



17th American Regional Meeting

Santiago de Chile, 14–17 December 2010

AMRM.17/D.4(Corr.)

Report of the Credentials Committee

1. The Credentials Committee, which was appointed by the 17th American Regional Meeting at its first sitting, met on 14, 15 and 16 December 2010, in conformity with article 9 of the Rules for Regional Meetings, to examine the credentials of the delegates and technical advisers accredited to the Meeting, as well as objections concerning their credentials and other communications.
2. The Committee was composed as follows:
Chairperson: Mr Nelson Loustaunau (Government delegate, Uruguay)
Vice-Chairpersons: Mr Juan Mailhos (Employers' delegate, Uruguay) Mr Gabriel Del Río (Workers' delegate, Dominican Republic)
3. Credentials that have been received in respect of the members of the delegations have been submitted in the form of official instruments, official letters, and facsimiles. Scanned copies of such documents sent by electronic mail have been considered as equivalent to facsimiles.
4. The Committee draws the attention of the governments to the importance of respecting article 1, paragraph 3, of the abovementioned Rules, according to which credentials must be deposited at least 15 days before the opening of a meeting (i.e. 29 November 2010, for this Meeting). The Committee was concerned that credentials from only nine of 35 member States invited were received within that time limit. Furthermore, some Members filed their credentials just before and during the Meeting, such a late filing meaning that 66.66 per cent of the delegations that had been accredited by the end of the Meeting did not appear on the First preliminary list of delegations made available online by the Office on 6 December 2010. Since this list provides advance information that may serve as the basis for objections to the credentials of delegates or their advisers, the absence of full information before the beginning of the Meeting was a concern to the Committee.

Composition of the Meeting

5. By the time of the adoption of this report, and as reflected in the table in Annex A, out of the 35 member States invited to attend the Meeting, 27 had sent credentials. In addition, of the three member States responsible for the external relations of non-metropolitan territories located in the region, one had sent credentials. The Meeting was composed of 50 Government delegates, 23 Employers' delegates and 24 Workers' delegates, i.e. 97 accredited delegates in all. In addition, the Meeting comprised 51 Government advisers, 39 Employers' advisers and 50 Workers' advisers, amounting to a total of 140 advisers.

Persons appointed as both substitute delegates and advisers have been included among the advisers. The total number of accredited delegates and advisers thus amounted to 237.¹

6. Regarding the number of delegates and advisers having registered, there were 45 Government delegates, 20 Employers' delegates and 20 Workers' delegates, making a total of 85 delegates. The total number of advisers amounted to 111, of whom 44 were Government advisers, 25 Employers' advisers and 42 Workers' advisers. Annex B to this report contains more detailed information on the number of delegates and advisers registered for the Meeting, amounting to a total of 196.²
7. The Committee noted that the delegation of three member States represented at the Meeting (Bahamas, Belize and Guatemala) was exclusively governmental. In addition, the delegation of Mexico comprised the Workers' delegate, and not the Employers' delegate.
8. With regard to the resolutions concerning the participation of women in ILO meetings, adopted by the International Labour Conference at its 67th and 78th Sessions (June 1981 and June 1991), the Committee noted that 23 of the 97 delegates and 35 of the 140 advisers who were accredited to the Meeting were women. Women represent therefore 24.5 per cent of the total delegates and advisers accredited, as compared to 21.8 per cent at the last American Regional Meeting.³ The Committee noted that five delegations contained no women delegates or advisers (Bahamas, Belize, Dominican Republic, Paraguay, Uruguay). The Committee wishes to recall that the United Nations set a target of increasing the proportion of women in decision- and policy-making bodies to at least 30 per cent which was referred to by the Director-General in the letter of convocation sent to the Members. The Committee calls upon the constituents to strive to meet this target of representation of women in delegations to the Regional Meetings.
9. Twenty Ministers and Vice-Ministers of the 26 registered member States of the region attended the Meeting.
10. Two Officers of the Governing Body attended the meeting.
11. Nine member States of the region (Cuba, Dominica, Grenada, Guyana, Haiti, Jamaica, Saint Kitts and Nevis, Saint Lucia, Saint Vincent and the Grenadines) and two member States responsible for the external relations of non-metropolitan territories located in the region (Netherlands and United Kingdom) were not represented in this Meeting (two less in total than in the prior Regional Meeting). In this connection, the Committee hoped that all member States would in future participate in Regional Meetings and that appropriate steps would be taken to this effect.

¹ In 2006, at the 16th American Regional Meeting, the total number of accredited delegates and advisers was 177 (86 delegates and 91 advisers).

² In 2006, at the 16th American Regional Meeting, the total number of registered delegates and advisers was 142 (70 delegates and 72 advisers).

³ Some 23.7 per cent of the delegates and 25 per cent of the advisers, as compared to 18.6 per cent and 24.7 per cent, respectively, at the 16th American Regional Meeting.

Representatives of member States from a different region

12. In accordance with article 1, paragraph 6, of the Rules for Regional Meetings, the following member States from a different region were invited to be represented by an observer delegation at the Regional Meeting:
- Portugal;
 - Spain.

Representatives of official international organizations

13. Of the official international organizations invited to attend the Meeting, in conformity with article 1, paragraph 8, of the Rules for Regional Meetings and in accordance with the relevant agreements or decisions of the Governing Body, the following were represented:
- Economic Commission for Latin America and the Caribbean;
 - United Nations Educational, Scientific and Cultural Organization;
 - Andean Development Corporation;
 - Organization of American States.

Representatives of non-governmental international organizations

14. Of the non-governmental international organizations invited to attend the Meeting, in conformity with article 1, paragraph 8, of the Rules for Regional Meetings and in accordance with the relevant agreements or decisions of the Governing Body, the following were represented:
- International Trade Union Confederation;
 - International Organisation of Employers;
 - World Federation of Trade Unions.

Objection regarding the designation of the Employers' delegation from the Bolivarian Republic of Venezuela

15. The Committee received an objection from the Employers' group concerning the designation of the Employers' delegation from the Bolivarian Republic of Venezuela. The objection alleged that the Government had included in Venezuela's Employers' delegation the following technical advisers, who should never have been considered to be representatives of organizations that represent employers under the criteria recognized by the ILO that is, free, independent and not the object of government influence: Mr Miguel Pérez Abad and Mr Miguel Valderrama, of the Federación de Cámaras y Asociaciones de Artesanos, Micros, Pequeñas y Medianas Industrias y Empresas de Venezuela (FEDEINDUSTRIA); Mr Alfredo Cabrera of the Confederación Nacional de Agricultores y Ganaderos de Venezuela (CONFAGAN); Ms Keila De La Rosa, Mr Elmer Villamizar and Mr Orlando Cabrera of Empresarios por Venezuela (EMPREVEN); Ms Fanny Suárez, Mr Alberto Cudemus, Ms Carla Cedeño and Mr Mario Vasallo, of the Consejo Bolivariano

de Industriales Empresarios y Microempresarios (COBOEIM). According to the Employers' group, these organizations barely had an enterprise base and received financial support and enjoyed the favouritism of the Government, as has been made known in complaints filed in the past with the Committee on Freedom of Association and the International Labour Conference. The Employers' group also indicated that the Government, in addition to changing the composition of the Employers' delegation that had been proposed by FEDECAMARAS, the most representative among all employer organizations, funded the participation of the technical advisers mentioned above, but only defrayed expenses for two of the members proposed by FEDECAMARAS (Mr Noel Álvarez and Ms Albis Muñoz).

- 16.** In a written communication addressed to the Committee, at its request, the Government stated that the country had never had a sole employer organization and rejected the unilateral consideration that FEDECAMARAS was the most representative, to the exclusion of the other organizations. The Government also highlighted the large number of small and medium-sized enterprises – the business segment that encompassed the majority of the country's employers – affiliated with FEDEINDUSTRIA, which was founded almost 40 years ago. The Government further stated that the most representative organizations at present, without ranking them, were the following: CONFAGAN, EMPREVEN, FEDECAMARAS, FEDEINDUSTRIA and COBOEIM. The Government underscored that these organizations had been mutually accepted and recognized as being the most representative, as revealed by the outcomes of meetings in which they participated, showing tolerance and respect. The Government stated that none of these organizations had been registered with the People's Ministry for Labour and Social Security, which explained why it did not have any documentation on the alleged numbers of their affiliate organizations. Therefore, the Government had invited them to participate in a consultative process, and held a meeting with them on 23 November 2010 at the Ministry. In the meeting, FEDECAMARAS demonstrated that it was the most representative organization and approved its proposed delegation, which was composed exclusively of its own representatives and communicated by letter on 15 November. The other organizations proposed their own representatives as delegates, claiming their right to participate in ILO meetings. The Government stated that there was no rotation system for designating the Employers' delegation, and that in recent years FEDECAMARAS had presented itself as the organization that designated the Employers' delegation, despite the displeasure expressed by the other organizations, which were most representative and requested to have a rotation system. This fact notwithstanding, the Government appointed FEDECAMARAS to be the delegate, despite the absence of data that would have objectively accredited it as being the most representative organization. The Government then proceeded to accredit all technical advisers that had been nominated by each employer organization, for the sake of pluralism, democracy, equality, participation and inclusion. As for the allegations of financial support and favouritism, the Government indicated that it has established institutions and programmes to promote small and medium-sized enterprises, individual producers and cooperatives. The Government alleged that it was not acting with favouritism toward or interfering with any corporate organization and, in keeping with its neutral stance, stated that it favoured the inclusion and participation of all social actors, while incorporating sectors that were formerly excluded. Likewise, the Government contended that, in line with the 1922 Advisory Opinion of the Permanent Court of International Justice (PCIJ), several organizations may be considered the most representative in one country and that the ILO Constitution did not require that all organizations reach an agreement with the most representative organization nor that the latter be the only one represented. The Government stated that all designated delegates and advisers came from important and renowned organizations corresponding to core economic sectors. Regarding the payment of travel and subsistence expenses, the Government declared that it had fulfilled the obligation established in the Rules for Regional Meetings to pay for its tripartite delegation's travel and subsistence expenses. In

accordance with its usual practice, the Government paid for the expenses incurred by the Workers' delegate and one of the advisers from each of the organizations.

17. *The Committee took note of the historical recognition of FEDECAMARAS as the most representative organization, a condition which is not questioned by the Government and which has been recognized by the ILO's supervisory bodies. Moreover, the Committee believes that it does not have objective information in order to determine whether the other organizations can be considered to be legitimate, independent and most representative, nor sufficient objective evidence to decide on the allegations concerning the non-representative nature of the challenged organizations.*
18. *The Committee recalls, as already stated by the Credentials Committee of the International Labour Conference that, in the absence of an agreement between organizations for the nomination of an Employers' delegation to be in accordance with article 1, paragraph 2, of the Rules for Regional Meetings, it is crucial that the Government establish and apply objective and verifiable criteria and adequate means to objectively determine the most representative nature of the organizations concerned. Likewise, the Committee recalls that the Government's application of the participatory democracy principle does not correspond to criteria for consultation drawn from principles established in the ILO Constitution. The root of the problem does not lie, as stated by the Government, in clarifying whether only one or more organizations can be considered to be the most representative, since this question was addressed by the PCIJ in its advisory opinion No. 1 in 1922, as recalled by the Credentials Committee at the last meeting of the Conference. Conversely, the issue is that there is currently no mechanism in place to assess representativeness.*
19. *The Committee regrets that the situation concerning the establishment and implementation of representativeness criteria has once again not materially changed with respect to prior years and that the Government has not approached the Office to discuss the possibility of receiving such technical assistance in that respect, as recommended on several occasions by the Credentials Committee of the Conference. Taking into account all of the above, the Committee once again recommends that the Government avail itself of the technical assistance that the Office may offer in order to advance in the establishment of objective and verifiable criteria for representativeness.*

Objection concerning the nomination of the Workers' delegation of the Bolivarian Republic of Venezuela

20. The Committee received an objection concerning the nomination of the Workers' delegation of the Bolivarian Republic of Venezuela submitted by Mr Manuel Cova, Secretary-General of the Confederación de Trabajadores de Venezuela (CTV). Mr Cova alleged that, in breach of the ILO Constitution, the Rules for Regional Meetings, and prior committee conclusions, the Government had nominated the Workers' delegation without agreement by the CTV, the most representative trade union organization, and disregarding the request to nominate its Secretary-General as Workers' delegate formulated for the latter and for two additional confederations – Confederación de Sindicatos Autónomos (CODESA) and Confederación General de Trabajadores (CGT). Consultative meetings were held by the Government on 18 and 22 November 2010, in which the following workers' organizations participated: CODESA, CGT, the CTV, the Confederación Unitaria de Trabajadores de Venezuela (CUTV), and the Unión Nacional de Trabajadores (UNETE). No agreement was reached between the workers' organizations invited. In spite of this, and ignoring a CODESA request, the CGT and CTV nominated the delegate proposed by the CUTV and the UNETE. The Government, by letter of 1 December 2010, informed Mr Cova that he had been nominated as technical adviser. Mr Cova refused this designation by letter of 6 December. In a letter that same day, the Government stated that it

was impossible to accept his resignation since the deadline for the submission of credentials had expired on 29 November 2010 and urged Mr Cova to reconsider his decision. The CTV, by letter of 7 December, rejected the Government's arguments, stating that notification of the designation itself had been executed after the aforementioned deadline had expired. Mr Cova also alleged before the Commission that the CTV had suggested institution of a rotation mechanism freely established by the trade unions, indicating that the Government had not taken this suggestion into account. The CTV requested invalidation of the Workers' delegate credentials.

- 21.** In a written communication addressed to the Committee at its request, the Government stated, in response to the objection, that the UNETE, CGT, CODESA, CTV and CUTV were highly representative Venezuelan workers' organizations, a condition these organizations acknowledged reciprocally. The Government explained that the workers' organization process had been strengthened substantially in recent years and, in that context, 5,387 new workers' organizations had been registered between 1999 and 2010, compared to 2,872 organizations registered between 1989 and 1998. Over the last three years, 50 per cent of the new organizations registered had affiliated to the UNETE, while the remaining 50 per cent did not belong to any other national confederation (CUTV, CGT, CTV or CODESA). In addition, according to the Government, the three largest worker federations that together have a total 128,000 members are affiliated to the UNETE, which features 252 registered union organizations (federations and trade unions) as opposed to 122 affiliated to the CTV. The Government declared that consultative meetings had been held on 18, 22 and 24 November 2010 – the first two of which were attended by the five aforementioned organizations and the third attended by the CUTV and the UNETE. The five organizations reached no agreement regarding nomination of the Workers' delegate; while the CTV, the CODESA and the CGT selected Mr Cova, the CUTV and the UNETE considered that a member of the UNETE should be nominated. The Government reported that a rotation system was in force between 2003 and 2007 and since it no longer applied, the Government had resorted to an inclusive dialogue method for election of delegations. Based on the data above, the Government determined that the UNETE was the majoritarian organization and appointed its representative as the Workers' delegate. Notwithstanding, in order to encourage inclusion of the other trade unions, the Government accredited all technical advisers requested by the same. The Government deposited its credentials for the delegation of Venezuela on 29 November 2010, the last day of the deadline for presentation of the same, notifying the members of the delegation regarding their nominations on 1 December. With regard to the rejection of Mr Cova, the Government reported that it had brought the nomination process and CTV resignations to the attention of the International Labour Office. However, with regard to a question by the Office as to whether this meant withdrawal of CTV credentials, the Government clarified that it was not making any change to the delegation, in virtue of its policy favouring greater inclusion and participation of all organizations and trusting that the CTV representatives would reconsider their position and participation as members of the Venezuelan delegation.
- 22.** *The Committee observes that, as it has done in past meetings of the International Labour Conference, the CTV has filed an objection concerning the designation of the Workers' delegate and that once again the Government has accredited Mr Cova, despite the fact that Mr Cova refused this accreditation in writing. As for the Government's response given to Mr Cova, that it could not accede to his request because the refusal was received after the deadline for introducing credentials, it is unacceptable given that at a later time the Government had ample margin to modify the credentials and in fact turned down the opportunity to do so.*
- 23.** *The Committee recalls that, in the absence of a rotation agreement, the existence and application of objective and verifiable criteria for determining the representativeness of trade organizations is critical when designating Workers' delegations. The Committee*

takes note of the fact that the Government chose the five organizations it considered to be most representative, and that the Government provided some information about the representativeness of those organizations. However, and bearing in mind the short duration of the Regional Meeting, the Committee observes that the information provided does not allow conclusions to be drawn about the combined representative force of the CUTV and the UNETE, as compared with the CGT, the CTV and the CODESA. In addition, the Committee does not have sufficient information to consider the allegations concerning representativeness presented by the CTV. Furthermore, the Committee recalls that the Rules for Regional Meetings do not provide for the consideration of requests for invalidation of credentials.

- 24.** *The Committee, expressing its concern over objections filed in regard to the Bolivarian Republic of Venezuela's Employers' and Workers' delegations, reiterates its recommendation that the Government avail itself of the technical assistance the Office can provide in this matter. The Committee regrets that, despite numerous recommendations the Government has received from the Credentials Committee, the Government has not availed itself of the advice that has been offered. The Committee hopes that the Government, with assistance from the Office, will ensure that the designation of the Workers' delegations to ILO Regional Meetings is conducted in agreement with the most representative industrial organizations in full compliance with article 1, paragraph 1, of the Rules for Regional Meetings.*

Communication concerning the Employers' delegation of the Republic of Panama

- 25.** The Committee received from the National Council for Private Enterprise of Panama (CoNEP) a communication concerning the composition of the Employers' delegation. CoNEP complained that the tripartite national delegation was composed of three Government representatives, three Worker representatives and only one Employer representative, implying a disparity of representation prejudicial to the Employers' delegation. CoNEP indicated that it had initially received a communication from the Ministry of Labour and Social Development dated 18 October 2010 informing it that the Government had decided to participate in the Regional Meeting with a delegation composed of a Worker representative and an Employer representative, and requesting the employers to submit a shortlist of three candidates from which to choose the Employer representative who would attend the Meeting. CoNEP chose its representative from an internal shortlist of three in accordance with the indication in the Government's note that only one Employer representative was to be designated. By a ministerial resolution of 28 October 2010, the Government decided to choose three representatives from the worker sector, three Government representatives and only one representative from the employer sector. CoNEP states that, when questioned regarding this disparity, the Government alleged that the note had been badly drafted, and for this reason the employers' organization submitted a new list on 8 November 2010, increasing the Employer representation to three. This was not accepted by the Government
- 26.** The Committee received a letter from the Employers' group supporting the CoNEP communication, recalling the importance of ensuring balanced representation in tripartite delegations accredited to Regional Meetings. The Employers' group expressed its regret regarding the lack of balance in the composition of the tripartite delegation of Panama, which was in its view prejudicial to tripartism, a guiding principle of the Organization.
- 27.** In a written communication to the Committee, at its request, the Government of Panama indicated that after receiving the invitation from the ILO to be represented at the Regional Meeting by a tripartite delegation, the Ministry of Labour and Social Development had sent invitations to both the workers' and employers' organizations for them to submit the

name of their participants for this tripartite event. The Government specified that, in CONATO's case, by virtue of article 1066 of the Labour Code, which was in force at the time of making the request, CONATO had been asked to send the shortlists of three for the choice of participants. The Government informed the Committee that this article, which was no longer in force, did not apply at that time to CoNEP, and that the organization was aware of this. The Government stated that both CONATO and CoNEP submitted the names of their delegates, and pointed out that the communication from CoNEP of 27 October 2010 contained no mention that the nomination had been made upon suggestion or adoption of any shortlist of three candidates. The Government stated that on receipt of the nominations of the social partners it had proceeded, without raising the least question, to appoint a national tripartite delegation to attend the Regional Meeting, in line with the indications received from the organizations concerned. The Government indicated that as was customary it had included in its delegation the Ambassador of Panama to the Government of the country hosting the Meeting. The Government stated that it had received a request from CoNEP to enlarge its representation, but that this had been received after the resolution designating the tripartite delegation had been finalized and published by the corresponding legal instances. The Government continued that as the budget for the current year had closed, it was impossible to obtain the resources to finance the other CoNEP members, and that its representatives had been duly informed of this. For these reasons, the Government regretted that, in consideration of the above facts, the composition of the Panamanian delegation to the Regional Meeting could not be balanced.

28. *The Committee observes that the communication from CoNEP cannot be considered an objection, as it does not call into question whether the Employers' delegation of Panama was nominated from the most representative professional organizations, nor can it be considered a complaint as it does not concern the payment of travel and subsistence expenses of the tripartite delegation.*
29. *The Committee, in view of the divergence in the information given by CoNEP and that from the Government, does not have sufficient elements to enable it to pronounce on CoNEP's allegations regarding the designation of the Employer representatives at the Regional Meeting. Likewise, the Government had not provided sufficient information to explain, in relation to the numeric limitations on the social partners' delegations, from one employer and one worker representative in its convocation letter to the possibility of including sectoral representatives as technical advisers. However, the Committee wishes to recall the general principle by virtue of which governments must send delegations which do not present a serious and manifest imbalance as between their three parts, so that they all have a comparable ability to actively participate in the work of Regional Meetings. This principle derives from the fundamental role of tripartism as the backbone of the ILO.*

Communication concerning incomplete delegations

30. The Committee received two communications from the International Trade Union Confederation (ITUC) concerning the delegations of Bahamas and Belize. ITUC alleged that the Governments of Bahamas and Belize had not respected their obligation to designate complete tripartite delegations, pursuant to article 1, paragraph 1, of the Rules for Regional Meetings, in so far as they did not include workers and employers in their respective delegations.
31. *The Committee presented these communications to the Governments of interest, inviting them to comment if appropriate. No responses were received. The Committee wishes to recall the importance of designating complete delegations in order to safeguard the tripartite model, a fundamental pillar of the Organization, and in this regard refers to paragraph 32 below.*

* * *

- 32.** The Committee recalls that, by decision of the Governing Body adopted at its 183rd Session (June 1971) and modified at its 205th Session (March 1978), the Director-General is requested to carry out inquiries concerning the reasons for failure to send complete tripartite delegations, including to Regional Meetings, and to report to the Governing Body on the responses. The Committee wishes to encourage the Director-General to contact the Governments mentioned in paragraphs 7 and 11 above and to report to the Governing Body accordingly.
- 33.** The Credentials Committee unanimously adopted this report, except for the conclusions related to the objection concerning the nomination of the Employers' delegation of the Bolivarian Republic of Venezuela which were adopted by majority with the abstention of the Chairperson of the Committee.
- 34.** This report will be presented to the Meeting in order for the Meeting to request the Office to bring it to the attention of the Governing Body in conformity with article 9, paragraph 4, of the Rules for Regional Meetings.

Santiago de Chile, 16 December 2010

(Signed) Mr Nelson Loustaunau
Chairperson

Mr Juan Mailhos

Mr Gabriel Del Río

Annex A

Accredited delegates and advisers (updated as of 2 p.m. on 16.12.2010)

	Government Delegates	Employers' Delegates	Workers' Delegates	Government Advisers	Employers' Advisers	Workers' Advisers
Antigua and Barbuda	1	1	1	-	-	-
Argentina	2	1	1	6	1	5
Bahamas	2	-	-	-	-	-
Barbados	2	1	1	-	-	-
Belize	2	-	-	-	-	-
Bolivia	2	1	1	-	-	2
Brazil	2	1	1	7	4	8
Canada	2	1	1	3	-	1
Chile	2	1	1	15	16	11
Colombia	2	1	1	3	-	7
Costa Rica	2	1	1	1	-	-
Cuba	-	-	-	-	-	-
Dominica	-	-	-	-	-	-
Dominican Republic	2	1	1	1	-	-
Ecuador	2	1	1	1	-	1
El Salvador	2	1	1	-	-	-
France	1	1	1	-	-	-
Grenada	-	-	-	-	-	-
Guatemala	1	-	-	-	-	-
Guyana	-	-	-	-	-	-
Haiti	-	-	-	-	-	-
Honduras	1	1	1	-	-	-
Jamaica	-	-	-	-	-	-
Mexico	2	-	1	5	-	2
Netherlands	-	-	-	-	-	-
Nicaragua	2	1	1	-	-	-
Panama	2	1	1	2	-	2
Paraguay	2	1	1	-	-	-
Peru	2	1	1	4	1	-
Saint Kitts and Nevis	-	-	-	-	-	-
Saint Lucia	-	-	-	-	-	-
Saint Vincent and the Grenadines	-	-	-	-	-	-
Suriname	2	1	1	-	-	-
Trinidad and Tobago	2	1	1	1	1	1
United Kingdom	-	-	-	-	-	-
United States	2	1	1	-	-	-
Uruguay	2	1	1	1	2	-
Venezuela (Bolivarian Rep.)	2	1	1	1	14	10
Total	50	23	24	51	39	50

Annex B

Registered delegates and advisers (updated as of 2 p.m. on 16.12.2010)

	Government Delegates	Employers' Delegates	Workers' Delegates	Government Advisers	Employers' Advisers	Workers' Advisers
Antigua and Barbuda	1	1	1	-	-	-
Argentina	2	1	1	6	1	5
Bahamas	-	-	-	-	-	-
Barbados	2	1	1	-	-	-
Belize	2	-	-	-	-	-
Bolivia	1	1	-	-	-	2
Brazil	2	1	1	7	3	7
Canada	2	1	1	3	-	1
Chile	2	1	-	12	12	10
Colombia	2	-	1	3	-	5
Costa Rica	2	-	1	1	-	-
Cuba	-	-	-	-	-	-
Dominica	-	-	-	-	-	-
Dominican Republic	2	1	1	1	-	-
Ecuador	2	1	1	1	-	1
El Salvador	2	1	1	-	-	-
France	1	1	1	-	-	-
Grenada	-	-	-	-	-	-
Guatemala	1	-	-	-	-	-
Guyana	-	-	-	-	-	-
Haiti	-	-	-	-	-	-
Honduras	1	1	-	-	-	-
Jamaica	-	-	-	-	-	-
Mexico	2	-	1	3	-	2
Netherlands	-	-	-	-	-	-
Nicaragua	1	1	1	-	-	-
Panama	2	1	1	2	-	2
Paraguay	2	1	1	-	-	-
Peru	1	1	1	2	1	-
Saint Kitts and Nevis	-	-	-	-	-	-
Saint Lucia	-	-	-	-	-	-
Saint Vincent and the Grenadines	-	-	-	-	-	-
Suriname	2	-	1	-	-	-
Trinidad and Tobago	2	1	-	1	1	1
United Kingdom	-	-	-	-	-	-
United States	2	1	1	-	-	-
Uruguay	2	1	1	1	2	-
Venezuela (Bolivarian Rep.)	2	1	1	1	5	6
Total	45	20	20	44	25	42