the total funds of the programmes; a similar level of support from donors should be maintained. This would also increase the control held by the Office on an increasingly complex programme and would facilitate the integration of IPEC with other departments of the ILO. The representative of the Government of France also noted a misprint on page 4 of the French version of the report, where it was stated that the ILO (and not IPEC) was the leading United Nations agency dealing with child labour issues. A concern was also expressed about the non-inclusion of West African countries in Annex D, since France funded many SIMPOC-related activities in these countries.

13. *The Government representative of Nepal* commended the Office for the comprehensive report, highlighting the extensive coverage of the child labour problem and the thematic sections. Child labour had been brought to the mainstream of the labour and development agenda in Nepal. IPEC had been present in Nepal since 1995 and was currently contributing to the development of a Time-Bound Programme. During the last eight years, numerous activities against child labour had been supported in the five development regions of the country, involving multiple partners. Nepal had included child labour in the national Poverty Reduction Strategy Paper (PRSP) and a national steering committee was in place. In brief, Nepal was fully committed to action against child labour, with the support from ILO-IPEC and the donor community. The main preoccupations of the country were related to ensuring effective implementation of the programme, guaranteeing sustainability and reducing poverty as a means for eliminating child labour.
14. *The Government representative of the United States* thanked the Office for the report and commended ILO-IPEC for the progress in supporting the global campaign against child labour. The United States contributed to the implementation of Convention No. 182, as shown by the funding of seven new Time-Bound Programmes and the support to the internal capacity of IPEC on programme design, implementation and evaluation. Increased coherence and synergy with other ILO programme areas would be welcomed. The Government representative of the United States expressed concerns on the structure and methodology of the upcoming IPEC evaluation, including its short timeframe and scarce resources. The five days to provide comments as part of the consultative process for the preparation of terms of reference were not sufficient. The number of case studies and site visits was inadequate to ensure a credible generalization of findings. Finally, the United States Government representative commended ILO-IPEC on the preparation of the *Time-Bound Programme Manual for Action Planning*.
15. *A representative of the Workers' group* (the Chairperson of the Governing Body Workers' group) felt that the video showed at the beginning of the session did not reflect the value of work with trade unions and employers. Tripartite initiatives should contribute to raise awareness on child labour issues; what was lacking was information on ILO-IPEC's effort to remove the scourge of the worst forms of child labour. As an example, in the region of the Caribbean, there was no support by donors to combat specific worst forms of child labour, such as the involvement of children in pornography, drugs dealing and prostitution. Donors should see trade unions as partners in the same way as ILO did, since its objectives were the same. Trade unions were not exclusive partners, but had complementary functions that underpinned the working of IPEC, some of which were related to collective bargaining. Trade unions were the moral conscience of society and champions of health and safety at the workplace. The World Congress of Former Child Labourers, to be organized in Italy by the Global March and Italian trade unions in 2004, was an example of possible collaboration. Employers and trade unions would play an integral role in this exercise to give voice to former child labourers and to advocate for transforming government commitments into action programmes.
16. *The Government representative of Argentina* expressed satisfaction at the quality of the report. Synergies with programmes in areas such as education and health developed by other United Nations agencies should be expanded. The report should have mentioned as an example the subregional programme that was being developed in the MERCOSUR region with IPEC's support. This programme had produced very relevant outputs such as a manual for labour inspectors, and a regional plan against child labour was under way.
17. *The Government representative of the Netherlands* welcomed the informative report, especially for its focus on the importance of education (non-formal, formal and vocational training) for the elimination of child labour. This was in line with the priorities of the development cooperation policy of the Netherlands, namely basic education – within the framework of Education for All – and HIV/AIDS. The Government representative encouraged IPEC to structure its cooperation with other agencies. The Understanding Children's Work (UCW) project implemented by the ILO, the

World Bank and UNICEF, was a step in the right direction. IPEC had visibility for its potential contribution to the Millennium Development Goals, so more attention should be devoted to these through the Time-Bound Programmes. Mainstreaming HIV/AIDS into all IPEC activities should be a priority for the future. A concern was raised about the evaluation of IPEC, which should be done correctly rather than quickly.

18. *The Government representative of Egypt* congratulated IPEC for its efforts against child labour and thanked donor countries for their continuous support. IPEC has continued to encourage ratifications, but it was more important to help countries to implement them, giving priority to the urgent elimination of the worst forms of child labour and the supply of alternative solutions to children and families. The Government representative noted that IPEC should strengthen collaboration with the World Bank and UNICEF, as well as with other ILO units, and should keep promoting the mainstreaming of child labour into PRSPs. Egypt encouraged IPEC to continue decentralization, monitoring and evaluation. Egypt was committed to the elimination of child labour at the highest political level. Egypt had launched awareness-raising campaigns as well as social protection measures, while integrating child labour issues into development, employment and education policies. Egypt regretted the reduction of IPEC budget for activities in the country.
19. *The Employer representative of India* expressed his concerns on three areas: (1) the IPEC International Steering Committee was an important instrument and should meet more than once a year to have greater impact on the work of IPEC; (2) numerous related efforts outside of IPEC should be recognized and perhaps could make a second volume of the report; (3) IPEC should be careful in entrusting projects to committed individuals, as without dedicated support at the country level the programme was bound to suffer from improper implementation. The Employer representative added that, in view of its importance, vocational training needed to be expanded in coordination with other departments of the ILO and social organizations. Resource allocation and collaboration with social partners was essential – employers' organizations and trade unions should be given opportunities to better serve the cause in the future.
20. *The Government representative of Italy* congratulated IPEC on the report that showed positive results. Italy reaffirmed the importance of the collaboration between the EU and the ILO, reinforced during the Italian presidency of the EU. The Italian representative referred to the Lucca meeting in September 2003, at which the priority to continue supporting the ILO in this combat had been reiterated. During the Lucca meeting the Italian presidency invited the ILO to present its programme. The Government representative stated that to guarantee a more effective impact, accurate monitoring and evaluation had to be enforced. Mr. Tapiola acknowledged the great value of the Lucca Declaration.
21. *The Government representative of the Dominican Republic* thanked IPEC and the Office for the report and showed appreciation for the donors' support to activities in the country. The Government representative provided information on the development of the Time-Bound Programme in the Dominican Republic, which was also supported by the education initiative funded by the United States Department of Labor. The objectives of this initiative were to make school more relevant and attractive and to facilitate access to the educational system. It included improvements in school infrastructure and teachers' training. The Government also offered additional benefits such as the "school card", the provision of breakfast, uniforms and materials to children, as well as transportation. The Dominican Republic was proud to be one of the 102 countries that had ratified both child labour Conventions.
22. *The Government representative of Germany* was pleased about the good and constructive cooperation with IPEC. Germany would continue to support IPEC, but regretted that no additional funding comparable with previous years would be possible. Funding would be allocated to projects in Central and Eastern Europe and Central Asia in the sectors of trafficking and the worst forms of child labour. An amount of 2 million euros from interest revenues could be used by the projects in the Central Asian countries. The Government representative appreciated the evaluation of the IPEC programme. Integration of IPEC within the ILO was extremely important, especially the integration to the field structures. Close cooperation with the World Bank and the United Nations youth employment network was called for. The Government representative raised two questions: how many IPEC staff were paid from regular budget resources?; how much of the 13 per cent overhead returned to IPEC?
23. *The Government representative of India* congratulated the Office on the report. The Government of India was concerned with child labour in the country. Under the Ninth Five-Year Plan, US\$40 million had been devoted to an action plan against child labour. Under the Plan, more than

US\$100 million was devoted to this end. More than 200 districts would be targeted in the next five years. Child labour elimination efforts would go hand in hand with the provision of basic education to all children who were currently not at school. The efforts carried out by IPEC in India were of a smaller scale (IPEC had provided US\$5 million over a period of ten years). The evaluation of IPEC should make clear whether its focus was placed on IPEC's activities or on the larger efforts of the Government of India. If it was the former, it should also make clear that this would constitute a limited evaluation.

24. *The Worker representative of the United Republic of Tanzania* commended the Office since IPEC has been able to fulfil its mandate, especially in the area of the girl child. She also commended donor countries and those that had decided to commit resources to address the problem, especially the United States and Germany for funding IPEC programmes in the United Republic of Tanzania. IPEC should intensify its efforts towards countries under civil war with continuous collaboration and funding from donors.
25. *The Government representative of Canada* congratulated IPEC on the comprehensive report and on the improvement of the programme delivery rate. Canada would continue working with IPEC. The Government representative welcomed IPEC focus and work with other international organizations towards including child labour in the international agenda. Sectoral alliances were considered a positive development. However, greater efforts would be needed to build relations with national and international agencies, especially in the context of the Time-Bound Programmes. Improvements in programme management and evaluation, including dissemination of lessons learned and good practices, as well as the establishment of country teams and IPEC focal points to enhance coordination, were also noted as positive developments. The Government representative suggested increasing coordination within the ILO and wider dissemination of results of research and products. The ongoing evaluation of IPEC was considered very important; however, concerns on limited scope, timeframe and resources were also raised, since this affected the credibility of the evaluation results.
26. *The Government representative of the United Kingdom* insisted that the elimination of child labour should be a key part of national development frameworks. The ILO should play a role in mainstreaming child labour issues in development policies. The move to more upstream work would require training in new skills. The evaluation of IPEC should analyse the capacity of the programme to move away from discrete projects, as well as the process used to disseminate good practices. Agreeing with the United States, the Netherlands and Canada, the United Kingdom Government representative reiterated the importance of devoting sufficient time and resources for the evaluation of IPEC.
27. *The Government representative of Indonesia* gave an account of the Government's efforts to eliminate child labour, especially its worst forms, and thanked IPEC for its financial and technical cooperation. There were extensive legislation and social plans dealing with child labour and specific forms of child labour – such as sexual exploitation and trafficking of children – in the country. There was also a national committee including governmental agencies, NGOs, social partners and academics. Indonesia was about to start a Time-Bound Programme in five sectors. In conclusion, the Government reaffirmed its commitment and welcomed technical assistance for implementing the programmes successfully.
28. *The Government representative of Finland* congratulated the Office specifically on the inclusion of the discussion on education and child labour in the thematic part of the report. This issue was central in the cooperation policy of Finland. The move towards bigger scale projects was also welcomed, especially the development of Time-Bound Programmes. The Government representative raised the following question: were there already conclusions on the effectiveness and sustainability of such programmes that could be used for future work? Cooperation between ILO-IPEC and relevant agencies should be increased and coordination at the country level should be strengthened so as to avoid duplication and promote synergies. The ILO should take advantage of the expertise of UNICEF and its network of partners at the country level. Finland's support to IPEC had been strong since 1998; it was currently funding interventions in the Russian Federation. The Government representative expressed the wish to be better informed on improvements in these programmes. Finland warmly welcomed the upcoming evaluation of IPEC, including the participatory approach that could prove to be very fruitful. Concerns on the short time planned for the evaluation and other details were also expressed. The findings of the evaluation should provide tools for the International Steering Committee.

29. *The Government representative of Turkey* expressed his thanks for the report. He said that IPEC had become one of the most important programmes of the ILO, and extended his congratulations to the Director-General and the entire IPEC team. He referred to the large-scale IPEC-supported programme in Turkey, ending in March 2004. The results of the programme were encouraging, and illustrated that the programme was an example of how a Time-Bound Programme could be effective. He said that an extension of the programme of three years had now been agreed upon, and he thanked the Governments of Germany and the United States for their continued support. He underlined that all the relevant ministries would continue to consult with non-governmental organizations and stakeholders concerning the implementation of the programme.
30. *The Government representative of Brazil* congratulated IPEC for its comprehensive report and reaffirmed the commitment of the Brazilian Government. He also thanked the United States and Germany for their contributions and encouraged the continuation of support.
31. *The Government representative of Switzerland* expressed her gratitude for the quality of the report. She welcomed the clarification indicating that IPEC did not consider all kinds of work child labour, as illustrated in section 1.1.1 of the report. She emphasized the importance of effectively informing and communicating this in the context of Conventions Nos. 182 and 138 to avoid misunderstanding. She also appreciated the information given in the report on relations with the OECD, and was pleased to note the useful study on costs and benefits of eliminating child labour. She also positively noted the intention of the Office to publish in 2005 a manual of good legislative practices in eliminating child labour.
32. *The representative of UNICEF* reported that UNICEF continued to partner with IPEC at all levels, from international to national, and policy to project levels. UNICEF shared the priority placed on the linkage between education and the fight against child labour. In this regard, he referred to the important international meeting, taking place later in November in New Delhi, on the Education for All Initiative, hopefully followed by a larger UNESCO conference in 2004. He expressed his satisfaction with the cooperation achieved in the garment industry project in Bangladesh. He further noted that more work was necessary to integrate child labour concerns in the Millennium Development Goals and that an evaluation by UNICEF of 20 PRSPs indicated that child labour so far was insufficiently addressed in most of those papers.
33. *The representative of the ECLT Foundation* (Eliminating Child Labour in Tobacco Growing) was encouraged to see the growing impact of IPEC in programmes aimed at eliminating child labour in the tobacco industry and thanked IPEC for its support to the ECLT board. He mentioned that the aim of the Foundation was to target child labour in the tobacco sector and to offer alternatives, as part of a wider approach to basic labour standards. He referred to programmes in Indonesia, the Dominican Republic and a special study in the United Republic of Tanzania, which was integrated into the Time-Bound Programme in that country.
34. *The representative of the International Confectionery Association*, representing the International Cocoa Initiative, emphasized how pleased the Initiative was in cooperating with IPEC. He said that the Initiative supported IPEC's work in the cocoa sector in West Africa. He congratulated IPEC on its report, and noted that as an observer coming from the private sector he was impressed by IPEC's work and results.
35. *Mr. Tapiola* thanked everyone for their support. He agreed that earlier submission of the report to all concerned was desirable, in all languages, but that it was not easy since the work of the report coincided with the reporting on end-of-the-year results before final accounts were available. He said that efforts would in the future be made for the more timely submission of the report. He also noted that the mandatory cut in size of 25 per cent on all Office documents had not been implemented in respect of the IPEC report, since its production was not funded out of the regular means of the Organization. The timing of the International Steering Committee meetings was a long-standing question to which thus far the perfect answer had not been found. The questions of whether a whole day should be allocated to the meeting, and whether it should take place in March or November, would be studied – seeking the Committee's guidance – as well as how possible answers would interact with the work of the Governing Body's Committee on Technical Cooperation. In this regard, Mr. Tapiola referred to the current discussion in the Governing Body on changes to the work and composition of the Governing Body, where the issues of the International Steering Committee's meetings could be brought up. There was clearly a reluctance to do away with a forum where IPEC donors and participating countries would meet, and this was the original intention of the International Steering Committee's creation.

36. A detailed list could be produced of NGOs which had participated in IPEC programmes. However, many activities were carried out jointly with many actors, and budgets did not reflect the way in which funds had been distributed between participating organizations. As to the calls for increased cooperation with ACTRAV and ACT/EMP, he noted that there had been several meetings to achieve this, but more had to be done. On the call for more synergy between IPEC and the ILO, he stated that this was a goal that had been actively pursued but needed perhaps more clarification. He said that it was logical and necessary to enhance cooperation with other departments, for example with SafeWork, on hazardous child labour. On the question of adequate resources, he said that since the introduction of InFocus Programme status, both IPEC and DECLARATION had been given regular budget posts and allocation in the programme and budget. In response to the Government representative of France regarding the translation of "ILO" as "IPEC" on page 4 of the French version of the report, he confirmed that this was the result of a translation error. The question of dividing up resources between the various departments was never an easy question, but he said the Office was doing the best it could with the available resources. However, no increases should be anticipated in the coming biennium. Turning to the reservations expressed by some on the short nature of the evaluation and the lack of representative studies, he said he understood the concerns but pointed out that there had also been calls in the past for a quicker evaluation. In any event, the only suggestion he could make was to take this dialogue to the evaluation team itself. In reply to the concern expressed by the Government representative of India that the report only reflected IPEC's work but not the efforts made by government as a whole, he admitted that this was the case, but that the report, as well as the Global Report, were primarily intended to evaluate Office action.
37. *Mr. Röselaers* expressed his appreciation for the positive comments on the quality of the report, in particular from representatives of the Employers' and Workers' groups, as well as from many Governments. He also thanked all colleagues who had contributed to writing the report but said that there was of course no excuse for the error contained in the French version of the report. He announced that the Time-Bound Programme manual would shortly be presented in different languages. Regarding the concerns raised about the cooperation between IPEC, ACTRAV and ACT/EMP, he acknowledged that more could and should be done, locally and internationally, including through sectoral alliances. In this context, he was hopeful to obtain further support from the Government of Norway. He highlighted some of the initiatives that had been undertaken this year, including briefings with liaison services; the production of joint guidelines; a workshop on education and child labour; a programming workshop with employers in Turin (May); and a trade union conference in Kathmandu (February). He said that more work was also needed to focus on the special situation of girls, and that IPEC had arranged for a gender audit to be carried out before the end of 2003. As to sectoral alliances, he was pleased with the positive response received. He emphasized that there were "rules of engagement" for working with the private sector, which included consultation with workers and employers, as well as the policy to work only with larger alliances. On inter-agency cooperation, IPEC worked to enhance cooperation with the World Bank, UNICEF and UNESCO – for example in the context of the "Education for All Initiative". On staffing and resources, the Committee was informed that at present 15 posts (three General Service and 12 Professional posts) were funded from the regular budget, and ten (seven General Service and three Professional posts) by Programme Support Income, making 25 in all out of a total of some 440 staff worldwide. IPEC staff worked in 45 different locations, 70 at headquarters (of which 70 per cent women) and 370 in the field (60 per cent women), making for a decentralization degree of 80 per cent.
38. *The IPEC Director for Policy Development and Advocacy* thanked the representatives for their contributions and addressed a number of questions raised by them. In response to questions from the representative of the Netherlands and the Employers' group, regarding integration of HIV/AIDS concerns in IPEC programmes, she stated that IPEC was working closely on this with UNAIDS and studies already carried out were benefiting from this collaboration. Southern Africa was mentioned as an example where systematic efforts were being made to mainstream HIV/AIDS concerns into child labour policies and programmes with a great potential in terms of replication. Regarding a question raised by the Worker representative on the school-based surveys carried out by SIMPOC, she indicated that this activity aimed mainly at shedding light on the difficult issue of sorting out light work from child labour and would further assist policy-makers and programmes in fine tuning their actions. With regard to the French representative's question about the status of SIMPOC studies in West Africa, she explained that the countries listed in the report were those where the preparatory phase was completed and hoped that the required information would be presented in the next report. She thanked donors for their support of specific programmes located in the policy branch, including efforts at increasing ratifications, research such as the cost and benefits analysis,

the collection and analysis of data, the “Red Card to Child Labour” campaign, and SCREAM; but she emphasized the pressing need expressed in the report for continued resources to carry out such activities that were critical to the success of IPEC.

39. *The IPEC Director for Operations* said that most points raised had already been addressed by his colleagues. Regarding the enhanced efficiency and delivery rate, he noted that in the last year IPEC had worked particularly hard to achieve improvements. IPEC’s planning and staff structure at the country level had also been strengthened through a focal point system which facilitated integration with other ILO programmes such as the Decent Work Agenda. The recent completion of the web-enabled Programme Operations Manual included many new streamlined procedures, which would in the future permit better decentralization. He noted that, while there had been a substantial increase in allocations and absolute delivery, there had been no staff increases implying there had been efficiency gains. He cautioned however that there were limits and that further efficiency gains would most likely be modest. The TBP MAP was one of the examples of tools and guidelines being developed by IPEC to facilitate more upstream policy work. He also referred to the increasing synergy with other ILO programmes such as SafeWork, IFP/SKILLS and IFP/CRISIS. Concerning the figures provided in Annex B of the report, he said that these did not give a detailed picture. In the larger action programmes implemented by government agencies, there existed extensive components of work undertaken by workers’ and employers’ organizations, and those were not reflected in the figures.