

Report II

**Information
concerning the Programme
and Budget for 2004-05
and other financial
and administrative questions**

Second item on the agenda: Programme and budget proposals
and other financial questions

ISBN 92-2-113032-0
ISSN 0074-6681

First published 2004

The designations employed in ILO publications, which are in conformity with United Nations practice, and the presentation of material therein do not imply the expression of any opinion whatsoever on the part of the International Labour Office concerning the legal status of any country, area or territory or of its authorities, or concerning the delimitation of its frontiers. The responsibility for opinions expressed in signed articles, studies and other contributions rests solely with their authors, and publication does not constitute an endorsement by the International Labour office of the opinions expressed in them. Reference to names of firms and commercial products and processes does not imply their endorsement by the International Labour Office, and any failure to mention a particular firm, commercial product or process is not a sign of disapproval.

ILO publications can be obtained through major booksellers or ILO local offices in many countries, or direct from ILO Publications, International Labour Office, CH-1211 Geneva 22, Switzerland. Catalogues or lists of new publications are available free of charge from the above address.

Preface

1. This report comprises, in addition to material submitted for information, a number of items requiring action by the Conference. Any other items which may arise after the publication of this report and which also call for action by the Conference will be submitted to the participants through the *Provisional Record*.
2. The items requiring action are:
 - (a) Financial Report and Audited Financial Statements for 2002-03, which is published in a separate document available to Conference participants;
 - (b) Scale of assessments of contributions to the budget for 2005;
 - (c) assessment of contributions of new member States; and
 - (d) composition of the Administrative Tribunal of the International Labour Organization.
3. Details of these items are set out in the following pages of this report.
4. Information concerning programme implementation in 2002-03 is contained in the report of the Director-General, under item I(a) of the Conference agenda.

Contents

	<i>Page</i>
Preface	iii
Financial and administrative questions	
I. Financial Report and Audited Financial Statements for 2002-03.....	1
II. Scale of assessments of contributions to the budget for 2005	2
III. Assessment of the contributions of new member States.....	3
IV. Composition of the Administrative Tribunal of the International Labour Organization	4
Annexes	
Annex 1. Report of the Government members of the Committee on allocations matters (GB.289/10/3).....	5
Annex 2. Matters relating to the Administrative Tribunal of the International Labour Organization – Composition of the Tribunal (GB.289/PFA/20/1).....	13

Financial and administrative questions

I. Financial Report and Audited Financial Statements for 2002-03

1. In accordance with articles 28 and 29 of the Financial Regulations, the International Labour Conference will be called upon to adopt the Financial Report and Audited Financial Statements for 2002-03 after their examination by the Governing Body. The Financial Report and Audited Financial Statements comprise the Director-General's financial report and audited financial statements covering the regular budget, the Working Capital Fund, and the special funds and extra-budgetary accounts administered by the Organization, including the accounts of the International Institute for Labour Studies, the accounts for the United Nations Development Programme and the various other technical cooperation accounts, including trust fund accounts.
2. The report and the statements for 2002-03, together with the Auditor's report, will be communicated to Members as a separate document. The Governing Body's recommendation as to the adoption of the Director-General's report and the audited statements will be communicated to the Conference in a separate document to the Finance Committee of Government Representatives.

II. Scale of assessments of contributions to the budget for 2005

1. At its 289th Session (March 2004), the Governing Body decided, on the recommendation of the Government members of the Programme, Financial and Administrative Committee, to propose to the Conference at its 92nd Session (June 2004) that it adopt the draft scale of assessments for 2005 as set out in column 3 of the appendix to the report of the Government members of the Committee on allocations matters.¹
2. It will be for the Finance Committee of Government Representatives to consider the proposals put forward by the Governing Body concerning the draft scale of assessments for 2005 and to make appropriate proposals to the Conference.

¹ GB.289/10/3, reproduced as Annex 1 to this report.

III. Assessment of the contributions of new member States

1. On 19 August 2003, the Democratic Republic of Timor-Leste, which joined the United Nations in 2002, became a Member of the ILO.
2. At its 289th Session (March 2004), the Governing Body decided, on the recommendation of the Government members of the Programme, Financial and Administrative Committee¹ to propose to the Conference at its 92nd Session (June 2004) that, in accordance with the established practice of harmonizing the rates of assessment of ILO member States with their rates of assessment in the United Nations, the contribution of the Democratic Republic of Timor-Leste to the ILO budget during 2003 and for 2004 be based on an annual assessment rate of 0.001 per cent.
3. It will be for the Finance Committee of Government Representatives to consider this proposal put forward by the Governing Body and to make appropriate proposals to the Conference.

¹ Report of the Government members of the Committee on allocations matters (GB.289/10/3), reproduced as Annex 1 to this report.

IV. Composition of the Administrative Tribunal of the International Labour Organization

At its 289th Session (March 2004), the Governing Body decided, on the recommendation of its Programme, Financial and Administrative Committee,¹ to propose to the International Labour Conference at its 92nd Session (June 2004) that it express its appreciation for services rendered by Mr. Jean-François Egli, it renew the appointment of Mr. Michel Gentot, it appoint Mr. Claude Rouiller and Mr. Agustín Gordillo as judges for a term of three years and it adopt a resolution in the following terms:

The General Conference of the International Labour Organization,

Decides, in accordance with article III of the Statute of the Administrative Tribunal of the International Labour Organization, to renew the appointment of Mr. Michel Gentot (France) for a term of three years;

Expresses its appreciation to Mr. Jean-François Egli for the services which he has rendered to the work of the Administrative Tribunal of the International Labour Organization over the last decade;

Decides, in accordance with article III of the Statute of the Administrative Tribunal of the International Labour Organization, to appoint as judges of the Administrative Tribunal, for a term of three years with effective from July 2004,

Mr. Agustín Gordillo (Argentina) and

Mr. Claude Rouiller (Switzerland).

¹ GB.289/PFA/20/1, reproduced as Annex 2 to this report.



TENTH ITEM ON THE AGENDA

Reports of the Programme, Financial and Administrative Committee**Report of the Government members of the Committee on allocations matters**

1. The Government members of the Programme, Financial and Administrative Committee of the Governing Body met on 16 March 2004 under the chairpersonship of Ambassador Andrea Negrotto Cambiaso, Chairperson of the Government Group of the Governing Body, who acted as Reporter.

Assessment of the contribution of the Democratic Republic of Timor-Leste
(First item on the agenda)

2. The Government members considered a paper¹ proposing a rate of assessment for the Democratic Republic of Timor-Leste, which had joined the ILO on 19 August 2003.
3. *The Government members recommend to the Governing Body that, in accordance with the established practice of harmonizing the rates of assessment of ILO member States with their rates of assessment in the United Nations, it propose to the Conference that the contribution of the Democratic Republic of Timor-Leste to the ILO budget for the period of its membership in the Organization during 2003 and for 2004 be based on an annual assessment rate of 0.001 per cent.*

¹ GB.289/PFA/GMA/1.

Scale of assessments of contributions to the budget for 2005

(Second item on the agenda)

4. The Government members had before them an Office paper² concerning the scale of assessments of contributions to the budget for 2005.
5. The representative of the Government of Mexico stated that, during discussions at the General Assembly of the United Nations in December 2003, her Government had proposed changes to the methodology used when drawing up the scale of assessment with a view to avoiding sudden rises in the assessments of member States, such as those which appeared in the scale approved for the triennium 2004-06. This scale had brought increases for several countries, including Mexico, and the appendix to the document revealed an increase for Mexico of 0.816 per cent in its contributions to the ILO. This was the largest increase of any ILO member State and would mean an increase in Mexico's contribution of nearly 3 million Swiss francs in 2005, when compared with 2004. In local currency terms, this increase could be further affected by exchange rate fluctuation. When denominated in pesos, Mexico had seen its contribution double over the period 2001-04. With the additional increase of 76 per cent proposed by the new scale for 2005 and ignoring the possibility of future exchange rate movements, Mexico's assessment would be 242 per cent above its 2001 assessment in local currency. She understood that all member States were expected to accept appropriate assessments but believed that increases should be gradual. The new scale meant that a reduced number of member States were taking on a larger proportion of the total budget and Mexico would become the tenth largest contributor. She wished to reiterate that the financial burden of paying contributions should be distributed more equitably and that increases should be gradual and reflect each country's real ability to pay. She hoped, therefore, that the ILO would prepare a new scale of assessments for 2005 and stated that she could not approve the point for decision. She reserved the right to return to this question at the Conference.
6. The representative of the Government of China requested an explanation of the basic principle underlying the increases and decreases in the last column of the table in the appendix.
7. The representative of the Government of United Kingdom, speaking on behalf of IMEC, supported the point for decision. She stated that, although she understood Mexico's concerns, she believed that the ILO should continue its practice of adopting the United Nations scale, adjusted as necessary for the difference in memberships of the two organizations.
8. The representative of the Government of Japan said Japan had also seen an increase in its contribution but accepted the ILO scale, as it was in accordance with the United Nations scale. His Government called for greater efficiency in the implementation of the budget, which it would be monitoring closely.
9. The representative of the Government of Canada supported the statement made on behalf of IMEC. Canada had also seen an increase in its contribution rate. Establishing the United Nations scale was a difficult and time-consuming process which was carried out by the Fifth Committee in New York on behalf of the United Nations family. There was no real

² GB.289/PFA/GMA/2.

value in moving this complicated and mathematical process out to each individual agency. He therefore urged Mexico to accept the principle of the ILO scale being based on the United Nations scale.

10. The representative of the Government of the Russian Federation supported the point for decision. He sympathized with Mexico but believed that an increase in contributions reflected an increase in the strength of the economy of the country concerned.
11. The representative of the Government of Germany emphasized that assessments were not calculated arbitrarily and supported the point for decision.
12. The representative of the Director-General (Executive Director and Acting Treasurer and Financial Comptroller) explained that the process for calculating the 2005 scale of assessments started with the consideration of a triennial scale of assessments at the United Nations in the Contributions Committee of the United Nations, which passed through the Fifth Committee before reaching the General Assembly of the United Nations for approval. The calculations were based, *inter alia*, on a variety of statistical sources over a base period of three and six years, including figures from the IMF, OECD and the United Nations. The technical work entailed estimating each country's gross national product. In addition, there was a minimum and maximum contribution rate of 0.001 per cent and 22 per cent, respectively, as well as a maximum assessment rate of 0.01 per cent for least developed countries. Complicated criteria as to whether to apply the market exchange rate or a price-adjusted exchange rate applied. The ILO took the United Nations scale as approved by the General Assembly and made a simple arithmetical adjustment to take account of the 14 States that were members of the United Nations but not members of the ILO. No mechanism existed at the ILO to depart from this long-established approach, or for smoothing out increases in rates of assessments.
13. The representative of the Government of China noted that he would report details to his Government and in the meantime had to reserve his position.
14. The representative of the Government of Mexico explained that her country was aware of how the calculations were made and had indeed argued in the United Nations that the method should be revised. She could not approve the point for decision and would reserve her position until the Conference.
15. The representative of the Government of the United Kingdom asked to be reminded of the process through to the Conference and if there would be any further GMA discussions. She wondered if the point for decision could be amended to incorporate reservations.
16. The representative of the Director-General (Executive Director and Acting Treasurer and Financial Comptroller) explained that the next opportunity for discussion would be at the Finance Committee of Government Representatives in early June 2004, before the resolution on the scale of contributions for 2005 was put to the 92nd Session of the Conference.
17. The representative of the Government of Canada suggested that the point for decision could reflect the reservations and that further discussion should be deferred to the Finance Committee.
18. The representative of the Director-General (Executive Director and Acting Treasurer and Financial Comptroller) indicated that the report of the meeting would be submitted to the Finance Committee and would record the reservations of the Governments of Mexico and

China. Further consultations could take place before the Conference on the basis of the full report without necessarily changing the point for decision.

- 19. *The Government members recommend to the Governing Body that, in accordance with the established practice of harmonizing the rates of assessment of ILO member States with their rates of assessment in the United Nations, it propose to the Conference the adoption of the draft scale of assessments for 2005, as set out in column 3 of the appendix to this report, subject to such adjustments as might be necessary following any further change in the membership of the Organization before the Conference is called upon to adopt the recommended scale.***

Geneva, 22 March 2004.

(Signed) A. Negrotto,
Reporter.

Points for decision: Paragraph 3;
Paragraph 19.

Appendix

Scale of assessments

State	ILO	UN	Draft scale of ILO	Increase (Decrease)
	assessments	assessments	assessments	(Diff. between
	2004	2005	2005	cols 3 and 1)
	Col.1	Col.2	Col.3	Col.4
	%	%	%	%
1 Afghanistan	0.009	0.002	0.002	(0.007)
2 Albania	0.003	0.005	0.005	0.002
3 Algeria	0.069	0.076	0.076	0.007
4 Angola	0.002	0.001	0.001	(0.001)
5 Antigua and Barbuda	0.002	0.003	0.003	0.001
6 Argentina	1.131	0.956	0.957	(0.174)
7 Armenia	0.002	0.002	0.002	-
8 Australia	1.602	1.592	1.593	(0.009)
9 Austria	0.932	0.859	0.860	(0.072)
10 Azerbaijan	0.004	0.005	0.005	0.001
11 Bahamas	0.012	0.013	0.013	0.001
12 Bahrain	0.018	0.030	0.030	0.012
13 Bangladesh	0.010	0.010	0.010	-
14 Barbados	0.009	0.010	0.010	0.001
15 Belarus	0.019	0.018	0.018	(0.001)
16 Belgium	1.112	1.069	1.070	(0.042)
17 Belize	0.001	0.001	0.001	-
18 Benin	0.002	0.002	0.002	-
19 Bolivia	0.008	0.009	0.009	0.001
20 Bosnia and Herzegovina	0.004	0.003	0.003	(0.001)
21 Botswana	0.010	0.012	0.012	0.002
22 Brazil	2.353	1.523	1.524	(0.829)
23 Bulgaria	0.013	0.017	0.017	0.004
24 Burkina Faso	0.002	0.002	0.002	-
25 Burundi	0.001	0.001	0.001	-
26 Cambodia	0.002	0.002	0.002	-
27 Cameroon	0.009	0.008	0.008	(0.001)
28 Canada	2.519	2.813	2.816	0.297
29 Cape Verde	0.001	0.001	0.001	-
30 Central African Republic	0.001	0.001	0.001	-
31 Chad	0.001	0.001	0.001	-
32 Chile	0.209	0.223	0.223	0.014
33 China	1.509	2.053	2.055	0.546
34 Colombia	0.198	0.155	0.155	(0.043)
35 Comoros	0.001	0.001	0.001	-
36 Congo	0.001	0.001	0.001	-
37 Costa Rica	0.019	0.030	0.030	0.011
38 Côte d'Ivoire	0.009	0.010	0.010	0.001
39 Croatia	0.038	0.037	0.037	(0.001)
40 Cuba	0.029	0.043	0.043	0.014
41 Cyprus	0.037	0.039	0.039	0.002
42 Czech Republic	0.200	0.183	0.183	(0.017)
43 Democratic Republic of the Congo	0.004	0.003	0.003	(0.001)
44 Denmark	0.738	0.718	0.719	(0.019)
45 Djibouti	0.001	0.001	0.001	-
46 Dominica	0.001	0.001	0.001	-
47 Dominican Republic	0.022	0.035	0.035	0.013

State	ILO	UN	Draft scale of ILO	Increase (Decrease)
	assessments	assessments	assessments	(Diff. between
	2004	2005	2005	cols 3 and 1)
	Col.1	Col.2	Col.3	Col.4
	%	%	%	%
48 Ecuador	0.024	0.019	0.019	(0.005)
49 Egypt	0.080	0.120	0.120	0.040
50 El Salvador	0.018	0.022	0.022	0.004
51 Equatorial Guinea	0.001	0.002	0.002	0.001
52 Eritrea	0.001	0.001	0.001	-
53 Estonia	0.010	0.012	0.012	0.002
54 Ethiopia	0.004	0.004	0.004	-
55 Fiji	0.004	0.004	0.004	-
56 Finland	0.514	0.533	0.533	0.019
57 France	6.367	6.030	6.036	(0.331)
58 Gabon	0.014	0.009	0.009	(0.005)
59 Gambia	0.001	0.001	0.001	-
60 Georgia	0.005	0.003	0.003	(0.002)
61 Germany	9.620	8.662	8.670	(0.950)
62 Ghana	0.005	0.004	0.004	(0.001)
63 Greece	0.531	0.530	0.530	(0.001)
64 Grenada	0.001	0.001	0.001	-
65 Guatemala	0.026	0.030	0.030	0.004
66 Guinea	0.003	0.003	0.003	-
67 Guinea-Bissau	0.001	0.001	0.001	-
68 Guyana	0.001	0.001	0.001	-
69 Haiti	0.002	0.003	0.003	0.001
70 Honduras	0.005	0.005	0.005	-
71 Hungary	0.118	0.126	0.126	0.008
72 Iceland	0.032	0.034	0.034	0.002
73 India	0.336	0.421	0.421	0.085
74 Indonesia	0.197	0.142	0.142	(0.055)
75 Iran, Islamic Republic of	0.268	0.157	0.157	(0.111)
76 Iraq	0.134	0.016	0.016	(0.118)
77 Ireland	0.290	0.350	0.350	0.060
78 Israel	0.409	0.467	0.467	0.058
79 Italy	4.98753	4.885	4.890	(0.09753)
80 Jamaica	0.004	0.008	0.008	0.004
81 Japan	19.21804	19.468	19.485	0.26696
82 Jordan	0.008	0.011	0.011	0.003
83 Kazakhstan	0.027	0.025	0.025	(0.002)
84 Kenya	0.008	0.009	0.009	0.001
85 Kiribati	0.001	0.001	0.001	-
86 Korea, Republic of	1.823	1.796	1.798	(0.025)
87 Kuwait	0.145	0.162	0.162	0.017
88 Kyrgyzstan	0.001	0.001	0.001	-
89 Lao People's Democratic Republic	0.001	0.001	0.001	-
90 Latvia	0.010	0.015	0.015	0.005
91 Lebanon	0.012	0.024	0.024	0.012
92 Lesotho	0.001	0.001	0.001	-
93 Liberia	0.001	0.001	0.001	-
94 Libyan Arab Jamahiriya	0.066	0.132	0.132	0.066
95 Lithuania	0.017	0.024	0.024	0.007
96 Luxembourg	0.079	0.077	0.077	(0.002)
97 Madagascar	0.003	0.003	0.003	-
98 Malawi	0.002	0.001	0.001	(0.001)
99 Malaysia	0.231	0.203	0.203	(0.028)
100 Mali	0.002	0.002	0.002	-

State	ILO	UN	Draft scale of ILO	Increase (Decrease)
	assessments	assessments	assessments	(Diff. between
	2004	2005	2005	cols 3 and 1)
	Col.1	Col.2	Col.3	Col.4
	%	%	%	%
101 Malta	0.015	0.014	0.014	(0.001)
102 Mauritania	0.001	0.001	0.001	-
103 Mauritius	0.011	0.011	0.011	-
104 Mexico	1.069	1.883	1.885	0.816
105 Moldova, Republic of	0.002	0.001	0.001	(0.001)
106 Mongolia	0.001	0.001	0.001	-
107 Morocco	0.043	0.047	0.047	0.004
108 Mozambique	0.001	0.001	0.001	-
109 Myanmar	0.010	0.010	0.010	-
110 Namibia	0.007	0.006	0.006	(0.001)
111 Nepal	0.004	0.004	0.004	-
112 Netherlands	1.711	1.690	1.691	(0.020)
113 New Zealand	0.237	0.221	0.221	(0.016)
114 Nicaragua	0.001	0.001	0.001	-
115 Niger	0.001	0.001	0.001	-
116 Nigeria	0.067	0.042	0.042	(0.025)
117 Norway	0.636	0.679	0.680	0.044
118 Oman	0.060	0.070	0.070	0.010
119 Pakistan	0.060	0.055	0.055	(0.005)
120 Panama	0.018	0.019	0.019	0.001
121 Papua New Guinea	0.006	0.003	0.003	(0.003)
122 Paraguay	0.016	0.012	0.012	(0.004)
123 Peru	0.116	0.092	0.092	(0.024)
124 Philippines	0.098	0.095	0.095	(0.003)
125 Poland	0.372	0.461	0.461	0.089
126 Portugal	0.455	0.470	0.470	0.015
127 Qatar	0.033	0.064	0.064	0.031
128 Romania	0.057	0.060	0.060	0.003
129 Russian Federation	1.182	1.100	1.101	(0.081)
130 Rwanda	0.001	0.001	0.001	-
131 Saint Kitts and Nevis	0.001	0.001	0.001	-
132 Saint Lucia	0.002	0.002	0.002	-
133 Saint Vincent and the Grenadines	0.001	0.001	0.001	-
134 San Marino	0.002	0.003	0.003	0.001
135 Sao Tome and Principe	0.001	0.001	0.001	-
136 Saudi Arabia	0.545	0.713	0.714	0.169
137 Senegal	0.005	0.005	0.005	-
138 Serbia and Montenegro	0.019	0.019	0.019	-
139 Seychelles	0.002	0.002	0.002	-
140 Sierra Leone	0.001	0.001	0.001	-
141 Singapore	0.387	0.388	0.388	0.001
142 Slovakia	0.042	0.051	0.051	0.009
143 Slovenia	0.080	0.082	0.082	0.002
144 Solomon Islands	0.001	0.001	0.001	-
145 Somalia	0.001	0.001	0.001	-
146 South Africa	0.402	0.292	0.292	(0.110)
147 Spain	2.48034	2.520	2.523	0.04266
148 Sri Lanka	0.016	0.017	0.017	0.001
149 Sudan	0.006	0.008	0.008	0.002
150 Suriname	0.002	0.001	0.001	(0.001)
151 Swaziland	0.002	0.002	0.002	-
152 Sweden	1.01109	0.998	0.999	(0.01209)
153 Switzerland	1.254	1.197	1.198	(0.056)

State	ILO	UN	Draft scale of ILO	Increase (Decrease)
	assessments	assessments	assessments	(Diff. between
	2004	2005	2005	cols 3 and 1)
	Col.1	Col.2	Col.3	Col.4
	%	%	%	%
154 Syrian Arab Republic	0.079	0.038	0.038	(0.041)
155 Tajikistan	0.001	0.001	0.001	-
156 Tanzania, United Republic of	0.004	0.006	0.006	0.002
157 Thailand	0.290	0.209	0.209	(0.081)
158 The former Yugoslav Republic of Macedonia	0.006	0.006	0.006	-
159 Timor-Leste, Democratic Republic of	0.000	0.001	0.001	0.001
160 Togo	0.001	0.001	0.001	-
161 Trinidad and Tobago	0.016	0.022	0.022	0.006
162 Tunisia	0.029	0.032	0.032	0.003
163 Turkey	0.433	0.372	0.372	(0.061)
164 Turkmenistan	0.003	0.005	0.005	0.002
165 Uganda	0.005	0.006	0.006	0.001
166 Ukraine	0.052	0.039	0.039	(0.013)
167 United Arab Emirates	0.199	0.235	0.235	0.036
168 United Kingdom	5.451	6.127	6.133	0.682
169 United States	22.000	22.000	22.000	-
170 Uruguay	0.079	0.048	0.048	(0.031)
171 Uzbekistan	0.011	0.014	0.014	0.003
172 Vanuatu	0.001	0.001	0.001	-
173 Venezuela	0.205	0.171	0.171	(0.034)
174 Vietnam	0.016	0.021	0.021	0.005
175 Yemen	0.006	0.006	0.006	-
176 Zambia	0.002	0.002	0.002	-
177 Zimbabwe	0.008	0.007	0.007	(0.001)
	100.000	99.934	100.000	0.000



TWENTIETH ITEM ON THE AGENDA

**Matters relating to the Administrative
Tribunal of the International Labour
Organization****(a) Composition of the Tribunal**

1. In accordance with article III of the Statute of the Administrative Tribunal, the Tribunal consists of seven judges appointed by the International Labour Conference for a period of three years. The Tribunal's current composition is as follows:
 - Mr. Michel Gentot (France), President: term of office expires in July 2004;
 - Mr. James K. Hugessen (Canada), Vice-President: term of office expires in July 2006;
 - Mr. Seydou Ba (Senegal): term of office expires in July 2006;
 - Mr. Jean-François Egli (Switzerland): term of office expires in July 2004;
 - Ms. Flerida Ruth P. Romero (Philippines): term of office expires in July 2005;
 - Ms. Genevieve Gaudron (Australia): term of office expires in March 2006.
2. There are two judges whose terms of office are due to expire in July 2004: Mr. Gentot and Mr. Egli. While Mr. Gentot has expressed his willingness and availability to accept a new three-year term, Mr. Egli will reach 76 this year, which is considered by the Tribunal itself as its maximum retirement age. In addition to the vacancy that will become available after Mr. Egli's retirement, the post left vacant last July upon the expiration of the term of office of Ms. Rondon de Sanso is also to be filled.
3. Of these two vacancies, one concerns a post that has been held traditionally by a national of the Organization's host country, as almost one-third of the 44 organizations which have accepted the Tribunal's jurisdiction, including some of the largest, have their headquarters in Switzerland. The second relates to a post traditionally held by a distinguished jurist from Latin America.

4. In keeping with long-standing practice, the Director-General, after consultation with the Officers of the Governing Body, examines potential candidatures for the position of Judge of the Administrative Tribunal on the basis of several criteria: candidates must have experience as judges of a high national jurisdiction or equivalent status at the international level and must be representative of different systems of law. An overall balance at the linguistic and geographical level must also be ensured. The Director-General then recommends to the Governing Body, through its Programme, Financial and Administrative Committee, the names of persons that the Conference will be invited to nominate as judges in order to fill the vacant posts in the Tribunal.
5. The Director-General, after consultation with the Officers of the Governing Body, therefore wishes to propose the following two appointments for a period of three years:
- *Mr. Claude Rouiller* (Switzerland) was born in 1941. He has a PhD in law. He practised law as a barrister and notary before being appointed as a deputy judge to the Supreme Court in 1975, and successively from 1979 as judge and President of one of the Supreme Court's chambers, namely the "Première Cour de Droit Public". He served as Vice-President of the Supreme Court between 1992 and 1994, and as its President between 1994 and 1996. He is currently a professor at the School of Law and Economics of the University of Neuchâtel. He holds or has held office in various expert committees, such as the Federal Office of Conciliation or the Swiss Exchange Arbitration Court. He is the author of numerous legal articles and books and is fluent in English, German and Italian, in addition to his mother tongue, French.
 - *Dr. Agustín Gordillo* (Argentina) was born in 1938. He is a Professor of Administrative Law (1960 to present) and Professor of Human Rights (1986 to present) at the University of Buenos Aires School of Law. He has served as judge of the administrative tribunals of the Inter-American Development Bank (1984-89 and 1988-89 as its President), Organization of American States (2002-07) and International Monetary Fund (1994-2003). He has also been the Presiding Judge of the Arbitration Tribunal for Peru, an adviser to the Constitutional Affairs Commission of the House of Deputies of Argentina and the founding president of the Administrative Law Foundation. He is the author of numerous legal publications and textbooks, including a comprehensive four-volume *Treaties of Administrative Law*. He has made numerous contributions to Latin American and European law journals and is a visiting professor of administrative law in various American and European universities.
6. *The Committee may accordingly wish, through the draft resolution below:*
- (a) *to recommend to the Governing Body, and through it to the Conference, that they convey to Mr. Egli their appreciation for the services he has rendered to the work of the Administrative Tribunal over the past decade;*
 - (b) *to recommend to the Governing Body that it propose to the 92nd Session of the International Labour Conference:*
 - (i) *the renewal of the term of office of Mr. Gentot for three years;*
 - (ii) *the appointment of Mr. Rouiller for a term of office of three years;*
 - (iii) *the appointment of Mr. Gordillo for a term of office of three years.*

The General Conference of the International Labour Organization,

Decides, in accordance with article III of the Statute of the Administrative Tribunal of the International Labour Organization, to renew the appointment of Mr. Michel Gentot (France) for a term of three years;

Expresses its appreciation to Mr. Jean-François Egli for the services which he has rendered to the work of the Administrative Tribunal of the International Labour Organization over the last decade;

Decides, in accordance with article III of the Statute of the Administrative Tribunal of the International Labour Organization, to appoint as judges of the Administrative Tribunal, for a term of three years with effect from July 2004,

Mr. Agustín Gordillo (Argentina) and

Mr. Claude Rouiller (Switzerland).

Geneva, 22 March 2004.

Point for decision: Paragraph 6.