FIFTEENTH ITEM ON THE AGENDA

Report of the Committee on Sectoral and Technical Meetings and Related Issues

Contents

| I. | Progress report on the review of the Sectoral Activities Programme | 1 |
| II. | Composition and purpose of the sectoral meetings to be held in 2002 | 3 |
| III. | Effect to be given to the recommendations of sectoral meetings | 6 |
| (a) | Tripartite Meeting on Moving to Sustainable Agricultural Development through the Modernization of Agriculture and Employment in a Globalized Economy | 6 |
| (b) | Tripartite Meeting on Labour Practices in the Footwear, Leather, Textiles and Clothing Industries | 7 |

Appendices

| I. | Composition and purpose of the sectoral meetings to be held in 2002 | 11 |
| II. | Written statements presented with regard to the fourth item on the agenda | 13 |
| III. | Written statements presented with regard to the fifth item on the agenda | 14 |
1. The Committee on Sectoral and Technical Meetings and Related Issues met on 22 March 2001. Following the departure of Mr. Navikas, Mr. Rimkunas (Government, Lithuania) was elected Chairperson on a proposal by the representative of the Government of the Russian Federation, speaking on behalf of the Central and Eastern European Government members, and seconded by the representative of the Government of Germany on behalf of the IMEC Government members. The Employer and Worker Vice-Chairpersons were Mr. Jeetun and Mr. Zellhoefer respectively.

2. The representative of the Director-General (Ms. Paxton, Executive Director, Social Dialogue Sector) welcomed the members of the Committee and congratulated the Chairperson on his nomination. She pointed out that while she had only taken up her duties for less than four weeks, she had had an excellent opportunity to become acquainted with the general orientations and priorities of the ILO through the meetings of the Governing Body committees. Ms. Paxton went over the items on the Committee's agenda and highlighted the relevance and importance of each point for the work of the ILO. She looked forward with confidence to a close cooperation on the important issues which would be on future agendas of the Committee.

3. Mr. Jeetun and Mr. Zellhoefer, together with a number of Government representatives, congratulated Mr. Rimkunas for his election and Ms. Paxton for her appointment.

I. Progress report on the review of the Sectoral Activities Programme

4. The Committee was given an oral report by a representative of the Director-General (Mr. de Vries Reilingh, Director of the Sectoral Activities Department) on this item. Mr. de Vries reminded the Committee that it had been informed in November 2000 that the Director-General had decided that, within the framework of the ongoing review of the Sectoral Activities Programme, further consultations with constituents needed to be held on how better to integrate the Programme into the Decent Work Agenda. Following the various reforms which had taken place, including the introduction of strategic budgeting, it was necessary to assess how sectoral activities would fit within this new frame and to ensure that these activities contributed to and supported the operational objectives, performance indicators and targets of the different technical sectors as appropriate. The review also needed to examine how sectoral meetings and their follow-up could more effectively fit within this new framework. Mr. de Vries emphasized that the Director-General attached great importance to the sectoral dimension of the Decent Work Agenda and to the need to mainstream sectoral activities in the work of the Office. Informal consultations with the constituents had been started, and these consultations were to continue in order to obtain wide support and possible consensus for a reinforced Sectoral Activities Programme which would respond to the new strategic policy framework of the Organization as well as to the needs of its constituents. It was the Director-General’s intention to present the new framework for sectoral activities to the STM Committee in November 2001. In the meantime, the Office intended to launch an inventory of all ILO activities, containing a particular sectoral dimension, which were either ongoing or planned for the next biennium. It would provide a global picture of ILO sectoral activities carried out throughout the Organization, as it would involve inputs from all headquarter units and field offices. It was proposed that a report on the findings could be presented to the Committee in November 2001 together with the proposals for the new orientations for the Sectoral Activities Programme.

5. Mr. Zellhoefer confirmed that discussions were being held between the workers’ organizations and the Office, and that this was a serious undertaking. He regretted that a
written status report had not been prepared, which did not allow for proper reaction. Complaints had been raised in the past from the Workers’ group, in particular concerning the draining of resources and the lack of meaningful follow-up to sectoral meetings. While reinforcing the unique and important aspects of these meetings in bringing the ILO closer to its constituents, he stressed that real follow-up should occur in the field, together with the government ministries and social partners, and that the Programme’s resource allocation and profile needed to be raised in order to make this possible. Issues such as the impact of globalization on various sectors had been covered in recent years, and further thought needed to be given to unique elements for future coverage. Innovations in the communication and dissemination of reports, better use of technological support, different types of meetings and different locations all needed to be explored so as to improve the quality of the meetings. Although Mr. Zellhoefer did not have any specific proposals concerning resource allocation, he hoped that Governments would increase their support to sectoral meetings, in particular in terms of increased attendance by Government delegates.

6. Mr. Jeetun indicated that the process of reviewing the Sectoral Activities Programme was not a new phenomenon, and that previous reviews had also been undertaken to improve the Programme. He emphasized that the employers’ organizations had been consistent in their approval of the programme and viewed it as one of the best programmes in the ILO. The meetings allowed a unique opportunity for networking and benefited the three groups of Governments, Workers and Employers alike. They also permitted the ILO to be in touch with the real issues in each sector while demonstrating the relevance of the Organization worldwide. The meetings provided a tripartite structure for social dialogue and in-depth discussions that allowed participants to learn within a sectoral context. It was important therefore that, for the new strategies to be effective, they should take account of the view of the constituents on all these matters.

7. The Employers’ representative from Austria cautioned that prudence was necessary when changing something that was extremely satisfactory, and that a number of in-depth discussions would be essential well before any changes could be envisaged. Once a document was submitted in November 2001, then a comprehensive exchange would be in order.

8. The representative of the Government of Germany thanked the secretariat for the oral report and stressed that when consultations were being referred to in the discussions, these should also include consultations with Governments. While agreeing that Governments needed to increase their participation in the meetings, he pointed out that often it was difficult for Governments to identify the appropriate sectoral experts who could both benefit from the meeting and impart their knowledge. He also agreed that certain changes would be welcome, such as more integration of the work of the Sectoral Activities Programme in the work of the other three technical sectors of the Office, the enhancement of the follow-up of meetings, more meetings held at the regional and subregional level, as well as promoting smaller working groups, such as those being proposed in the maritime sector.

9. The representative of the Government of Italy supported the views of his German colleague, and stressed that the sectoral meetings offered a great deal of information in the form of experiences and good practices that could be applied at national levels.

10. Mr. Zellhoefer indicated that he had hoped to hear from more Governments. He recognized the difficulty for Governments in identifying the appropriate experts. He also agreed with many of the points raised by Mr. Jeetun, in particular the relevance of the sectoral meetings for Workers as well, particularly when the meetings were attended by companies operating in the sectors being discussed. He suggested that the Office could put together an informal paper which could be used as the basis of informal consultations with the constituents.
during the International Labour Conference in June 2001 in order to move the discussion along. Given that it was difficult to predict whether any decisions could be taken in November 2001, perhaps an end date for decision-making on the review needed to be considered as well.

11. Mr. de Vries took the floor to thank the Committee members for their contributions, and emphasized that further informal consultations with the constituents would be held, including during the forthcoming ILC in June, both with the individual groups and on a tripartite basis.

12. The Committee took note of the oral report and the ensuing discussions.

II. Composition and purpose of the sectoral meetings to be held in 2002

13. The Committee had before it a paper 1 on the composition and purpose of the sectoral meetings to be held in 2002. At its meeting in November 2000, the Committee had selected the 12 sectors and topics to comprise the programme of sectoral meetings for 2002-03. The sectors and topics selected by the Committee were reflected in the Programme and Budget proposals for 2002-03. It was understood that the meetings selected for 2003 and their agendas would be subject to confirmation at the November 2001 session of the Governing Body. Taking this into account, the Director-General has drawn up proposals with regard to the duration, the type of meetings and number of delegations, the method of selection of delegates, the countries to be invited, the countries to be included in the reserve list and the purpose of each meeting to be held in 2002.

14. In introducing this item, Mr. de Vries explained that the Office had taken into consideration as much as possible all the criteria mentioned in paragraph 4 of the document, as well as the preferences of member States for the various meetings. A letter had gone out requesting governments for replies with the deadline set for 20 January 2001. In order to be able to prepare the paper, replies received by 6 February 2001 had still been taken into account. Unfortunately, a number of replies had been received after that date and he suggested that these countries be added to the reserve list for meetings in which they had expressed interest. The Committee accepted this proposal.

15. The Committee agreed to recommend that the duration of the meetings be five days (Monday-Friday).

16. There was an extensive debate concerning the type of meetings to be held as per paragraph 34(b) of the paper. Mr. Jeetun exposed the Employers’ point of view that all meetings should be tripartite, and that it was not proper to exclude any or part of any of the constituents especially if progress were to be made in the social and labour aspects of work. Using the example of the meeting on health services, the Employers could contribute to the national debate and enrich social dialogue, since the trend in many countries was towards more private health care providers. Therefore the proposal for a joint meeting for health services as proposed in paragraph 11 of the document with the participation of only seven Employers’ representatives from the private sector was not acceptable, and he made a strong plea that, as a matter of principle, and not on a case-by-case basis, all meetings should be tripartite.

---
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17. Mr. Zellhoefer explained that, historically, joint meetings were held on the core public sectors, such as education and health services, where the large majority of workers were employed by governments. Although he agreed that the share of health care providers from the private sector had increased in certain countries, 70-80 per cent of the services continued to be provided in the public sector in virtually all countries, a figure that the secretariat confirmed as accurate. This view was supported by the Workers’ representative from Zimbabwe, who reminded the Committee of the situation in African countries. Although public services were dwindling in many African countries, on account of structural adjustment, health care was still in the hands of the governments. In order to improve these services, it was imperative to have governments as employers at the meetings, as they were the responsible counterparts. This opinion was echoed by the Workers’ representative from Benin, who emphasized that the reality in developing countries was that health care infrastructure was state-owned and personnel worked for the State. Therefore any meaningful social dialogue had to be between the appropriate partners.

18. Speaking in her capacity as spokesperson for the African governments, the representative of the Government of Ghana requested that consideration should be given to all meetings being tripartite. This view was supported by the representative of the Government of India as well as the representative of the Government of Namibia. However, because of burgeoning “parastatal” institutions in the health sector in many African countries as well as local authorities that were becoming more involved in providing health services, the Government representative of Namibia also thought that some arrangement had to be made with regard to the meeting on health care to accommodate these developments.

19. The representative of the Government of Germany recalled that many more sectoral meetings had been of a joint nature in the past, but that due to large-scale privatization in particular sectors, such as public utilities and the postal and telecommunications services, these meetings eventually were becoming tripartite. In the cases of education and health care, these sectors continued to be dominated by the public sector, but perhaps the number of Employers’ representatives at the meeting for health services could be raised slightly. Since the only joint meeting being proposed was for the health services sector and this meeting was to be held in October 2002, he proposed that a decision be postponed until the next meeting of the STM Committee in November 2001.

20. The Chairperson proposed this last suggestion to the Committee. Both Mr. Jeetun and Mr. Zellhoefer confirmed that it would also allow the cost implications of changing a joint meeting to a tripartite meeting to be studied as well. Consensus was reached to postpone the decision on the type of meeting for health services to November 2001.

21. Regarding the method of selection of the delegates in paragraph 34(c), the alternatives proposed in paragraph 7 were discussed. The representative of the Government of the Russian Federation proposed that 7(a) should be considered, as national tripartite delegations created a very good opportunity for social partnership and social dialogue. However, Mr. Zellhoefer and Mr. Jeetun supported paragraph 7(b) and this was accepted on the basis of consensus, i.e. “that the Government representatives be appointed by the governments of the countries selected and the Employers’ and Workers’ representatives be appointed on the basis of nominations made by the respective groups of the Governing Body”.

22. Paragraph 34(d) and (e) were discussed concerning countries to be invited and countries to be included on the reserve list. The representative of the Government of Ghana, speaking on behalf of the African governments, brought the fact to the attention of the Committee that African governments were keen to participate in the sectoral meetings, but needed support from the ILO in order to overcome financial and budgetary constraints. She
informed the Committee that the Government of the Libyan Arab Jamahiriya had expressed a strong desire to attend the meeting on oil and gas production and the one on transport, and the African government group had supported this request.

23. Mr. Zellhoefer expressed his regret that the Government of the United States was willing to participate in only three of the proposed meetings, and had declined participation in the oil and gas, the postal and telecommunications and the transport meetings.

24. The representative of the Government of India expressed his Government’s gratitude in being invited to participate in three of the six meetings. However, he also expressed India’s desire to participate in the health services meeting, and to be placed on the reserve list of the meeting. This would be considered for November 2001.

25. The representative of the Government of the United Kingdom asked the Committee to explore why only 81 member States had responded to the letter to indicate their interest in the sectoral meetings, as budgetary reasons alone could not be the cause for the lack of response. She stated that her Government would have a difficult time in identifying the experts needed for the four meetings in which it had expressed interest. Therefore, her Government was willing to relinquish participation in the oil and gas meeting.

26. The Committee accepted this proposal and decided to include the Libyan Arab Jamahiriya in the titular list for the oil and gas meeting.

27. On a query from the representative of the Government of Croatia concerning the role of geographical distribution in country selection, Mr. de Vries explained that, as was stated in paragraph 4 of the document, this was indeed one of the criteria used, but not the sole one.

28. Paragraph 34(f) concerning the purpose of the meetings was discussed. Mr. Zellhoefer pointed out that the wording for the purpose of the health services meeting in paragraph 13 needed to make reference to action at the national level, which would be reviewed for November 2001. Regarding the meeting for postal and telecommunications services, he requested that the Office be creative in taking into account the characteristics of the subsectors covered. He also mentioned that the purpose of the transport meeting on the restructuring of civil aviation should include reference to proposals for action by governments, and by employers’ and workers’ organizations at both national and international levels.

29. Mr. Jeetun proposed changes to paragraph 13 concerning the purpose of the health services meeting, which would be reviewed for November 2001.

30. The Committee recommends to the Governing Body that –

(a) the duration of each meeting be five calendar days;

(b) the type of meeting and the number of delegations be as proposed in paragraphs 15, 19, 23, 27, and 31 of document GB.280/STM/2. The decision on the meeting concerning health services will be postponed until the November 2001 session of the STM Committee at the 282nd Session of the Governing Body;

(c) for each meeting, the Government representatives be appointed by the governments of the countries selected and the Employers’ and Workers’ representatives be appointed on the basis of nominations made by the respective groups of the Governing Body, as per paragraph 7(b).
31. The Committee recommends that the Governing Body approve, on the basis of the table in Appendix I, the proposals concerning—

(d) the governments of the countries to be invited to be represented;

(e) the governments of the countries to be included on the reserve list;

(f) the purpose of the meetings.

III. Effect to be given to the recommendations of sectoral meetings

(a) Tripartite Meeting on Moving to Sustainable Agricultural Development through the Modernization of Agriculture and Employment in a Globalized Economy

(Geneva, 18-22 September 2000)

32. The Committee had before it the Note on the Proceedings of the Tripartite Meeting on Moving to Sustainable Agricultural Development through the Modernization of Agriculture and Employment in a Globalized Economy.

33. Mr. Schlettwein (Government, Namibia), who had acted as the Chairperson of the Meeting, gave a brief recount of the proceedings and expressed his entire satisfaction with the quality of the discussions on this wide-ranging topic. While there had been some controversy and lively debate, he viewed this as a good sign of social dialogue at work, especially since decisions were reached by consensus. The evaluations of the Meeting were above average, and he noted a correction that had to be made in the results of the evaluation questionnaire on point 1 regarding “Panel discussion on voluntary private initiatives”, which raised the average from 2.9 to 3.1.

34. Mr. Zellhoefer thanked the Office on behalf of the Workers’ group for an extremely well-prepared report and was pleased to recognize that the Meeting was able to make significant progress in obtaining recognition that application of core labour standards and agricultural labour standards should be used as a measure of sustainable agriculture. In particular, the Workers supported the operative part of the resolution on standards: “the Meeting urges the member States to ratify the eight core Conventions and other relevant up-to-date labour standards”, as well as the important resolution on the future activities of the ILO, calling for the next agricultural meeting to discuss “social dialogue as a means to promote the application of core labour standards” and asking the Office “to prepare a study on collective bargaining in agriculture including an assessment of barriers to bargaining and identifying what needs to be done to strengthen the capacity of the social partners to promote collective bargaining”. The Workers’ group felt that the Meeting served as a timely and useful direct exchange of views for the second discussion at the forthcoming session of the ILC, where they looked forward to a successful outcome for a new Convention, backed up by a Recommendation, on safety and health in agriculture.
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35. Mr. Jeetun expressed the Employers’ satisfaction with the outcome of the Meeting, congratulated the Chair on his able leadership and fully endorsed the points for decision in paragraphs 4 and 5 of the Office paper.

36. The representative of the Government of Ghana, speaking on behalf of the African governments, reminded the Committee that agriculture was the mainstay of most of the African economies. Sustainable agriculture meant developing a highly productive but economically sound agriculture, and needed the appropriate resources to meet that challenge. Globalization brought a sense of urgency to the need for developing sustainable agriculture, and Africa needed assistance in its efforts to build up productivity. She also forwarded the group’s suggestion that the effects of genetically modified organisms be researched by the competent United Nations bodies, as there was the fear that dependency on the West for seeds, some of which were manipulated to make them sterile, would compound an already bad situation. The group requested that a study be undertaken on how the bulk of farmers in Africa could benefit from collective bargaining as part of the resolution concerning the future activities of the ILO. In addition, the group welcomed the resolution concerning freedom of association and labour standards for agricultural workers, emphasizing the role of women in agriculture. In Africa, although women made up 60-80 per cent of the agricultural labour force, producing in some cases about two-thirds of the food crops, women farmers were often among the voiceless in influencing agricultural policies and projects.

37. The Committee on Sectoral and Technical Meetings and Related Issues recommends that the Governing Body –

(a) authorize the Director-General to communicate the Note on the Proceedings:

(i) to governments, requesting them to communicate these texts to the employers’ and workers’ organizations concerned;

(ii) to the international employers’ and workers’ organizations concerned;

(iii) to the international organizations concerned;

(b) request the Director-General to bear in mind, when drawing up proposals for the future work of the Office, the wishes expressed by the Meeting in paragraph 15 of the conclusions and in the relevant parts of the resolutions.

(b) Tripartite Meeting on Labour Practices in the Footwear, Leather, Textiles and Clothing Industries
(Geneva, 16-20 October 2000)

38. The Committee had before it the Note on the Proceedings of the Tripartite Meeting on Labour Practices in the Footwear, Leather, Textiles and Clothing Industries.

39. Ms. Sasso-Mazzufferi (Employers’ representative from Italy), who had acted as the Chairperson of the Meeting, gave a brief recount of the proceedings and recalled all the
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positive aspects of social dialogue in action during the Meeting. Despite a few tense moments and divergences of opinion, constructive decisions had been taken and the outcomes were merit-worthy. She underlined the high level of women’s participation, about 40 per cent, and especially the quality of their backgrounds and their interventions at the Meeting.

40. Mr. Jeetun congratulated the Chairperson of the Meeting and endorsed the point for decision.

41. Mr. Zellhoefer recalled the importance and the many problems related to achieving decent work in the textile, clothing and footwear (TCF) sector over the last decade. A dramatic shift in job distribution had occurred, with two-thirds of world production now concentrated in one region. The conclusions of the Meeting were welcome and constructive in offering guidelines on several important points, such as child labour, women workers, export processing zones and voluntary initiatives, provided the conclusions were not seen as a substitute for national legislation and collective bargaining. The Workers’ group regretted that the Meeting had adopted only one resolution out of the four proposed on issues such as social dialogue and international collective bargaining, multi-stakeholder corporate codes of conduct, the informal sector, and future ILO action. Other core issues of the TCF sector needed to be addressed where workers suffered from unimaginable and shameful inhuman treatment and exploitation. Not only was there a denial by some of the abusive practices, but there was also a refusal to discuss key issues facing industries today – i.e. international collective bargaining, framework agreements, codes of conduct – all issues that were submitted in draft resolutions by the Workers.

42. The African government group spokesperson stressed that most of the TCF industries in Africa were in the informal sector where workers had to endure substandard conditions. The group suggested that the ILO should step up its cooperation with governments in Africa so as to ensure that conditions in the TCF industries were brought up to the required international level though education, training and social dialogue. In addition, regional and subregional meetings specific to the TCF industries were welcome.

43. The Committee on Sectoral and Technical Meetings and Related Issues recommends that the Governing Body –

(a) authorize the Director-General to communicate the Note on the Proceedings:

(i) to governments, requesting them to communicate these texts to the employers’ and workers’ organizations concerned;

(ii) to the international employers’ and workers’ organizations concerned;

(iii) to the international organizations concerned;

(b) request the Director-General to bear in mind, when drawing up proposals for the future work of the Office, the wishes expressed by the Meeting in paragraphs 26-31 of the conclusions and the relevant part of the resolution.

44. The Committee had before it a paper 4 on the Report of the Seventh Session of the Joint ILO/UNESCO Committee of Experts on the Application of the Recommendation concerning the Status of Teachers.

45. Mr. Zellhoefer regretted that the Joint Committee’s report had not been distributed in English until 20 March and was available in French and Spanish only on 21 March, which constituted a handicap for the examination by the whole Committee. These delays were unacceptable, seeing as the meeting was held the previous September, and especially for a document that needed to be recommended by the Governing Body to go to the Conference Committee on the Application of Standards in June.

46. The Workers’ group stressed that social dialogue in education was clearly essential, also for the purpose of creating the corresponding institutions, and needed to receive priority attention from the Organization as a whole. Synergies between IFP/DIALOGUE and IFP/SKILLS needed to be examined, and the ILC resolution concerning human resources training and development had to be applied specifically to the teaching profession. The ACTRAV/DECLARATION programme for training on the principles of core Conventions needed to be considered for possible extension to teacher education and training, especially concerning areas such as equality, discrimination and child labour and extending it especially to the national level. Concerning the five key actions the Joint Committee had identified as priority, consultations with the organizations representing teachers at the international level were necessary, as well as the exploration of new ways to involve the social partners.

47. With reference to paragraphs 28-32 of the report, consultations with teachers’ representative organizations had been quite useful and needed to be encouraged in the future. In paragraph 43, reference was made to a report on the statistical profile of the teaching force, and it was important that this report be made available and accessible. The report showed that the importance of IT had not yet translated into improvements in terms of teacher training, salaries and status. In fact it highlighted areas of deterioration and used strong language in referring to pauperization, as in paragraphs 65-69.

48. Mr. Zellhoefer pointed out that the examples, in paragraph 77, of Senegal and the Republic of Korea as best examples of social dialogue were strange. The report noted various activities by the ILO and UNESCO but as yet these had not translated into meaningful improvements to the status of teachers or the quality of education. The case of Senegal highlighted the continuing use of “volontaires” without adequate training and remuneration, a practice which had spread into most of French-speaking Africa and even India. This practice undermined the implementation of the joint ILO/UNESCO Recommendation. In reference to paragraph 78 and the experiences of self-evaluation in Scandinavia, he recalled that other good examples existed, such as the European Union
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project (1997-99) with 111 participating schools from all European Union and European Economic Area countries.

49. As the Committee ran out of the time allotted at this session, the rest of the comments of the Workers’ group were agreed to be presented to the LILS Committee. In addition, there was consensus among the Officers that two written statements, one presented on behalf of the African government group and the other on behalf of the Government of India, would be included in the report of the Committee (Appendix II).

50. The Committee on Sectoral and Technical Meetings and Related Issues recommends that the Governing Body –

request the Director-General to take into consideration, where appropriate in consultation with the Director-General of UNESCO, the Joint Committee’s proposals for future action by the ILO and UNESCO, contained in the relevant paragraphs of its report, notably paragraphs 124-131, in planning and implementing future ILO activities, due account being taken of available resources.


51. The Committee had before it a paper 5 on the report of the Second Session of the Joint IMO/ILO Ad Hoc Expert Working Group on Liability and Compensation regarding Claims for Death, Personal Injury and Abandonment of Seafarers. The Committee adopted the recommendation contained in the Office paper. For lack of time, it was agreed that two written statements, one presented on behalf of the African government group and the other on behalf of the Government of India, would be included in the report of the Committee (Appendix III).

52. The Committee on Sectoral and Technical Meetings and Related Issues recommends that the Governing Body approve the holding of a third session of the Working Group, with participation by the eight ILO (four Shipowner and four Seafarer) representatives, at no cost to the ILO, from 30 April to 4 May 2001 at IMO headquarters in London.


Points for decision: Paragraph 30; Paragraph 31; Paragraph 37; Paragraph 43; Paragraph 50; Paragraph 52.
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## Appendix I

### Composition and purpose of the sectoral meetings to be held in 2002

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Type</th>
<th>Composition</th>
<th>Reserve list</th>
<th>Purpose</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Meeting on Lifelong Learning in the Mechanical and Electrical Engineering Industries</strong></td>
<td>Tripartite 20 governments: Belgium, Chile, China, Egypt, Finland, France, Hungary, India, Japan, Republic of Korea, Malaysia, Mexico, Morocco, Poland, South Africa, Spain, Sri Lanka, Thailand, United Kingdom, United States.</td>
<td>Austria, Belarus, Burkina Faso, Central African Republic, Czech Republic, Ecuador, Indonesia, Islamic Republic of Iran, Italy, Kenya, Lebanon, Norway, Pakistan, Panama, Peru, Philippines, Portugal, Sudan, Switzerland, Tunisia, Turkey, Zimbabwe.</td>
<td>To exchange views on the need for lifelong learning and training in the MEE industries, and the social and labour implications for the parties concerned, using a report prepared by the Office as the basis for its discussions; to adopt conclusions that include proposals for action by governments, by employers' and workers' organizations at the national level and by the ILO; and to adopt a report on its discussion. The meeting may also adopt resolutions.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Meeting on the Evolution of Employment, Working Time and Training in the Mining Industry</strong></td>
<td>Tripartite 18 governments: Bulgaria, Canada, Chile, China, Germany, Ghana, India, Indonesia, Namibia, Peru, Philippines, Poland, Romania, South Africa, Togo, Ukraine, United States, Zambia.</td>
<td>Argentina, Botswana, Burkina Faso, Colombia, Ecuador, Finland, Greece, Guinea, Islamic Republic of Iran, Madagascar, Mexico, Mongolia, Morocco, Portugal, Sudan, Sweden, United Republic of Tanzania, Thailand, Turkey, United Kingdom, Uruguay, Zimbabwe.</td>
<td>To exchange views on the evolution of employment, working time and training in the mining industry, the social and labour implications of these developments for the parties concerned, and the role of social dialogue in addressing them, using a report prepared by the Office as a basis for its discussions; to adopt conclusions that include proposals for action by governments, by employers' and workers' organizations at the national level and by the ILO; and to adopt a report on its discussion. The meeting may also adopt resolutions.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Meeting on the Promotion of Good Industrial Relations in Oil and Gas Production and Oil Refining</strong></td>
<td>Tripartite 18 governments: Belarus, Cameroon, China, Ecuador, Egypt, France, Islamic Republic of Iran, Japan, Libyan Arab Jamahiriya, Mexico, Mozambique, New Zealand, Nigeria, Norway, Romania, Trinidad and Tobago, United Arab Emirates, Venezuela.</td>
<td>Algeria, Argentina, Austria, Chile, Colombia, Finland, Italy, Kenya, Lebanon, Lithuania, Morocco, Pakistan, Panama, Peru, Philippines, Poland, South Africa, Sudan, Turkey, Zimbabwe.</td>
<td>To discuss and review different approaches to promoting good industrial relations in a variety of geographical, cultural, political, economic and technical circumstances, using a report prepared by the Office as a basis for its discussions; to adopt conclusions that include proposals for action by governments, by employers' and workers' organizations at the national level and by the ILO; and to adopt a report on its discussion. The meeting may also adopt resolutions.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Type</td>
<td>Composition</td>
<td>Reserve list</td>
<td>Purpose</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-------------------------</td>
<td>-----------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>-------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>---------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Meeting on Employment, Employability and Equal Opportunities in the Postal and Telecommunications Services</td>
<td>Tripartite  22 governments: Argentina, Barbados, Canada, Chile, China, Croatia, France, India, Islamic Republic of Iran, Japan, Kenya, Republic of Korea, Lithuania, Malta, Morocco, Portugal, Russian Federation, Slovakia, Spain, Switzerland, United Kingdom, Zimbabwe. 22 Employers’ representatives; 22 Workers’ representatives.</td>
<td>Austria, Bahamas, Benin, Burkina Faso, Cambodia, Cameroon, Central African Republic, Cuba, Cyprus, Egypt, Estonia, Finland, Greece, Guinea, Italy, Kiribati, Lebanon, Luxembourg, Mali, Norway, Panama, Philippines, Poland, San Marino, Thailand, Trinidad and Tobago, Ukraine, United Arab Emirates, Uruguay.</td>
<td>To exchange views on employment, employability and equal opportunities in postal and telecommunications services, the social and labour implications of these developments for the social partners, and the role of social dialogue in addressing them, using a report prepared by the Office as the basis for its discussions; to adopt conclusions that include proposals for action by governments, by employers’ and workers’ organizations at the national level and by the ILO; and to adopt a report on its discussion. The meeting may also adopt resolutions.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Meeting on Restructuring of Civil Aviation: Consequences for Management and Personnel</td>
<td>Tripartite  20 governments: Austria, Benin, Brazil, Canada, Czech Republic, Egypt, El Salvador, France, Kenya, Kiribati, Republic of Korea, Lebanon, Norway, Pakistan, Peru, Philippines, Sudan, United Kingdom, Venezuela, Zimbabwe. 20 Employers’ representatives; 20 Workers’ representatives.</td>
<td>Bahamas, Bangladesh, Barbados, Burkina Faso, Cameroon, Cambodia, Chile, China, Croatia, Finland, Guinea, Islamic Republic of Iran, Italy, Libyan Arab Jamahiriya, Lithuania, Malta, Mauritius, Morocco, Namibia, Romania, Spain, Switzerland, Thailand.</td>
<td>To exchange views on the restructuring of civil aviation and consequences for management and personnel, using a report prepared by the Office as the basis for its discussions; to adopt conclusions that include proposals for action by governments, by employers’ and workers’ organizations and by the ILO; and to adopt a report on its discussions. The meeting may also adopt resolutions.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Appendix II

Written statements presented with regard to the fourth item on the agenda

(a) Statement presented on behalf of the African government group

We welcome the report and recommendations of the Joint Committee. If Africa is to overcome its present predicaments, we believe education is a prerequisite, and the role of teachers, in this regard, is indispensable. We support the Committee’s call that, given the scarce resources, emphasis be placed on a limited number of priority areas, and we have no difficulty in living with the chosen activities. We welcome, in particular, the recommendation on HIV/AIDS prevention. Various literature and statistics on HIV/AIDS indicate that Africa, south of the Sahara, has the highest rate of infection. As Dr. Peter Piot, Executive Director of UNAIDS, said in November 1999, AIDS has emerged as the greatest threat to development in many countries in the world. This makes the situation in Africa more critical. As education has been identified as one of the main tools in the fight against the HIV/AIDS pandemic, incorporating information on the prevention of HIV/AIDS in all teacher education and training curricula will afford the child in even the remotest part of Africa the opportunity to learn about the disease.

We urge the two institutions to utilize to the maximum, the available limited resources. In order to avoid waste and duplication of resources, the group also calls on the ILO and UNESCO to work in tandem with the WHO, UNAIDS and their partners in the battle against HIV/AIDS. There is no doubt that this recommendation on teachers and education on HIV/AIDS requires resources to be effectively implemented. It is needless to stress that without the necessary technical assistance this laudable recommendation will remain on the shelves.

(b) Statement presented by the Government of India

Teacher performance is the most crucial input in the field of education. Teacher selection and training, competence, motivation and conditions of work impinge directly on teachers’ education. India’s National Policy on Education, 1992, calls for a substantial improvement in the conditions of work and the quality of teachers’ education, and the policy also emphasizes teachers’ accountability to pupils and their parents, the community and to their own profession.

India has recognized the challenge and threat posed by HIV/AIDS to the education agenda. The Dakar Declaration has recognized the potential of the education system to help reduce the incidence of HIV/AIDS and to alleviate its impact on society. Educational programmes that emphasize life skills relevant to local needs and adopt a multi-sectoral approach have to be developed on the basis of the curriculum framework for school education recently brought out in India.

India has been making tremendous progress in the field of education since independence. The main challenge ahead is to achieve universal elementary education and adult literacy. Emphasis is being given to non-formal education, and flexible patterns of schooling through an increase in allocations for the education sector, especially in the primary education sector.

The Government of India is examining the recommendations contained in the Joint Committee’s report, keeping in view the need for giving due and respectable status to teachers who have a pivotal responsibility in shaping the future generations of every nation.
Appendix III

Written statements presented with regard to the fifth item on the agenda

(a) Statement presented on behalf of the African government group

We hope that the draft resolution on guidelines on provision of financial security in cases of abandonment of seafarers (pages 28-30), when approved, will ultimately solve most of the problems faced by seafarers from Africa. Abandoned seafarers are sometimes left to their fate with little or no money, and end up being treated as illegal immigrants. Invariably, the responsibility of rescuing the seafarer falls on the State to which he belongs.

The African government group would have liked to see, in the resolution, a clause outlawing the recruitment of seafarers outside official channels, in the same way as substantive paragraph 3 calls on member States to indicate focal points for dealing with cases of abandonment.

Under subsection 3.2 in the annex, my group would like to presume that the call on a State to repatriate its nationals who have been abandoned will become the exception and that defaulting shipowners and flag States will not be let off the hook too easily.

We welcome the guidelines on shipowners’ responsibilities in respect of contractual claims for personal injury or death of seafarers. We hope shipowners will comply in good faith with the resolution when it is eventually enacted. The group refers specifically to the relevant parts of the text and calls on shipowners to honour their obligations so as to save seafarers and their families the agony they sometimes experience when trying to claim what is legally due them in times of injury or death.

(b) Statement presented by the Government of India

Firstly, we extend our support to the view of the Joint Ad Hoc Expert Working Group that the problems regarding crew claims for abandonment, injury and death of seafarers result from aspects of contract law and complex legal questions in different legal regimes of different jurisdictions. We also feel that the implications of injury or death of seafarers are far more than those relating to the issue of abandonment. As regards the “immigration and repatriation aspect” (as reflected on page 9 of the report), we are trying to amend the Merchant Shipping Act, 1958, to incorporate adequately the provisions of ILO Convention No. 108 on seafarers’ identity documents. A national tripartite seminar held at Cochin in India, which examined the possibility of the ratification of Convention No. 179 concerning the recruitment and placement of seafarers, and Convention No. 108 concerning seafarers’ identity documents, did recognize that the international legal status of seafarers was an important question which is also noted by the Working Group’s report.

As suggested by the Working Group, the Government of India awaits the examination of the Vienna Convention of Consular Relations, 1963, which is to take place in April-May 2001. Perhaps some solutions could be found in that Convention for the abandonment, injury and death of seafarers.

We also feel that “after-the-event renegotiation” (“quit claim forms” as referred to in paragraph 6.9 of the report) of contractually set damages is an important issue as noted by the Working Group. We would suggest that this should be adequately addressed by the Working Group at its next session.

We also agree with paragraph 5.3 of the Working Group’s report that the basic level of social protection to be provided to seafarers requires an international solution, on account of the international nature of the shipping industry and wherever national legislation in some countries may not be adequate.
We feel that, while compulsory insurance could possibly cover the liability for abandonment, injury and death, it may not be consistent with the concept of mutuality as observed by the P&I Club. However, the ultimate objective is that seafarers and their families are offered at least minimum possible protection. We also agree with the view taken by France that the risk of good owners subsidizing bad ones is inherent in insurance. We are of the view that the Working Group could consider the formulation of a proper insurance scheme in this regard.

We have indicated in our views that the issue of abandonment, injury and death of seafarers needs an international solution and await the finalization of the two resolutions which should be put to the legal committee of the IMO in October 2001. In general, the Government of India supports the ongoing exercise by the IMO/ILO in this regard. In this connection, the NUSI (National Union of Seafarers of India) has also supported this issue.