



FOURTH ITEM ON THE AGENDA

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

As in previous years, the report on the operational aspects of IPEC is made up of the following appendices:

- Appendix I: IPEC action against child labour: Highlights 2004;
- Appendix II: Summary record of the fourteenth meeting of the IPEC International Steering Committee, 11 November 2004.

Geneva, 12 January 2005.

*Submitted for information.*

## **Appendix I**

### **IPEC action against child labour: Highlights 2004**

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 fourteenth meeting of the IPEC International Steering Committee (11 November 2004)

1. The fourteenth meeting of the IPEC International Steering Committee (ISC) was held at the International Labour Office, Geneva, on 11 November 2004 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 was pleased to note that a good number of representatives from participating countries, Workers and Employers, and other partners attended the meeting. He expressed his gratitude to the participants for the confidence placed in the IPEC team and the ILO in general.
3. *Mr. Tapiola* drew the attention of the Committee to some landmark events and achievements: (1) the publication of the study “Investing in every child: An economic study on the costs and benefits of eliminating child labour”; (2) the publication on child domestic labour, called “Helping hands or shackled lives? Understanding child domestic labour and responses to it”, which was extensively debated on the World Day against Child Labour on 12 June, celebrated this year for the third time; and (3) the Red Card campaign, which, among others, was active during the 2004 Asian football games. The number of ratifications of Conventions Nos. 138 and 182 currently stood at 135 (up five from last year) and 150 (up three from last year), respectively. The pace of ratifications has slowed down, but this had been anticipated. When aiming for universal ratification, it was to be expected that the last ones would be more difficult. *Mr. Tapiola* referred to the major evaluation of IPEC that had been carried out by PROGRAM. This evaluation had been discussed that morning at the PFA Committee of the Governing Body. In preparing the Programme and Budget proposals for the 2006-07 biennium, the Director-General was proposing a closer integration of the ILO’s work on child labour and other fundamental labour rights. Further mainstreaming would result in efficiency gains, more coherence and better assistance offered.
4. The agenda of the meeting was approved as proposed.
5. The record of proceedings of the thirteenth meeting of the Steering Committee (held on 10 November 2003) was approved without comments.
6. *Mr. Röselaers*, Director of the International Programme on the Elimination of Child Labour, expressed his gratitude to the 88 participating countries and 30 donor countries. He informed the participants that the facts and figures of the mid-term report (“IPEC action against child labour: Highlights 2004”) should be considered provisional, as the year had not yet ended. The target of direct beneficiaries, set at 300,000, would be reached or exceeded. The number of ratifications of the child labour Conventions had been modest. He noted that several countries were considering ratification and that some may complete the ratification process soon. Overall, 209 ratifications of the two Conventions had been registered since the adoption of Convention No. 182 on 12 June 1999. These ratifications explained, in part, the continued high demand for assistance by IPEC, which was now working in close to 90 countries. Programme delivery in 2004 was projected at US\$54 million. Progress continued in the programme delivery rate, which went from 30 per cent in 1999 to 66 per cent in 2003 and it was expected that in 2004 that same rate (66 per cent) or a somewhat higher figure would be achieved. He noted that there had been much support for implementing time-bound programmes (TBPs) and that IPEC was implementing 19 TBPs in 2004, up from three in 2001.
7. *Mr. Röselaers* noted that particular attention has been given to integration with other departments, in areas such as youth employment, hazardous child labour, trafficking, forced labour, and employers’ and workers’ activities. With regard to methodologies for research, two manuals for SIMPOC had been reviewed extensively by the SIMPOC External Advisory Committee and tested in cooperation with other UN agencies. The publication of “Investing in every child” has also been discussed with outside partners, most notably in a round-table meeting with the chief economist of the World Bank. *Mr. Röselaers* pointed out a number of cross-cutting issues covered in the report. Child labour played a substantive role in supporting the recommendations made by the World Commission on the Social Dimension of Globalization. He also referred to the section in the

implementation report on Africa and to the work done on impact assessment methodologies. With regard to management improvements, he mentioned the efforts made to decentralize selected functions from headquarters to the regional and field structures. Some 250 IPEC staff had received training in 2004 through four seminars with the assistance of the ILO International Training Centre in Turin. IPEC had also participated in preparatory work for the introduction of IRIS in order to alleviate bottlenecks in budgeting, contracting and procurement. *Mr. Röselaers* informed the participants that global advocacy for action against child labour had been actively pursued in 2004. To this effect, IPEC had organized the celebration of World Day against Child labour on 12 June 2004, which focused on child domestic labour, and had continued the use of the Red Card to Child Labour Campaign in major football events. The campaign on Supporting Children's Rights through Education, the Arts and the Media (SCREAM), had been taken up by many institutions and groups, among others, Education International, the Global Forum and the World Organization of the Scout Movement. *Mr. Röselaers* expressed his hope that IPEC would continue to receive guidance from its partners during the debate in order to help reduce child labour and, especially, eradicate the worst forms of child labour as quickly and completely as possible.

8. *The spokesperson for the Workers' group* expressed his gratitude to donors and to IPEC staff for contributing to the endeavour to make the commitment to eradicate child labour a reality. He said that the Workers' theme for this meeting would be "Investing in IPEC", signalling to the Committee, Employers, and especially donors, that workers and their representatives had more than an academic interest in removing child labour. He wanted to move beyond IPEC's implementation report and also discuss wider issues. He expressed his satisfaction with the report which was excellent and thoughtful. However, one major constraint was the status of IPEC staff, of which only a small number were permanent ILO officials. He noted that this was a great concern to the Workers, namely that a programme spending US\$90 million for children around the world, was faced with such limited staffing constraints. He expressed his concern on the solution adopted by IPEC of relying on short-term contracts for its staff, unequipped to fight entrenched employers' interests and defend the rights of children. Another approach should be taken, putting seasoned activists and advocates in field positions, and having seasoned campaigners dealing with matters such as child prostitution. In this regard, the approach that donors had towards short-term funding was well intentioned but failed to achieve the intended objectives. He suggested to the donors to reinvest from a different perspective in IPEC, for example through donations over three years with annual evaluation exercises, which would enable the recruitment of seasoned officers among Workers and Employers to be attached to IPEC for the duration of three years through secondment. With regard to training, he expressed his concern that with six-month contracts, training of one or two weeks for staff members was insufficient. IPEC should strive to find people who already had some elemental training in this kind of activism and participation in campaigns. He suggested that it might be desirable to hold a reassessment, perhaps in Turin, to review IPEC totally, to set up the appropriate kind of monitoring required for the kind of in-depth relationship between IPEC at headquarters and in the field, and cooperation with governments, workers and employers, and NGOs.
9. *The spokesperson for the Workers' group* also expressed his concern about the false perception that by concentrating on the worst forms of child labour, the ILO was saying that child labour no longer mattered as long as it did not occur in its worst forms. Even though false, this perception sometimes took root and needed to be dispelled. With regard to the monitoring of programmes, he suggested that Employers and Workers should play a part. He noted that NGOs received funding and support, while Employers and Workers seemed to be given inadequate attention. At headquarters there was insufficient consultation with ACTRAV. He asked for the report to be published as early as possible and sent to the participants before arriving in Geneva. He enumerated several specific proposals. Firstly, while commending the World Congress on Child Labour organized in Italy by the Government, and the Global March, he suggested that the ILO should review the outcomes, and endeavour to see the extent to which it could assist the process by being part of any follow-up. Secondly, he proposed InFocus persons, coordinators, mentors, selected in consultation with the Employers and Workers, to be sent to work in countries to identify worker and employer activists to work with them as trainers and coordinators in the field on pilot projects.
10. *The spokesperson for the Employers' group* congratulated IPEC on the report, the Spanish version of which unfortunately had become available only at a late stage, and expressed the hope that it would be issued earlier in future. He also expressed the Employers' gratitude to the evaluation team. The evaluation report had met their expectations: it revealed IPEC's strengths and weaknesses and mentioned some areas for improvement. Regarding the International Steering Committee (ISC) and

the recommendation about its functions, this Committee should function as a consultative body, an important forum for exchanging information and opinions. He listed five items of importance to the Employers. Firstly, while he agreed on the necessity of research (Chapter 1, page 4), he was worried about the approach shown in the following sentence “*to see why employers prefer children to adults, particularly for some types of work*”. This sentence undervalued the commitment and actions taking by employers to combat child labour. Regarding adolescents between 14 and 18 years of age, it was important to mention that there were areas where more protection was needed. Any attempt to reduce employment on this group had to include measures to improve the family’s income and to enrol children in the education system. If not, IPEC’s work could even worsen the problem by withdrawing children from formal work and letting them work in the informal sector of the economy.

11. Secondly, the *spokesperson for the Employers’ group* expressed the need for additional funds in order to improve and strengthen the fight against child labour. He favoured more collaboration with employers’ and workers’ organizations and the accompanying increased budget for activities. He wanted to know what organizations were implementing projects and for what budget. This could be included in an appendix to the next report. Thirdly, he emphasized the need for analysing extra-budgetary resources, pointing to the risk of relying too heavily on extra-budgetary means. Fourthly, it was essential to make impact assessments. On this point, effective evaluation should be done by IPEC and its partners. He encouraged IPEC to develop effective evaluation processes to learn about its successes and to publish the results. Lastly, he mentioned the relationship between child labour and the social dimension of globalization. He stressed the need for follow-up and for integration of the objectives of the World Commission on the Social Dimension of Globalization into IPEC.
12. *The Government representative of Sweden* reiterated the great importance Sweden attached to the fight against child labour, which was illustrated by its support to IPEC. With regard to Part VI 21(b) of the terms of reference (*Review evidence of direct and indirect effects on target groups*) for the evaluation by PROGRAM, the evaluation report did not live up to those requirements. The Government representative stressed the importance of impact measurements. Out of 246 million children in labour, the target group reached amounted to only 300,000 children. It was necessary to raise the ambitions. She asked for a clarification of geographical choices. In addition, she asked when the target of the implementation rate, set at 66 per cent would be reached. With regard to the report she asked for a better and more detailed representation of budget allocation and earmarking for each donor, proposing to take guidance from a recent model developed by the Office of the High Commissioner for Human Rights (OHCHR). She also asked for the status of the priority attached to the girl child.
13. *The Government representative of Brazil* expressed his country’s gratitude to IPEC for the report. Brazil had been in close cooperation with IPEC on a number of projects, and after ten years, real improvements could be witnessed. The Government representative enumerated several achievements, such as the Plan of Action, the Brazilian Programme to Eliminate Child Labour (PETI) and the start of a TBP in September 2003 in five selected States. He encouraged donors to keep supporting IPEC.
14. *The Government representative of Switzerland* welcomed the report. She expressed her concern on the structure and organization of the International Steering Committee and recalled the recommendation made in the evaluation of IPEC to the Governing Body, in point 18(c) to “propose a redefinition of its name, purpose and terms of reference for confirmation by the Governing Body”.<sup>1</sup> She asked for the way forward with regard to this recommendation. She said that the World Day against Child Labour did not have a sufficiently high profile during the 2004 International Labour Conference and that child labour had not been put centre stage during the Conference.
15. *The Government representative of Nepal* expressed his appreciation for the clear report, which gave a good update on IPEC activities. He saw the collaboration with other departments within the ILO as a positive signal. The Government representative encouraged donors to keep on sustaining programmes. He listed measures taken in Nepal in the fight against child labour, among which the TBP, the national plan on education, the master plan on child labour, and several action programmes under the TBP. He noted that challenges existed because of the insurgency, but that the

<sup>1</sup> GB.291/PFA/11.

TBP was active in 22 districts. He expressed his gratitude to IPEC and donors, in particular USDOL, Germany and Italy.

16. *The Government representative of the Netherlands* noted the excellent report and reiterated the commitment of the Netherlands to the elimination of child labour worldwide, a struggle that needed to continue. She was pleased with the focus on education in child labour programmes and noted that education is one of the four pillars of the Netherlands' development cooperation policy. She encouraged IPEC to step up work on HIV/AIDS, being an aggravating circumstance of child labour in many countries. She expressed her concern on the over-reliance on *voluntary* donor contributions.
17. *The Government representative of Argentina* congratulated the Office for the clarity of the report. Regarding the thematic activities around the celebration of the World Day against Child Labour and the concern of Switzerland, in MERCOSUR this celebration had been a matter of active regional involvement, in which the participation of IPEC had been indispensable.
18. *The Government representative of Canada* expressed her gratitude for a comprehensive report and reiterated her Government's support for the work of IPEC. She expressed the need to mainstream child labour into other international institutions, such as the Millennium Development Goals and she also stressed the need to improve dialogue with other ILO departments. She said that IPEC, being over ten years old, was now at a turning point and that it was appropriate to take into account the recent evaluation.
19. *The Government representative of Indonesia* gave an account of progress made by numerous projects, workshops and other activities held in the country in the fight against child labour.
20. *The Government representative of the Dominican Republic* complimented the Office on the quality of the report and expressed his gratitude to the donors. He noted that the first cause of child labour was poverty. In this regard, he emphasized the poverty alleviation projects in the country, such as the creation of jobs through "social plans". He informed the Committee of the recent approval of a prohibition of hazardous forms of child labour, as incorporated in resolution 52/2004, recently adopted in the country. He furthermore noted the focus in the country on projects against child labour in agriculture.
21. *A representative of the Employers' group (Mr. Anand)* made four points. Firstly, he expressed the need to link IPEC with other programmes such as IFP/SEED and IFP/SKILLS, in order to ensure the integration of children into proper vocational work. Secondly, he criticized the approach to research that placed too much emphasis on examining the causes of child labour, as it was clear since 1995 that poverty was the main cause. Thirdly, he pointed out that child labour was part of the cultural atmosphere and suggested that to eliminate child labour, awareness raising and education should be improved. Lastly, he suggested holding "on-the-spot evaluations" on a sample and tripartite basis.
22. *The Government representative of the United States* congratulated IPEC on the quality of the report. Her Government was supporting IPEC and was pleased to contribute to its work. She stated that impact evaluation was important to measure effectiveness, and welcomed the IPEC evaluation and tracer studies.
23. *The Government representative of the Philippines* expressed her gratitude for the support of the donors and stressed the importance of having the ILO's assistance.
24. *The Government representative of the United Kingdom* welcomed the report. She stressed that there should be further clarification on how funds were spent and she encouraged more cooperation with other UN agencies. She requested more information about IPEC's capacity-building efforts at the country level.
25. *A representative of the Workers' group (Mr. Steyne)* stated that there should have been a specific section concerned with the girl child. He further emphasized that the report should be received earlier in the future and stressed the need to improve strategic management. He put forward three further points. Firstly, referring to paragraph 1.4.2 of the report, he mentioned that consultations were under way between ACTRAV and ACT/EMP and he looked forward to the publication of the guidelines facilitating the involvement of social partners in national programmes and activities. Secondly, he emphasized the importance of IPEC investing more efforts in working with multinational enterprises and in assisting them in the way this was done in the cases of the tobacco and cocoa industries. He also stressed the existence of genuine misunderstandings among activists on child labour, and the impression held by many that the ILO was only targeting the worst forms of child labour. In response to the remarks of an Employer representative, he stated that poverty as the

cause of child labour was too simplistic. Other factors in eliminating child labour included political will, free education and the payment of taxes by the wealthy. Moreover, he noted that the pursuit of universal education and action against child labour needed to go hand in hand and that neither could be reached without the other. He suggested that it be made clear that the ILO also works on non-hazardous forms of child labour and that Conventions Nos. 138 and 182 were interlinked. As a final note, he proposed to rephrase the executive summary by adding “as the priority in the campaign for the total elimination of child labour” to the last sentence on page 3 of the implementation report.

26. *The Government representative of Kenya* congratulated IPEC on the good report and stated that Kenya had been one of the first countries to welcome IPEC activities. He expressed his gratitude to the donors and various programmes in Kenya. He gave a brief summary of the action programmes and IPEC projects in the country and stated that remarkable achievements had been made, among them the ratification of Convention No. 182 (having already ratified Convention No. 138), a national child labour policy, the installation of universal free primary education, a street children rehabilitation programme, labour law reform, and a preparatory national TBP.
27. *The Government representative of Germany* extended her gratitude for the report. She stated that Germany had contributed for 14 years to IPEC and had been an engine behind the Programme. When the Programme was launched, few countries were willing to co-finance it. IPEC had now evolved into a magnificent programme. She called on all participants to continue to work together in the fight against child labour.
28. *The representative of the ECLT (Eliminating Child Labour in Tobacco Growing) Foundation* expressed his gratitude for the report and stated that the Foundation had initiated projects in Africa, the Philippines and would soon start work in Mexico and Tajikistan. He stated that the Foundation’s financial commitment would continue in 2005. He expressed his deep concern over the rumour that some commercial agricultural programmes will end in eastern and southern Africa due to a lack of funds.
29. *The representative of the International Confectionery Association (ICA)*, representing the global chocolate industry, welcomed the report. He stressed the value of IPEC advice to the sectoral alliance and of its project interventions in the supply chain of cocoa and stated that it was a good example of cooperation with industry and social partners.
30. *The representative of UNICEF* expressed his hope for further enhancing partnership and collaboration with IPEC in the future. He stated that the report contained many lessons for child protection. He noted that UNICEF and IPEC were working together in some 70 countries. He stressed the importance of mainstreaming child labour goals in the Millennium Development Goals (MDGs). He reaffirmed UNICEF’s commitment on projects such as Understanding Children’s Work and hoped to continue to go forward. Despite all efforts, a disconnection still existed between child labour and primary education. He emphasized that a recent evaluation of UNICEF programmes found that education could only be an effective alternative to child labour if it was accessible, of good quality, relevant, affordable, equal, safe and valued by the community itself. Drawing on experience in Bangladesh, six areas for ILO/UNICEF partnership had been identified, namely advocacy, country level action, research, harmonization of policy, cooperation with the Inter-Parliamentary Union (IPU) and private sector and a better coordination between, for example, the Committee on the Rights of the Child and the ILO Committee of Experts on the Application of Conventions and Recommendations. He looked forward to continued cooperation with IPEC in 2005.
31. *The Government representative of Paraguay* thanked IPEC for the report and for the constant support to country and regional projects. He said that Paraguay had ratified Convention No. 138 and expressed his gratitude to IPEC and donor countries for their financial contribution.
32. *The spokesperson of the Employers’ group* sought a point of clarification from the Workers, referring to their concern that the excessive focus was on the worst forms of child labour. Last year, it had been agreed that a distinction had to be made between child labour in general and its worst forms. He asked for the Worker representative to further clarify their concern.
33. *The representative of the Workers’ group* stated that child labour was never morally permissible. Convention No. 138 made it clear that all child labour needed to be eliminated. The point the Workers wanted to make was that one first has to focus on the worst forms of child labour. These forms needed to be eliminated urgently and countries should do this through time-bound measures. He clarified that he had not intended to say that IPEC did not understand the difference, but that

there was sometimes a misrepresentation, deliberately or by mistake, that child labour would be all right for children under the age of 18 years.

34. *Mr. Tapiola* thanked participants for a rich discussion. He continued to be amazed by IPEC staff performance, which was an example to the entire ILO. However, although IPEC managed to deliver a large-size programme, it did so at the extreme limits of staff capabilities, which was taking its toll. In that regard, any possibility to put staffing on a more secure financial basis would be very welcome. Being a small programme, when it was started by Germany's enthusiasm, IPEC was now one of the major priorities of the ILO. Although some increase in resources had been possible, perhaps not enough of the regular budget could be allocated to IPEC due to the zero-growth budget overall. This situation was unlikely to change, making IPEC rely heavily on donors. IPEC did not voluntarily rely on short-term personnel, but this situation was due to the insecurity of funds. However, IPEC did have a good and dedicated core staff of Professionals. As regards the discussion between the Employers and Workers concerning what IPEC actually was to eliminate, he referred to the Global Report of 2002, which had aimed at demystifying this question. In perspective, 12 years ago, before IPEC was created, Convention No. 138 was considered obsolete by some constituents, and it had less than 50 ratifications. Now its significance was evident due to the accelerated pace of ratifications, and its potential had been brought out, making the combination with Convention No. 182 a success. During the discussions in the Conference Resolutions Committee in 1996, it had become possible to explain that the urgent eradication of the worst forms of child labour and the aim to eliminate all child labour fitted together. Appropriate language was found, and it also featured in the Preamble to Convention No. 182. This formula was the basis for action against child labour and it had to be reiterated time and again that the two Conventions were not contradictory but complementary.
35. *Mr. Tapiola* further mentioned that if any problems of miscommunication existed with ACTRAV and ACT/EMP, these would be worked out. IPEC was working with them, as with a number of NGOs. With regard to the recommendation of the PROGRAM evaluation to strengthen tripartite work and governance, he stated that the way in which Employers and Workers could be involved in delivery of actual work on the ground should indeed be further developed. Regarding the earlier delivery of the report, he stated that it was prepared as early as possible. However, the ILO's regular services and resources did not cover the production of the report and its translation. He confirmed the intention to improve the timely publication of the report. He shared some of the frustration on the present role of the ISC. He noted that the ISC was already linked to the Governing Body schedule and it had an increased tripartite structure. However, the manner in which the ISC would be further integrated into the Governing Body needed to be explored further. He also agreed that the World Day against Child Labour did not feature sufficiently at the 2004 International Labour Conference. He argued that a formula had to be found which would not disrupt normal ILC work too much. Any ideas to enhance the focus on the World Day against Child Labour would be welcome and looked into.
36. *Mr. Röselaers* said he would take to heart the remarks concerning the misunderstandings regarding IPEC's perceived role in combating child labour and its worst forms. Each opportunity to clarify this should be used. He noted however that this was in part due to IPEC's own success in capturing increased media attention and coverage of the issue of child labour. With regard to the suggestions regarding staff resources and training, he stated that these would be explored and discussed with Employers and Workers. He stressed the need for a sufficient core budget for research and legal work. With regard to the prioritization of work, he remarked that IPEC succeeded in matching demand and supply, although there were some blind spots, particularly funding for projects in the Caribbean region and the Central Asian Republics, which posed some problems, although donor countries had now stepped forward. The last blind spot concerned the Pacific, where no funds had yet been found. With regard to the girl child, he agreed that no specific chapter had been devoted to this issue in the report. However, 11 new publications had been released in 2004, the last one just three days ago on 8 November. He mentioned that 49 evaluations had been carried out in 2004 and that these were fully transparent and publicly available. With regard to HIV/AIDS, he noted that six studies had been carried out in southern and eastern Africa. IPEC was collaborating with UNICEF in coordinating forces on HIV/AIDS-affected children. *Mr. Röselaers* responded to the comment on the status of projects on commercial agriculture in southern and eastern Africa by informing the Committee that these projects would continue, but that a new approach had been taken. The projects would be incorporated in national programmes, such as TBPs.
37. *Mr. Guy Thijs*, IPEC Director for Operations, thanked the participants for their constructive comments and questions. On the issue of staff and capacity, he explained that IPEC was aware of

the scope to improve even further organizational and management practices. Following the introduction of the Programme Operations Manual in 2003, which streamlined and documented procedures, staff training was conducted for over 250 staff members in the regions during 2004. This type of training was very expensive and could only be held once every two years. He also noted that recruitment of staff in IPEC was a very rigorous and transparent process and that before being sent out to the field, newly recruited staff were immersed into a one-week training programme at headquarters. He stated that although project monitoring was being carried out by IPEC staff, the independent evaluation process included stakeholder meetings, at which Employers and Workers were present. With regard to the question on 300,000 beneficiaries of the Programme, he pointed out that in addition there was the target of 1 million children as indirect beneficiaries. He added that focusing on beneficiaries only was also not a sustainable strategy and more impact could be achieved by strengthening the capacity of member States to apply and bring IPEC experience to scale. Regarding impact assessment, he referred to tracer studies undertaken by IPEC. One such tracer study had been carried out in Turkey and showed that, looking at ex-beneficiaries (young adults presently), the work had had a very positive impact overall.

38. A *Worker representative (Mr. Steyne)* suggested the need for a more coherent IPEC approach on corporate social responsibility for multinational enterprises. On another issue, he reiterated that misunderstandings on the role of IPEC did exist, not among those present but in the field. Lastly, he stated that more intensive training should be provided for personnel, not just providing induction training for one week prior to leaving for the field.
39. *Mr. Tapiola* shared the concerns regarding the work overload and the need for proper training for the field and, indeed, all IPEC staff. Agreeing that the misunderstandings on IPEC's role were not shared in the building, he suggested that IPEC should try to enable ILO officials to counter these. He agreed that the issue of corporate social responsibility should have more emphasis. There being no other business under the final point of the agenda, *Mr. Tapiola* thanked all for their support, participation and contribution to the Meeting.