



SECOND ITEM ON THE AGENDA

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

1. At the 282nd Session (November 2001) of the Governing Body, the Committee on Technical Cooperation was apprised of the proceedings of the IPEC International Steering Committee's eleventh meeting, held on 5 November 2001, and agreed that a written report on the operational aspects of IPEC would be submitted to the Committee's meeting in March 2002, as in previous years.
2. The report on the Operational aspects of the International Programme on the Elimination of Child Labour is made up of the following appendices:

Appendix I: Updated IPEC implementation report "IPEC Action Against Child Labour: Progress and Future Priorities, 2000-01";

Appendix II: Presentation by Executive, Director Mr. K. Tapiola, to the Committee on Technical Cooperation, 8 November 2001;

Appendix III: Summary record of the eleventh meeting of the IPEC Steering Committee (5 November 2001).

Geneva, 8 February 2002.

Submitted for information.

Appendix I

Updated IPEC implementation report “IPEC Action Against Child Labour: Progress and Future Priorities, 2000-01”

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

Presentation by Executive Director, Mr. K. Tapiola, to the Committee on Technical Cooperation, 8 November 2001

The IPEC International Steering Committee met on Monday, 5 November 2001, to review the implementation of IPEC's programme during the 2000-01 biennium and to decide on the priorities and allocations for the 2002-03 biennium.

Preliminary results for the current biennium, as reflected in a report submitted to the Steering Committee, were presented by the IPEC Director. On all counts, IPEC was on course to meet the targets set for it in the ILO's Programme and Budget 2000-01. In addition, improved controls, better quality standards and numerous innovations could be reported, as well as vastly expanded partnerships with ILO constituents, and with partners of the United Nations system and beyond.

The ratifications of Convention Nos. 138 and 182 stood at 115 and 106 respectively. Delivery of programmes amounting to US\$53 million or more was expected, a 150 per cent increase over the last biennium. A total of 29 national child labour surveys and 38 rapid assessments had been produced. Three countries were launching time-bound programmes and ten others were preparing such programmes. A total of 311,000 children and families benefited from IPEC's services.

For the new biennium, 2002-03, the programme was prepared and well equipped to meet the ambitious targets as stated in the report, and to deliver programmes corresponding to the allocations proposed in the operational budget for 2002-03 (Part II of the report). A number of major challenges remained to be addressed, i.e. to match the growing demand for IPEC programmes with individual donor contributions and possibly also with the proceeds from a new global inter-agency fund for the reduction of child labour and other children's issues. Other challenges included the successful continuation of the ratification campaign, the effective assistance to countries implementing the Conventions they have ratified, effective communication and dissemination of information on child labour, and the need to prepare appropriate responses to the crisis in and around Afghanistan.

Delegates generally commended the report submitted to the meeting for its quality, richness in factual information, and for its relevance in terms of trends and initiatives. It reflected the performance of IPEC over the past year, and was able to provide some indications of impact.

Delegates also endorsed the overall orientation of the IPEC programme, its mix of advocacy, advisory and operational activities, its emphasis on the implementation of Convention No. 182, without neglecting the fundamental principle contained in Convention No. 138, its broad-based partnerships especially with employers' and workers' organizations, and the efforts made to improve quality and accountability. However, concerns were expressed about insufficient mainstreaming – a process having been initiated only recently – and about the steering mechanism for IPEC through its Steering Committee meeting each November, and the reporting to the Governing Body Committee on Technical Cooperation in November and in March of each year.

Specific queries and suggestions were made by the Employers' group, inter alia, concerning the participation of enterprises in monitoring of child labour, about the role and functioning of the International Steering Committee, and about gender mainstreaming.

The Workers' group, while commending IPEC for its achievements, inter alia emphasized the need for more tripartite action, for a broader approach embracing fundamental principles and rights at work as a whole, and stressed the need for more to be done in the Central and Eastern European region and for more regular budget support to be given to IPEC.

Among the points stressed by the Government delegates, the following constituted the highlights:

- mainstreaming of IPEC into the ILO's technical and field programmes was necessary, and should be intensified;
- close coordination with the InFocus Programme on promoting the Declaration was desirable;
- IPEC programmes should be closely linked to Poverty Reduction Strategy Papers (PRSPs) in all countries so as to ensure sustainability;

- a comprehensive approach to monitoring and evaluation with an emphasis on impact assessment should be progressively put in place;
- more emphasis was needed for communications and advocacy;
- with the increasing numbers of ratifications, the programme should gradually shift its main emphasis to helping, in different ways, member States to implement the standards in law and in practice.

The following suggestions, in addition to appropriate follow-up on the points mentioned above, will be implemented to the extent possible:

- further strengthening of tripartite participation at all levels;
- a major drive to ensure the present or higher levels of contributions to match the needs of participating countries, including also by diversifying donor sources and the possibility of setting up a global fund;
- the tenth anniversary of IPEC, in 2002, should be celebrated in an appropriate way, in the context of the International Labour Conference, on 12 June 2002, and in conjunction with the discussion of the Global Report on Combating Child Labour.

The next IPEC International Steering Committee will take place in November 2002. The final results of the 2000-01 biennium will be reported to the Technical Cooperation Committee of the Governing Body at its 283rd (March 2002) Session.

Appendix III

Summary record of the eleventh meeting of the IPEC Steering Committee (Geneva, 5 November 2001)

1. The eleventh meeting of the IPEC International Steering Committee was held at the International Labour Office, Geneva, on 5 November 2001 at 15.00.
2. The meeting was opened and the participants welcomed by Mr. Kari Tapiola, Executive Director, Fundamental Principles and Rights at Work Sector.
3. Mr. Tapiola noted the significant changes that had taken place within IPEC, which has now been an InFocus Programme of the ILO for two years, thus reflecting the importance attached to it within the Office. The year 2002 will be the tenth anniversary of IPEC and there were a number of occasions at which IPEC's work could be celebrated, for instance the 2002 Global Report; Child Labour Day on 12 June 2002; and the United Nations Special Session on children that was due to be held in September, postponed until May 2002.
4. Mr. Tapiola finished his introduction by stating that after the incredibly successful ratification of Conventions Nos. 182 and 138, the next challenge will be to assist countries to implement the Conventions.
5. The agenda for the eleventh meeting of the IPEC International Steering Committee was approved as proposed.
6. The summary of proceedings of the tenth meeting of the IPEC International Steering Committee (held on Friday, 3 November 2000) was approved with only one small amendment from Bangladesh to correct a comment addressed by them.
7. Mr. Frans Röselaers, Director of the InFocus Programme on Child Labour, made a presentation on behalf of IPEC. One of the challenges IPEC had faced was to keep pace with the size of the programme, which had expanded greatly in terms of personnel, programming and in its scope to encompass all activities related to child labour within the Office. To achieve success had required strong cooperation between ILO's social partners, United Nations agencies and International Financial Institutions (IFI) and from within the ILO itself, under the leadership of the Director-General and the Executive Director for the Sector. IPEC's success could be measured against the operational objectives set out in the ILO programme and budget document in 2000-01. By achieving ratification of 106 and 115 countries respectively for Conventions Nos. 182 and 138, IPEC had exceeded the first objective of half the membership for Convention No. 182 and significant increase for Convention No. 138; IPEC's programme expenditure would increase to over US\$52 million, which bettered the target to double expenditure; the number of children and their families to whom services were provided totalled 311,000 up to August 2001, which comfortably exceeded the target for the entire biennium of 260,000; three time-bound programmes (TBP) were starting in 2001 with ten more under preparation, as compared to the target of ten-15 countries; and SIMPOC data was now available for 38 countries, which again was more than the target of 30 countries for the biennium. In addition to these, IPEC had streamlined and improved its operations in line with the recommendations of the external auditor; developed innovative approaches to deal with child labour, e.g. the TBPs, networking and partnership building; and an increased level had been reached of mainstreaming IPEC into the ILO, as shown by the five MDT posts to be allocated to IPEC from 2002-03. There were still a number of challenges to be met: how to match the demand of countries that have ratified Convention No. 182 and who needed support to implement it; advocacy of child labour issues at a global level (e.g. through the UNGASS meeting to be held in May 2002 and the Yokohama World Congress against Commercial Sexual Exploitation to be held in December 2001); the ratification campaign would not rest on its laurels in the next biennium; IPEC would need to manage its ever-expanding knowledge base and satisfy the increasing demand for information, as shown, for example, by the substantial increase in visitors to the IPEC website. The final challenge to be faced by IPEC would be to respond to the crisis situation in and around Afghanistan.
8. During the discussion on the implementation report and programme and budget document, and on the report of the Director of the InFocus Programme on Child Labour, the issues below were highlighted.

9. The *spokesperson for the Employer members* congratulated IPEC on an excellent, informative, transparent and analytical report, in which IPEC was not afraid to mention areas where there was still scope for improvement, for example, regarding gender mainstreaming. The Employers' group was very grateful to donors and particularly noted the contribution of the Japanese Rengo. He noted that IPEC and the Inter-Parliamentary Union efforts at finalizing a handbook for parliamentarians on child labour had not been completed and seemed to be at the same stage as last year. He agreed that ensuring elimination of child labour should be considered in Poverty Reduction Strategy Papers (PRSPs) and supported IPEC efforts in this area. IPEC performance was particularly impressive and he congratulated IPEC on work on Convention No. 182 ratification and said that the focus should now be put on implementation. The monitoring section was interesting and private companies had good experience in this area, which IPEC should further explore. The role of the International Steering Committee (ISC) was still open to confusion and more formal integration into the Governing Body could ensure better debate and more involvement of employers. The representative observed that it had been good for ACT/EMP to be in touch and work directly with constituents and he appealed to donors to fund ACT/EMP and ACTRAV activities.
10. The *spokesperson for the Worker members* expressed congratulations especially on the excellent ratification of Convention No. 182 and was grateful to all donors, especially the new donors, for their funding of IPEC activities, however he still remained concerned about the heavy dependency on extra-budgetary resources for this aspect of ILO work. More was also needed in tripartite action and social dialogue in programmes on child labour, with more systematic attention to working with unions and employers. The report also mentioned the importance of gender analysis and mainstreaming and this was welcomed. Trade unions could also provide support in matters of policy and research. The role of national steering committees needed to be re-addressed, especially to ensure wider workers' and employers' participation. The spokesperson noted the relatively low resources allocated to Eastern Europe. IPEC's work with the least developed countries (LDCs) was most laudable, and there was still a need to integrate IPEC into the ILO and to receive a larger regular budget allocation. Finally, regarding the action taken on the external audit report, he was pleased to note that action had been taken to regularize contracts of IPEC local staff.
11. The *Government representative of El Salvador* congratulated IPEC on its report, thanked the IPEC donors and was happy to note that El Salvador was one of the first countries to develop a time-bound programme which was supervised by a National Steering Committee with tripartite membership.
12. The *Government representative of New Zealand* expressed wishes, as a new donor to IPEC, that child labour action be expanded to the Pacific region, and noted the level of ratification of Convention No. 182 in the Pacific region.
13. The *representative of the Italian Social Partners Initiative* complimented IPEC on the report. However, she wished to stress that work was still needed to address fundamental policy issues, and in this respect IPEC's mainstreaming into ILO was still far from complete. The role of trade unions and organized workers as crucial agents of monitoring and the role of employers and their commitment in ensuring long-lasting effects of worker action was absolutely indispensable. The real measure of IPEC's success must be in how far governments increased their allocation to education and other initiatives that were currently provided by outside resources. The TBP initiatives were congratulated and it was especially pleasing to see Nepal as one of the first countries where the trade union movement had been very influential in policy matters related to combating child labour. Trade unions could play an important role in monitoring the workplace. The representative reiterated the wish to work closely with the employers and workers and create synergies. Mention was made again of the need to obtain greater regular budget resources from the ILO. Finally, in one project in Sialkot, Pakistan, there had been problems with freedom of association.
14. The *Government representative of Italy* expressed disappointment at receiving the report so late, and expressed continued support to IPEC's global communications campaign. The success of the ratifications was impressive, but this should not be the only indicator of IPEC success, merely evidence of a good start. Other indicators should measure social impact.
15. The *Government representative of Bangladesh* thanked IPEC for all its activities in the country and all the donors who had enabled these activities in Bangladesh to take place.
16. The *Government representative of Canada* expressed her thanks for the report and agreed with other speakers that there was scope to review the structure and role of the ISC. The year 2002 would provide several opportunities for IPEC to show its expertise in child labour issues so a

communications strategy was vital. As regards indicators of success, it was felt that the number of beneficiaries reached far outweighed the amount of money spent on programme expenditure. Canada looked forward to continued partnership with IPEC/ILO and to improved monitoring/evaluation procedures.

17. The *Government representative of Egypt* congratulated IPEC and thanked its donors, noting that more gender-focused activities would be welcome. IPEC assistance was sought in several areas, for example to hold a seminar for trade union leaders, and to provide training to labour inspectors.
18. The *Government representative of France* complimented IPEC on its report despite the late receipt. One question raised was to clarify the estimate of one million people to receive benefits in the next biennium. The representative was pleased to see that the evaluation methodology had been revised and was being reflected in a database and thanked IPEC for its positive proposals and effective communication.
19. The *Government representative of India* reiterated comments on both the quality and tardiness of the report. Also, given the size of the IPEC programme, it was considered that three hours was insufficient to deal with such an important subject. The representative explained the joint USDoL/Government of India project that is going to total \$40 million. It was vital for child labour issues to be non-donor driven and have a strong national budget component. In this respect, the reduction in core funding in favour of specific projects that may in some cases reflect donor priorities rather than those of the country, was raised as a concern. Involvement of local NGOs is crucial as they are operating at the grass-roots level. A SIMPOC project to understand the magnitude of the problem of child labour was under consideration with national sample surveys on a continuous basis. It was felt that national organizations could conduct research based on a universal and scientific basis reflecting national priorities and not be donor driven. The Indian Government is committed to eliminating child labour in all its forms through economic development, poverty reduction and universal education.
20. The *Government representative of Germany* welcomed what IPEC had achieved so far and stated that the level of German assistance to IPEC programmes to date demonstrated the importance of the task. IPEC had been in existence for almost ten years and it was now opportune to undertake a worldwide evaluation of the programme to demonstrate successes and to find out how it can be made more effective in future. More work was needed on public relations and communications. He expressed the hope that the Global Report would cover areas such as poverty reduction, decent work and action to combat child labour.
21. The *Government representative of Morocco* thanked IPEC and also the donors who had made the activities possible in Morocco. Poverty was the root of the problem of child labour. The need to buy fuels and the tariff barriers set meant countries like Morocco could not compete in an open economy. ILO and IPEC should serve as a liaison with international agencies like the WTO, the World Bank and IMF to sensitize it to the countries of the South. People should not merely be engaged in awareness-raising activities. The representative noted that management costs of the programme sometimes amounted to two-thirds of the amount donated. Rather than work on the capacity of small institutions, it would be more constructive to associate with workers and employers.
22. The *Government representative of the Netherlands* thanked IPEC for a detailed and quantitative report, and complimented the high level of ratification; gave support to the TBP initiative; welcomed the gender mainstreaming work; and also the attention to HIV/AIDS, but noted that more work is needed in this area. There is also still need for more qualitative information to highlight new trends. The representative welcomed IPEC participation in PRSP. IPEC could get more out of the ISC and donors should have an opportunity to discuss more in-depth certain themes – for example, child labour in agriculture or child labour in prostitution. For the tenth anniversary, a discussion could be envisaged on the evolution of the IPEC programme. Most importantly, IPEC visibility had grown and 2002 was a suitable year to reflect on future strategies.
23. The *Government representative of Ecuador* thanked IPEC and noted that although ratification of Conventions in itself did not constitute a complete indicator of success, in his country it did show a measure of the commitment of the government to address the problem. He was pleased to see the high number of beneficiaries. The representative reiterated the thanks to donors but also stressed the need for more regular budget resources.
24. The *Government representative of Finland* was heartened by the number of ratifications and encouraged further ratifications of Convention No. 182 as well as Convention No. 138. Together

with the Convention on the rights of the child, this provided a strong normative framework. Gender mainstreaming work was also welcomed, to make more explicit the link between women's and children's rights. Finland had funded core programmes and project-specific activities and agreed that donor-driven programmes could not work as well as those that were formulated to meet national requirements. She added to the speakers urging greater ILO regular budget resources and was pleased to note the increase in cooperation with other UN agencies. Her Government supported the Florence initiative. She agreed that there was scope to change the role of the ISC and supported the idea of a specific theme being discussed every year.

25. The *Government representative of Kenya* thanked IPEC for its support of activities in Kenya since 1992. The IPEC programme had facilitated enhancement of capacity building of tripartite partners. With 1.9 million out of a total 10.9 million children estimated to be involved in child labour, many of them in commercial agriculture and fishing, the challenges facing Kenya remain. The representative requested consideration of funding of a TBP.
26. The *Government representative of Burkina Faso* thanked IPEC for the report and noted that IPEC had helped to put the worst forms of child labour on the global agenda. For IPEC to build on its success it needed to consider more sustainable approaches and, in this respect, harmonization of all agencies within the country to develop a consolidated programme would be welcome.
27. The *Government representative of Peru* thanked IPEC and was pleased to inform the ISC that the Government had ratified Convention No. 182 on 28 October and recognized the valuable work of IPEC.
28. The *Government representative of Turkey* also complimented IPEC on its work and noted that child labour was a risk to a nation's development, not just to that of the individual. Turkey was one of the original member countries of IPEC. The contribution to IPEC had begun to bear fruit and had succeeded in reducing the number of children working to one-half in the last five years. One aspect that was extremely encouraging was the coalition of four trade unions to work against child labour.
29. The *Workers' representative of the United Republic of Tanzania* was grateful for IPEC's work not just in the United Republic of Tanzania but also in the 21 African countries, and thanked the donors who had made IPEC activities in the United Republic of Tanzania possible. One area where more aid could be provided was in the area of child soldiers, even to those countries that had not yet ratified Convention No. 182.
30. The *Government representative of Benin* informed the ISC that it had already ratified Conventions Nos. 138 and 182 and had created a compensation fund for rehabilitation of child labourers.
31. The *Government representative of the United States* thanked IPEC and all donors, especially the new donors, for their support, as well as the Government of India for the joint \$40 million initiative in that country. He stressed that IPEC should always ensure that its activities reflected the national needs and priorities.
32. The *Government representative of Pakistan* thanked IPEC and its donors, but stated that he had received the report too late to make detailed comments on it. The likelihood of reduction in the level of future core funding was noted with regret.
33. The *representative of UNICEF* stressed the increased cooperation with IPEC at every level. The 2002-06 UNICEF strategic plan would include as one of its five priorities an increased emphasis on child protection, in which IPEC would be asked to play a key part. The TBP initiatives were supported and the Florence project was an extremely useful one for research coordination.
34. *Mr. Tapiola* noted that the Committee's meeting had been substantive and stimulating, and had allowed discussions to be businesslike and frank. Many useful proposals had been made, and IPEC management would take these on board. On a number of questions, he was best placed to respond to the debate. The mainstreaming of IPEC was still work in progress, but definitely important to pursue in view of the strategic objectives the ILO had adopted, and which could only be achieved in synergy. If the IPEC International Steering Committee had to be linked to the Governing Body's work, questions of differing composition, and the links to the programme and budget, would have to be addressed also. Presently IPEC had a dual reporting system, both to its Steering Committee and to the Governing Body's TC Committee. This, however, was preferable to no or insufficient reporting. The matter would form part of the overall review in the forthcoming Global Report on Child Labour.

35. As regards evaluation, Mr. Tapiola pointed out that a comprehensive approach was being adopted by IPEC, but that the constituents were right to emphasize the need for evaluating the impact of action against child labour, in addition to the ratification pattern or the changes in government budget, the latter being indicators, however, of the political will and the national commitment to combat child labour.
36. The IPEC/IPU Handbook for Parliamentarians on Action against Child Labour had taken somewhat longer than foreseen originally, but the relevance (the content now covering both ratifications and implementation) and the quality of the document, which was finalized in August 2001 and would be launched in March 2002, had been improved in the process.
37. The aim of achieving near-universal ratification of Convention No. 182 was to be interpreted as meaning that, apart from some exceptional cases of member States, which could not realistically be expected to complete the ratification process before end-2003, there would be virtually complete ratification.
38. Mr. Tapiola strongly emphasized the determination of the Office, and of the departments/programmes forming part of the Fundamental Rights and Principles at Work Sector, to work closely together and to achieve synergies. This had proven to be feasible and preferable precisely in the cases where problems arose during the implementation of IPEC programmes, e.g. in a recent case in Pakistan which was now being dealt with.
39. *Mr. Röselaers, Director of IPEC*, explained that the delivery rate was the proportion of resources available in a given year that the programme had been able to spend/implement. The aim and expectation was for this percentage to reach slightly over 60 per cent in 2001, up from 50 per cent in 2000, and from just over 30 per cent in 1999. He also mentioned that the ILO's own support, from regular budget resources and through supplementary allocations, had increased considerably recently and would be further stepped up during the 2002-03 biennium.
40. In response to a suggestion by the Employers' spokesperson, he welcomed the possibility of using private sector capacity for the monitoring of child labour, amongst other methods.
41. He reassured the Workers' spokesperson that the work done by IPEC to promote Convention No. 82 and its implementation was complementary to the goals pursued under Convention No. 138, and that both were to be seen in the broader framework of the Declaration and with due regard to the concept of decent work. He quoted the notion, often used by the Director-General and by IPEC that "a decent childhood is required to prepare for a decent adult working life". He explained how the count of children and families benefiting from IPEC action had been established.
42. He also pointed out that the role of the national steering committees had been examined in depth, new guidelines issued, an inventory of Employers' and Workers' members of these committees made and guidelines for them also developed. The representative of the Government of India had described the functioning of NSCs during the meeting.
43. The IPEC was indeed planning to step up its activity in the Pacific region, and was grateful to the support from the Government of New Zealand to take these initiatives.
44. In response to an observation made by the representative of the Italian Social Partners Initiative, he reiterated IPEC's approach to achieve sustainability by combining the withdrawal of children from work with income-generating or income-improving activities, and with improving schooling and access to schools.
45. Several comments had been made about the need to strengthen the communications function of IPEC. This would be done, with the help of several donors, in consultation with them and in consultation with the ILO's Communications Department.
46. He undertook to include in next year's IPEC report one or several thematic highlights, as had been done (less prominently, however) this time.
47. In 2002, apart from the major events such as UNGASS and the discussions at the International Labour Conference, the tenth anniversary of IPEC would be celebrated and commemorated in an appropriate fashion, i.e. as much by substantive as by festive elements.
48. *Ms. Ouédraogo, IPEC Director for Advocacy and Policy Development*, thanked the participants for their useful comments as well as the IPEC donor countries who, during the present biennium, had extended their contribution to campaign, research and SIMPOC activities. She also took note of the announcements made by some Government representatives about the impending ratifications of

Convention No. 182. While she agreed that ratification numbers are not a sufficient indicator of success and that it was important to assist countries in implementing the Conventions, ratification was very often the starting point for a request for technical assistance. Using various examples she showed that while the overall campaign on child labour continued on the ratification front, it had made a major shift towards implementation. She added that the campaign was now taking special initiatives such as a newly launched campaign with the African Cup of Nations organizers, and subsequently with similar major events in other regions, which have the potential of reaching vast numbers of people worldwide. She also outlined the plans for further work to ensure gender integration and would report on results next year. A major effort was under way to review and improve SIMPOC methods and approaches with a view to making them more effective, user-friendly and more adapted to the needs and capacities of countries. An expert group aimed at assisting SIMPOC efforts in producing relevant and usable data would be soon set up and this was a good opportunity to address the need to more closely involve constituents into this subprogramme's work.

49. She stated that IPEC was ready to resume the preparations for UNGASS. While the outcome document as it stood was not ideal, there had been some improvement, thanks to the support of the ILO's constituents. This and other events taking place in 2002 were good opportunities for IPEC to be assertive about the ILO's values and about the work under way in many countries by the ILO's partners. She finally indicated that IPEC was planning to prepare a major report on IPEC's contribution over the last decade to the elimination of child labour as well as future challenges and recommendations for action.
50. *Mr. Ng, IPEC Director Operations*, had been very encouraged by the comments and suggestions made during the meeting. These would certainly guide his team, and were at the same time indications of the partnership and the close cooperation IPEC enjoyed. He drew attention to the fact that while delivery was a most important yardstick for IPEC's work, the concerns of quality, impact and sustainability required intensive consultations and investment in capacity building which were not necessarily done best in the shortest possible time frame, and certainly not if the necessary approval criteria were not adhered to. With a view to realizing maximum efficiency beyond this trade-off, IPEC had done its best to decentralize decision-making, to streamline procedures, to improve monitoring of progress and results. In addition, sound human resource management had strengthened the quality of staff.
51. In response to Mr. Rampak's concern over the need for systematic tripartite consultation and participation, Mr. Ng informed the meeting of the guidelines being prepared by IPEC in collaboration with ACTRAV and ACT/EMP for the active involvement of employers' and workers' organizations as implementing agencies. Good practices are being identified by IPEC in order to demonstrate the role of both employers' and workers' organizations in the design and implementation of IPEC programmes. The need for enhancing IPEC's cooperation with the ILO field structure and other headquarters technical programmes was emphasized, especially in view of the fact that the IPEC programme had grown and now represented nearly 40 per cent of all ILO technical cooperation. The link to the Decent Work Agenda was clear and useful for the programme: children grow up in poverty and enter work, they will face the least favourable situation on the labour market as adults. Not only are their rights denied, the improvement of their productivity and income was undermined. IPEC, therefore, had been paying special attention to place child labour as a priority target group in the development policy agenda, and as an indicator for the Poverty Reduction Strategy Papers in LDCs, such as the Nepal and United Republic of Tanzania. The aim of this concerted effort was to break the vicious circle of poverty and child labour.
52. Mr. Ng mentioned the importance of the support received from US/DoL and UKDfID to enhance IPEC capacity to design and implement programmes.
- Supplementing the remarks of Mr. Tapiola on core labour standards, Mr. Ng noted that the goal of eliminating child labour, especially in its worst forms, had been accepted by all. Examples showed that it was feasible to extend IPEC's work on hazardous conditions and child labour monitoring to cover other areas of concern to the Declaration. The work on bonded child labour in Nepal was a good example.
53. There being no other business, *Mr. Tapiola* proposed that the next meeting take place in November 2002.