



Governing Body

310th Session, Geneva, March 2011

GB.310/15(Rev.)

FIFTEENTH ITEM ON THE AGENDA

Report of the Committee on Technical Cooperation

1. The Committee on Technical Cooperation met on 15 March 2011. The Committee was chaired by Ms B. Kituyi. The Employer and Worker Vice-Chairpersons were Mr L. Traore and Ms M. Francisco respectively.
2. The Committee had the following agenda items:
 - I. Operational strategies for capacity development for constituents in Decent Work Country Programmes and technical cooperation
 - II. Decent work and aid effectiveness
 - III. Operational aspects of the International Programme on the Elimination of Child Labour (IPEC) – oral report
 - IV. Report on the implementation of the Tripartite Agreement on Freedom of Association and Democracy in Colombia

I. Operational strategies for capacity development for constituents in Decent Work Country Programmes and technical cooperation

3. The representative of the Director-General, Mr J.F. Hunt (Acting Director of the Partnerships and Development Cooperation Department) presented the paper.¹ He emphasized that appropriate capacity development required proper capacity evaluation which identified gaps in knowledge and also detected strengths. The integration of technical and institutional capacity development into the preparation of Decent Work Country Programmes (DWCPs) and the planning of technical cooperation measures was a challenge that was being met. It was vital to make the training offered by the International Training Centre, Turin, more accessible and to provide wider opportunities for exchanges of knowledge and experience among peers. Turning to the monitoring and evaluation of results, he stressed the need to assess the changing situation with regard to constituents'

¹ GB.310/TC/1.

capacity. In conclusion, he said that the paper proposed practical measures in line with discussions of the Programme and Budget for 2012–13.

4. The Employer Vice-Chairperson said that the paper under consideration took account of the recommendations set out in the paper adopted by the Committee on Technical Cooperation in November 2010. He noted, among its good points, the reference to the important role of employers in economic development and to the Turin Centre's key role. The paper did not, however, contain any specific proposals for a strategy to boost the social partners' capacities, a strategy which had to be based on their real needs. A capacity-building component had to be included in each DWCP and every technical cooperation project, and the Turin Centre had to be involved as a matter of course. The resources for helping employers' organizations to meet the needs of enterprises were inadequate; the Turin Centre's action should not be hampered by a lack of wherewithal. He asked the Office to continue follow-up on those issues and to present a position paper at the next Governing Body session. The Employers' group endorsed the point for decision.
5. The Worker Vice-Chairperson said that constituents' capacity should be evaluated in such a way as to allow their needs to be identified and provide them with a suitable training programme designed to improve the representation of their interests, their contribution to social dialogue and their participation in the consensual formulation of development policies. Promoting the development of institutional capacity and integrating capacity into the technical cooperation of DWCPs offered a new model of technical cooperation which placed the ILO's constituents and their individual and collective training at the centre of the development process, including training within a tripartite context.
6. Social dialogue would be enhanced if, when DWCPs were developed and implemented, trade union organizations were better coordinated so that they arrived at a joint labour agenda. Exchanges of different labour experiences at the regional or international level were essential to capacity development. The ILO needed bipartite and tripartite training programmes in order to create favourable conditions for appropriate, coherent and sustainable social policy at the national level.
7. She cited examples of the International Programme on the Elimination of Child Labour (IPEC) and the Better Work programme, and stressed that what was needed was more participation by workers and more training for them. She wanted to see capacity building for informal sector workers included in the paper.
8. She drew attention to the important role played by the International Training Centre, Turin, and especially of the Bureau for Workers' Activities (ACTRAV), in developing constituents' capacity, and to its contribution to enhancing the effectiveness of the social partners. She also highlighted the importance of developing medium-term training programmes. The strategies under discussion gave due recognition to the functions of the Bureaux for Workers' Activities and Employers' Activities (ACTRAV and ACT/EMP), and in the case of ACTRAV made it responsible for planning and carrying out capacity development for trade unions in order that they might play an active role in DWCPs. Lastly, she supported the point for decision and requested that the abovementioned strategies should be assessed in greater detail with a view to ensuring that they were followed up.
9. The representative of the Government of Argentina, speaking on behalf of the Group of Latin America and Caribbean Countries (GRULAC), said that developing constituents' technical and institutional capacity had to form part of DWCPs and of ILO technical cooperation programmes and projects. When tackling institutional needs, capacity building had to have both a strategic direction and a tripartite focus. The Turin Centre played a key role, since its training courses gave effect to the strategy for boosting technical and

institutional capacity. Field offices and decentralized programmes were the right channels for increasing that capacity.

10. In conclusion, he suggested that it would be advisable to assess the progress made in capacity building. He supported the point for decision, and noted that ILO technical cooperation required its own specific forum within the Governing Body structure.
11. The representative of the Government of Mozambique, speaking on behalf of the Africa group, said that the paper met his group's concerns. The ILO approach to strengthening capacity must help to further the fight against poverty in the least advanced countries through, for example, South–South cooperation. He wished to know how the Office would incorporate those strategies into new DWCPs and support the active participation of beneficiaries in project design. The Africa group approved the point for decision.
12. The representative of the Government of Canada, speaking on behalf of the group of industrialized market economy countries (IMEC group), agreed with the position taken in paragraph 14 on the need for government capacity, in particular effective labour administration, including efforts to deal with the informal economy. She stressed that not every technical cooperation project needed a capacity-development component. The Office should prepare information on good capacity development practices identified in such programmes as IPEC, Better Work and at the International Training Centre, Turin. The IMEC group supported the suggestions set out in paragraph 7. More information was also needed on lessons learned from DWCPs and whether the results were being integrated into new projects. In addition, clarification was requested on paragraph 9 of the document. The Office's inclusion of proposed indicators with efforts to include the informal economy was to be welcomed, but greater clarity was needed on the proposed development of core programmes. In view of the limited resources, capacity development should focus on areas clearly within the ILO's mandate.
13. A high-quality strategy on capacity development would be most likely to attract resources. The IMEC group therefore requested the Office to further develop the strategy and related indicators for consideration at the November 2011 meeting of the Committee. She proposed a revised point for decision in that regard.
14. The representative of the Government of Australia, speaking on behalf of the Asia and Pacific group (ASPAG), noted that strengthening governance and social partners was central to decent work. Capacity building should be action-oriented. It was important for the Office to develop good indicators on capacity development as there was a lack of reliable evaluation results linking capacity development to decent work outcomes, and it should provide some evidence-based information on the success of capacity development in achieving objectives. ASPAG agreed with the importance of the assessment of constituents' needs, which should include objective assessments and not just inquiries about what constituents felt they needed.
15. The representative of the Government of the United Republic of Tanzania underlined the importance of capacity development in building a sense of ownership, accountability and monitoring and evaluation. He commended Brazil on its support for South–South and Triangular Cooperation, and thanked the Office for its support in preparing the second DWCP in his country. He supported the point for decision.
16. The representative of the Government of Mexico endorsed the proposal to evaluate constituents' capacities, as it would help to avoid imposing solutions. Evaluation should take place, especially by means of consultation, during the preparation of DWCPs. The Turin Centre offered advantages when it came to capacity building through exchanges of

knowledge and experience among constituents. She called on the Office to work out further indicators which would make it possible to assess capacity development.

17. The representative of the Government of Egypt said that DWCPs should take account of the constituents' needs and avoid imposing a single approach for all countries. He supported calls for strengthening the Turin Centre and for better evaluation of capacity-development initiatives.
18. The representative of the Government of Ghana highlighted the need for capacity development and assessment, which would help identify institutional needs and the development of sustainable solutions. She called for more support to the Turin Centre to make training opportunities more widely available, and for an expansion of the scope of the training programmes. She supported the strategies outlined in the document.
19. The representative of the Government of Bangladesh noted that capacity development could be regarded as a deliverable of particular relevance for least developed countries (LDCs), and the Office could develop such a concept in the light of the forthcoming Fourth United Nations Conference on the Least Developed Countries. While he endorsed the strategies set out in the paper, he requested further clarification on the methodologies relating to the monitoring of outcomes, indicators and milestones in paragraph 18. He inquired what would occur if a DWCP fell short of capacity-development criteria in the quality control procedures. He requested further information on evidence-based literature which examined how capacity development led to real changes on the ground. He supported the point for decision but hoped that further information on the issue could be provided in a future document.
20. The representative of the Government of India emphasized the need for a coordinated approach in capacity-building programmes, and called for Turin Centre offers to be more widely available through larger investment in field-based courses and specific mechanisms and incentives to enhance knowledge and experience-sharing activities among constituents. He supported the need to develop guidelines on capacity-development indicators and called for attention to be paid to on-the-ground realities and diversities in development stages. He recalled various initiatives undertaken in India under the DWCP. Strengthening the capacity of ILO constituents ensured the participation of real economy actors in the development process and would bring about more effective and sustainable development results. He supported the point for decision.
21. A Worker member called for more engagement with ACT/EMP and ACTRAV in delivering of capacity development for constituents in the DWCPs and technical cooperation. He noted that various capacity efforts did not constitute capacity-building programmes as a whole, and called for better integration of capacity-development efforts.
22. The representative of the Government of France stressed the importance of national ownership and the central role of the social partners. Labour administration and inspection authorities also had to be able to deal with the requirements of decent work, especially in the informal economy. South-South cooperation might help them to do so. Those concerns should be reflected in paragraph 18 of the paper.
23. The representative of the Government of Kenya expressed appreciation for the ILO's capacity-development initiatives, but noted the need for further shaping of such initiatives to ensure maximum impact. He called for continuous development, implementation and evaluation of national employment and labour policies, legislative frameworks for gender equality, and enforcement of laws dealing with such areas as non-discrimination and equal pay for work of equal value. He also urged the ILO to collaborate effectively with the Turin Centre and to consider further linkages with other reputable regional institutions in

order to ensure mainstreaming of capacity-development initiatives into technical cooperation programmes. He supported the point for decision.

24. The representative of the Government of Brazil, supporting the GRULAC position, emphasized that DWCPs were essential in promoting decent work as a key part of any national development strategy. The enhancement of institutional capacity and the actual transfer of knowledge and experiences were key elements in assessing development effectiveness. He supported the point for decision.
25. The representative of the Government of the United States urged the Office to conduct an inventory of ongoing capacity-building activities with a view to identifying best practices in capacity building for governments and the social partners. She requested information on whether lessons had been learned on that subject from successful DWCPs and, if so, whether they were being integrated into DWCPs. She also requested clarification on paragraph 9 of the document. Even though her delegation found merit in supporting capacity building for the tripartite partners, it was difficult to identify clear strategies proposed in the paper. She requested the Office to more clearly elaborate strategies and proposed performance indicators for consideration at the meeting in November 2011.
26. The representative of the Government of Nigeria noted the need to focus on capacity-development interventions where the ILO had core competencies, while remaining flexible and able to respond to emerging issues that might face ILO constituents and countries. He stressed that capacity development should not be a one-off event. There was a need for continuous review of ongoing capacity-development efforts to ensure that sustainability indicators were clarified, especially for best practices that could be replicated.
27. A representative of the Workers' group was of the opinion that the strategy to build constituents' capacity in line with the 2008 Declaration on Social Justice for a Fair Globalization called for close coordination within the Office and that cooperation initiatives were measured by their impact. The same policy of results-based evaluation had to be applied when judging progress in constituents' capacity to participate actively in the formulation of economic and social policies.
28. A representative of the Director-General, replying to the debate, said that tripartite constituents' participation was essential for analysing needs, planning strategy and evaluating institutional capacity, and it would also be taken into account when evaluating the progress of bipartite and tripartite capacity-building programmes. He noted that the Office was drawing up guidelines on capacity development. With regard to the questions concerning bona fide programmes, he explained that the notion referred to consolidated programmes with a basic monitoring and evaluation capacity and sustainable and predictable funding. For those reasons, such programmes would be most effective at developing constituents' capacity. He observed that indicators for measuring capacity development were central to ILO activities and that their purpose was to measure quality and sustainability.
29. He noted that LDCs continued to be a priority of the technical cooperation programme, and that the ILO would be present at the forthcoming United Nations Conference on Least Developed Countries in Istanbul. The Office was working on integrating capacity development more effectively into DWCPs. Constituent participation was already assessed in the appraisal procedure for technical cooperation projects. He concluded by stating that a further paper on capacity development would be submitted at the next Governing Body session, which would include an inventory of current capacity development initiatives.
30. The Chairperson, noting the discussion, proposed that the Committee adopt the point for decision, and that the Officers would request another paper on the matter for the November

2011 session of the Governing Body to address the concerns raised by some members of the Committee. The point for decision was adopted.

- 31. *The Committee recommends that the Governing Body endorse the operational strategies for capacity development for constituents in DWCPs and technical cooperation outlined above, taking into account the views expressed during its discussion.***

II. Decent work and aid effectiveness

- 32.** A representative of the Director-General presented the paper ² and underscored the pertinence of the Decent Work Agenda to the debate surrounding aid effectiveness. He noted that the social partners of the ILO could play their part by helping to formulate national development policies, and highlighted the contribution made by DWCPs to social dialogue and tripartite consultation and the fact that they could bring together the actors of the real economy. He noted that the ILO could buttress national systems by developing constituents' capacity, and a significant percentage of technical cooperation projects were implemented in fragile States. The United Nations Third Global South–South Development Expo, which had been hosted by the ILO in November 2010, had been important in that it had demonstrated the potential of South–South cooperation as a pillar of development assistance. Those efforts were directed towards building a new “aid structure” tending more to the exchange of good practices, knowledge and experience and giving greater weight to the principles of social justice and international solidarity enshrined in the 2008 Declaration on Social Justice for a Fair Globalization.
- 33.** The Employer Vice-Chairperson regretted that, despite its strategic implications, the paper had not been submitted for decision. The Busan High-level Forum was approaching, yet the difficulties outlined at previous High-Level Forums on Aid Effectiveness still existed, especially those relating to harmonization. Since few of the social partners – 25 out of 102 – were taking part in developing United Nations Development Assistance Frameworks (UNDAFs), they were not involved in the discussions and were often lumped together with the rest of civil society. The ILO needed to help the social partners to step up their participation.
- 34.** Employment had to be at the heart of programmes to combat poverty, especially during a crisis. The ILO had an important role to play in the field. Dwindling resources necessitated more efficient technical cooperation, which would need above all to satisfy national priorities in a context of results-based management. Close cooperation with the UN system was equally essential for coordination at country level.
- 35.** A Worker member, speaking on behalf of the Workers' group, supported the document. He called for the promotion of a rights-based approach to development and tripartism in effective development. Respect for international labour standards, decent work, social protection and social security, and fair redistribution of incomes, should replace jobless growth patterns. The priority of the Workers' group was the integration of the Decent Work Agenda, the Declaration on Social Justice for a Fair Globalization, and the Global Jobs Pact, as the basis for a new social and economic paradigm.
- 36.** He highlighted the role of social dialogue and tripartism in aid and development effectiveness, and expressed concern about calls for the privatization of development aid. In that respect, it was important to have rules of engagement that would not endanger the

² GB.310/TC/2.

capacity to respond to country needs and equitable development strategies. With regard to aid and development effectiveness, trade unions played a key role in creating democratic structures and ensuring a fair and sustainable development. With the inclusion of the informal sector, trade unions could promote social dialogue and justice. Sustainability and viability of the development process included strengthened capacity of institutions, increased independence, ownership of policies and accountability.

- 37.** The Workers' group favoured new development policies based on decent work and income distribution, skills, respect for workers' rights, and protection of the environment, as outlined in the Social Justice Declaration and the Global Jobs Pact. The inclusion of fundamental principles and international labour standards in country frameworks through DWCPs and UNDAFs continued to be a priority. DWCPs should also build on the outcomes of the ILO supervisory mechanism. South–South cooperation should reflect a new model of development for southern countries playing a critical role in sharing good practices, knowledge and experience. Tripartism and social dialogue were particularly important in the context of aid to fragile States. He concluded by noting that the regulatory role of the ILO and its tripartite structure were central elements for rebuilding a new international architecture and achieving development effectiveness, for which policy coherence was also of key importance, and that the topic addressed in the paper was important for the ILO as there were current efforts to bring the aid effectiveness debate into the United Nations, with the possible development of a Convention on development effectiveness.
- 38.** The representative of the Government of Mozambique, speaking on behalf of the Africa group, stressed the importance of the Decent Work Agenda as a tool for fighting poverty, which the ILO should defend at the Busan High-level Forum. The ILO, however, with the support of all its Members, had to do more to promote the effective participation of its tripartite constituents, especially those from the least developed countries, in that process. In that respect, South–South cooperation was a fundamental asset, which was why initiatives in that sphere needed to be expanded.
- 39.** A Worker member stressed the need to present a more ambitious and more strategic paper in order to fuel constituents' discussions on the issues at stake at the Busan High-Level Forum. How did the ILO intend to participate in the redefinition and reorientation of criteria to measure aid effectiveness, which would be a key issue at that meeting? Social dialogue and human rights considerations were essential to the process of defining and ensuring national ownership of development policies in both beneficiary and donor countries. Furthermore, those development policies also had to be brought into line with international commitments, especially those of the ILO. Lastly, the good practices of South–South cooperation needed to be highlighted, especially as far as the treatment of work in the informal economy was concerned.
- 40.** The representative of the Government of the Islamic Republic of Iran called for the development of a comprehensive technical programme to achieve the Millennium Development Goals (MDGs), which should be made available for all member States without discrimination. She stressed the need for more work on employment and social protection, and called for support to the IPEC programme.
- 41.** The representative of the Government of the Republic of Korea noted that the Republic of Korea had experience and know-how in transforming itself from an aid recipient into a donor country, and was proud to host the Fourth High-level Forum on Aid Effectiveness in Busan. It was expected that some 2,000 leaders would participate in the Forum, including Heads of State, ministers, United Nations organizations, and representatives of diverse civil society groups. The event should offer the opportunity to discuss the implementation of aid-effectiveness principles and a new development paradigm that better responded to

the changing aid environment. The Republic of Korea, as the host country, encouraged the ILO's active participation in the Forum.

42. The representative of the Government of Australia encouraged the Office to ensure that its own programmes were subject to the same rigorous results-based assessments as it applied to technical cooperation projects. Welcoming the ILO's engagement in the discussions on aid effectiveness, he encouraged the Office to explore new ways of mainstreaming the Decent Work Agenda in other forums, and to continue its efforts to refine the messages on decent work.
43. The representative of the Government of Brazil said that the Office should base its participation in the Busan High-level Forum on the principles of tripartite consensus and on negotiated international texts such as the Monterrey Consensus and the Doha Declaration, as well as on the triennial comprehensive policy review of operational activities for development of the United Nations system. Although the Paris Declaration on Aid Effectiveness was internationally recognized, it did not stem from a multilateral discussion, which was why its principles did not apply to South–South cooperation. The traditional criteria for cooperation could not be applied to South–South cooperation because the methods were fundamentally different. Those differences were reflected in the Accra Agenda for Action.
44. A Worker member welcomed the emphasis placed on the need to include social partners, as it could help to ensure the sustainability of DWCPs. He stressed the need to reinforce the Office's role in supporting aid and development effectiveness by being the advocate of the Decent Work Agenda throughout the UN system and with governments both directly and through such forums as the G20. The Office had to champion the fact that decent work and the technical cooperation programmes that supported it were at the heart of sustainable development. Without that emphasis in development assistance programmes the MDGs could not be achieved. There was a mutual responsibility to ensure that donor governments subscribed to the principles of the Paris Declaration on Aid Effectiveness and offered genuine assistance based on priorities set at country level, rather than imposing from on high.
45. The representative of the Government of India noted that the principles of aid effectiveness as set out in the Paris Declaration on Aid Effectiveness and the Accra Agenda for Action should be more promotional in nature. He stressed the need to ensure the ownership of national governments of partner countries, while promoting active participation of civil society organizations, social partners and the private sector in the development and implementation of results-based development strategies. Regarding fragile States, he noted that the incorporation of the Decent Work Agenda in aid-related activities would contribute to youth employment, inclusive social protection, and institutional capacity building. The ILO should facilitate South–South and Triangular Cooperation in the field of decent work by ensuring widespread dissemination of decent work solutions.
46. A representative of the Director-General stressed that the Office was engaged with preparations for the Busan High-level Forum, both through the United Nations Development Group and by supporting constituents. He noted the challenges facing the social partners in the UNDAF processes, which were often encountered where the ILO did not have a field presence. The Office was taking a proactive approach to the promotion of decent work as a central pillar of development. He recalled that 75 per cent of UNDAFs currently contained references to at least three pillars of the Decent Work Agenda, which had also been incorporated into recent UNDAF guidelines. The Office rolled out training programmes for the constituents aimed at increasing their involvement in the UNDAF processes, and was sensitizing the United Nations Country Teams on the special role played by the social partners in development.

47. The rights-based approach to development was a key strength of the ILO. The current situation in North Africa and the Middle East showed that workers' rights, and in particular freedom of association, were key demands from societies in search of democratic change. The ILO had identified new areas of work, including the Green Jobs and post-crisis response, where social partners had a crucial role to play. The Office would continue developing tools for the involvement of the informal economy in the light of the discussion. He noted that the ILO currently spent 21 per cent of its extra-budgetary resources in LDCs, and fragile States remained an important focus area. South–South cooperation was being further developed, with 69 horizontal cooperation initiatives already included in the DWCPs.
48. A representative of the Director-General (Ms María Angélica Ducci, Executive Director, Office of the Director-General) added that the Office was examining the most effective ways to promote the Decent Work Agenda among development partners, including the South–South dimension. The ILO was very active in the G20 development group, as well as in the G20 Labour and Employment Ministers' Meeting. The Chief Executives Board (CEB) of the United Nations had increased its understanding of how decent work, with its rights-based approach, was central to sustainable development. The ILO also worked on this issue with the Bretton Woods institutions and at the regional level. In this connection, the ILO highlighted the exceptional character of South–South cooperation, which had less of a “donor–recipient” character and was based more on a horizontal flow of knowledge and expertise between partners.

III. Operational aspects of the International Programme on the Elimination of Child Labour (IPEC) – Oral report

49. A representative of the Director-General (Mr Guy Ryder, Executive Director, Standards and Fundamental Principles and Rights at Work Sector) reported on the 20th meeting of the IPEC International Steering Committee (ISC) held on 14 March 2011. His report featured a presentation of the IPEC implementation report for the year 2010 followed by a discussion, and a panel presentation on social protection and child labour also followed by a discussion.
50. In reporting on the ISC proceedings, Mr Ryder stressed that 2010 had been an extremely eventful year for IPEC, and highlighted the launch of the ILO's Global Report with new global estimates on child labour; the Conference discussion on the Global Report; a Global Child Labour Conference 2010 in The Hague; the adoption of the Roadmap for achieving the elimination of the worst forms of child labour by 2016; the endorsement by the Governing Body in November 2010 of the 2010 Global Action Plan (GAP); the 2010 MDG Summit Outcome document and the UN General Assembly Resolution which both referred to the importance of the elimination of child labour; the launch of a new generation of projects with an integrated area-based approach aimed at tackling the root causes of child labour and with increased focus on strengthening the role of the social partners and social dialogue in good cooperation with ACT/EMP and ACTRAV; a breakthrough in the quantification of the worst forms of child labour; and improved methods for impact evaluation and impact assessment.
51. He welcomed the ratifications in 2010 of child labour Conventions and pointed out that the Minimum Age Convention, 1973 (No. 138), still awaited ratification by some of the most industrialized countries. He noted that in 2010, IPEC was operational in 77 countries with a total expenditure of US\$48.9 million, delivery improved markedly from 67.2 per cent to 80 per cent, 41 projects had closed while nine projects had opened, IPEC had received US\$50 million in grants (less than in previous years) and, set against the ambitious agenda

laid out by the Governing Body through the 2010 GAP, and given the ambitious target of eliminating the worst forms of child labour by 2016, it was crucial to reverse the downward trend in incoming resources.

- 52.** He noted that the ISC debate had been rich, with 19 speakers from among the constituents, and that there had been general satisfaction with IPEC's work and the implementation report for 2010. The Workers had expressed concern at the impact of the economic crisis on child labour. They had drawn attention to the importance of sustainable solutions including policy work that tackled root causes, elimination of child labour through social dialogue, and efforts to move from project to programme funding approaches. They made the point that future reports should include information on the number of requests for technical cooperation assistance from social partners as well as governments. They regarded child labour and supply chains in a range of sectors as an area for future work and had expressed concern that the social partners received too little of IPEC funding.
- 53.** Mr Ryder noted that the Employers' group had expressed concern at the slowing pace of the reduction in child labour and warned that the goal of eliminating worst forms of child labour by 2016 might not be attained. The Employers had pointed at the need to focus more intensely on Africa and Asia and to address hazardous child labour, and emphasized that ratification of child labour Conventions should continue to be pursued. They recommended a more analytical approach to future reports, with more information on impact. Both the Workers' and Employers' groups had expressed concern at the reduction in the number of IPEC projects and donor approvals, and pointed out that IPEC needed resources to meet its targets. They acknowledged IPEC efforts to report activities by country, type of intervention and implementing agency, and underlined the importance of working with ACT/EMP and ACTRAV.
- 54.** A representative of the Government of the Netherlands had spoken on behalf of the IMEC group, and recalled the 2010 GAP and the adopted Roadmap which had been noted by the UN General Assembly's Third Committee. The group had urged all constituents to implement the 2010 GAP and called on the ILO to actively support implementation of the Roadmap in the context of that plan. On that point the representative of the Government of Germany had encouraged all constituents to breathe life into those initiatives with funding, while emphasizing that his Government would continue to support IPEC. The IMEC group had emphasized the importance of effective monitoring and evaluation, noted that IPEC's resource base was under pressure and encouraged IPEC to explore opportunities to work more closely with other ILO units, leverage resources from them, and achieve more sustainable results. It had reiterated its commitment to work with IPEC.
- 55.** The representatives of the Governments of Belgium and Norway had expressed concern with regard to the reduction in IPEC funds and had sought clarification as to why the ILO did not transfer more funds from the Regular Budget Supplementary Account (RBSA) to IPEC, given that eliminating child labour was a priority for the Office. Both had suggested capitalizing on UN "Delivering as One" as a vehicle to achieve the 2016 goal. The representative of the Government of Belgium and the Employer representative from Gabon had recognized the importance of working with social partners, but pointed at their lack of representation in the informal economy where most child labour was to be found. The representative of the Government of Brazil had highlighted the importance of South-South cooperation, and invited all representatives to the next Global Child Labour Conference, which was due to be held in Brazil in 2013, and reiterated the need to follow up on the Hague Roadmap within countries. Many Government members had provided details on the problems of child labour and ongoing programmes in their own countries to eliminate child labour, while some had requested additional technical cooperation assistance.

56. Following interventions by the ISC members, Mr Ryder reported that IPEC had observed that an overarching concern shared by many was the drop in resources for IPEC and how to maintain high funding levels. It was explained that IPEC was making attempts to integrate more into DWCPs and the work of other ILO units; to expand the donor base; to encourage local resource mobilization; and to work on public-private partnerships within guidelines set by the Office. It was explained that it was adopting measures to tackle hazardous work, develop a focus Africa strategy, research the impact of the economic crisis, and harness information on impact from evaluations.
57. In reporting on the panel discussion on social protection and child labour, Mr Ryder informed the Committee that it had included speakers from the Government of South Africa, workers' and employers' representatives, and the ILO's social security department. The session had highlighted the fact that social protection was a right for all, not just those in formal employment, and that social security needed to be seen not as a cost but as an investment in the future. Basic social protection was also affordable, even for low-income countries and households. Recent evidence further pointed to the important role of social protection systems as an effective safeguard against child labour, in particular in times of economic crisis. Policy-makers were urged to go beyond child benefit schemes and mainstream child labour into social protection schemes.
58. The Employer Vice-Chairperson commended IPEC for its efforts to involve social partners, reiterating the importance of continuing to do so in the light of the MDGs to be achieved by 2015, and to involve ACTRAV and ACT/EMP. He expressed satisfaction with the rate of ratification of the ILO child labour Conventions and underlined the importance of follow-up. He thanked the Governments of Ireland and Norway for their contributions to IPEC activities with the social partners, and expressed concern about the impact of the economic crisis on child labour. He stressed the significance of evaluating work on child labour as it allowed for judgement on impact, and acknowledged that IPEC had done much in that field recently. He sought clarification as to what would happen with the ISC, including reporting to the Governing Body if reforms of the Governing Body were to materialize.
59. A Worker member, speaking on behalf of the Workers' group, expressed concern that the progress made in eliminating child labour had probably been compromised owing to the impact of the economic crisis. It was important to invest in sustainable socio-economic policies and have the right legal framework to tackle the root causes of child labour, and essential to renew efforts to achieve universal ratification and implementation of the child labour Conventions. Job-intensive growth and decent wages for adults were crucial, and governments must ensure free, compulsory, high-quality education for all children and establish a social protection floor. He called on donors to support IPEC and fund initiatives which would: (1) promote policies and legal frameworks that tackle the root causes of child labour; (2) promote an industrial relations approach to fighting child labour through social dialogue; and (3) move from project to programme support integrating child labour issues into national development frameworks and DWCPs. He thanked the Irish and Norwegian Governments for their contributions to the work of IPEC, expressed regret at the underfunding and insufficient integration of the social partners in IPEC's work, and recalled Sir Roy Trotman's call in 2010 for a 15–20 per cent share of overall IPEC funding to go to trade union efforts against child labour. The issue of child labour and supply chains was a priority for the Workers' group, and all IPEC activities with trade unions should be designed and implemented with the involvement of ACTRAV.
60. The representative of the Government of Nigeria thanked Mr Ryder for the presentation and commended IPEC on its work. He stressed the link between hunger and child labour and underscored the fact that a focus on food security could contribute to eliminating child labour. He recommended that sustainable solutions should include the development of

agricultural infrastructure. He suggested that IPEC should work with other UN agencies on food security, as otherwise achieving the 2016 Goal would be difficult.

61. In responding to the various remarks, Mr Ryder observed that the Employers' and Workers' groups had expressed a common insistence on the involvement of the social partners in action against child labour, and assured the Committee that IPEC was following this track. He acknowledged the concerns expressed regarding the impact of the economic crisis on child labour, and said that it was precisely at such times that efforts had to be redoubled to protect children from external shocks. He further recognized the need to redouble resource mobilization efforts, and said that IPEC's past achievements were its best weapon. In response to the questions posed regarding the reform of the Governing Body, he observed that the reform was an incomplete process. The ISC was not a Governing Body structure and it would continue, and appropriate provisions would be made to report on the outcome of future ISCs. In response to the intervention by the representative of the Government of Nigeria, he said that IPEC focused on child labour in agriculture as that was the sector where 60 per cent of child labour was to be found, and further referred to the discussion earlier in the day on rural development at the Committee on Employment and Social Policy.

IV. Report on the Implementation of the Tripartite Agreement on Freedom of Association and Democracy in Colombia³

62. The Employer Vice-Chairperson commended the Colombian tripartite constituents on their genuine cooperation in the implementation of the Tripartite Agreement on Freedom of Association and Democracy in Colombia and welcomed the financial effort made by the Government of Colombia. Social dialogue must be improved, the effort to train officials in the application of standards must be continued, the social partners' capacity must be strengthened and sustainable enterprise must be promoted.
63. The Worker Vice-Chairperson said that in Colombia compliance with labour standards, in particular the Freedom of Association and Protection of the Right to Organise Convention, 1948 (No. 87), and the Right to Organise and Collective Bargaining Convention, 1949 (No. 98), was still limited and the situation with regard to freedom of association was a serious one. She also referred to the attack on social security and the use of models of industrial relations based on labour cooperatives. She acknowledged that the Office's efforts to improve social dialogue had been helpful, and wanted action in that field to be expanded by: (i) pursuing technical cooperation in order to promote a genuine climate of social dialogue, freedom of association and collective bargaining; (ii) securing guarantees through the Government for the enjoyment of freedom of association, taking into account the comments made by the ILO's supervisory bodies; and (iii) encouraging the amendment of labour legislation on respect for social dialogue to bring it into line with international standards. Lastly, she expressed satisfaction with the visit of the ILO High-Level Mission to Colombia, and the hope that the labour and trade union situation would improve.
64. The representative of the Government of Colombia said that full respect for human rights, including fundamental labour rights, was central to her Government's policy. Her Government was committed to the 2006 Tripartite Agreement which she described as the backbone and road map in areas such as the fight against impunity. To that effect, the Government applied zero tolerance towards violence against trade unions and employers' associations. The Government's efforts were visible in a number of indicators, such as the

³ GB.310/TC/4.

drop in the murder rate of trade unionists and the adoption of Act No. 1309, which increased sentences for crimes committed against any trade union member. Lastly, she stated that the ILO mission had helped to promote trust between constituents, and described some of the technical cooperation activities which the Government was carrying out with ILO support.

65. The Worker Vice-Chairperson of the Governing Body, Sir Roy Trotman, spoke of his visit to Colombia and commended the Government's will to transform the security levels and their openness towards the Committee. However, the visit had also revealed entrenched areas of corruption and the need for significant resources, personnel and training.
66. The establishment of "bogus cooperatives" continued to raise concerns, as they prevented workers from joining the collective bargaining process. In some cases, individuals were threatened, beaten, or risked losing employment if they did not join such "cooperatives". The President had committed to address this issue, which required ILO support. He called for a renewed ILO presence in Colombia, which would help promote tripartism, tolerance, and build a community where the harmony required for development could be achieved.
67. The Regional Director of the ILO Regional Office in Lima, Ms E. Tinoco, closed the discussion by commenting that the High-Level Mission had produced some very good results which would serve as a basis for promoting the implementation of the Agreement and for identifying areas requiring greater technical cooperation with the ILO.

Geneva, 18 March 2011

Point for decision: Paragraph 31