



FOR INFORMATION

FOURTH ITEM ON THE AGENDA

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

As in previous years, the report on the operational aspects of IPEC is made up of the following appendices:

- Appendix I: IPEC action against child labour 2004-05: Progress and future priorities.
- Appendix II: Summary record of the fifteenth meeting of the IPEC International Steering Committee, 8 November 2005.

Geneva, 3 February 2006.

Submitted for information.

Appendix I

IPEC action against child labour 2004-05: Progress and future priorities

Given the need for this section of the document to reflect the most up-to-date results, Appendix I will be presented later as a separate publication.

Appendix II

Summary record of the fifteenth meeting of the IPEC International Steering Committee (8 November 2005)

1. The fifteenth meeting of the IPEC International Steering Committee (ISC) was held at the International Labour Office, Geneva, on 8 November 2005 at 3 p.m.
2. The meeting was opened by Mr. Kari Tapiola, Executive Director of the Standards and Fundamental Principles and Rights at Work Sector. He welcomed the participants and expressed his appreciation for their continued interest in the Programme and the confidence placed in the ILO and the IPEC team. He noted that, following the appointment of Mr. Frans Röselaers as Director of the newly created Department for Partnerships and Development (PARDEV), Mr. Guy Thijs had taken over the directorship of IPEC. He thanked Mr. Röselaers for the important contribution he had made to the steady growth and many successes of the Programme over the last five years.
3. *Mr. Tapiola* said that 2005 had been a rather challenging but rewarding year for the Programme. Apart from the overall performance of the Programme, he drew attention to some important events and achievements. The World Day against Child Labour, on 12 June 2005, had focused on the plight of children trapped in mining. In addition to drawing global attention to that horrendous form of child labour, the event had also resulted in a concrete commitment by 15 tripartite delegations across all regions to eliminate child labour in mining within a defined period of time. The general secretaries of the workers' federations concerned with mining and the mining sector employers had joined in that effort with a pledge to support the ILO and governments in their efforts to eliminate the problem globally, thereby turning the event into a truly tripartite global initiative. Furthermore, IPEC was the first ILO Programme to have activities on the ground in the areas struck by the tsunami in Indonesia and Sri Lanka in December 2004. The Programme was now also part of ILO efforts to respond to the recent earthquake in Pakistan. Cooperation with the World Bank, UNICEF and UNESCO, particularly in the framework of the Education for All (EFA) campaign, had advanced significantly during the year and was expected to lead to the announcement of a Global Task Force on child labour and education during the next EFA meeting in Beijing later in November 2005. As regards ratification, while progress had been slower than in the previous biennium, as had been expected, an additional 19 ratifications of the two main ILO child labour Conventions (Nos. 138 and 182) had been registered during the current biennium. Ratifications of those Conventions now stood respectively at 141 and 157.
4. *Mr. Tapiola* said that IPEC had been the subject of substantial scrutiny during the biennium to ensure the highest possible level of efficiency and quality. Apart from the global evaluation undertaken by PROGRAM during 2004, there had been a gender audit of IPEC, a review of IPEC's business processes, a total of 82 project evaluations, and external audits of close to 30 projects. The overall conclusion of those reviews had been that IPEC delivered an innovative programme and responded effectively to new challenges with relevant strategies. Steps had been taken during 2005 to address the areas identified for improvement, including better mainstreaming of the ILO's work in the overall ILO agenda, enhanced tripartite action, efforts to strengthen the gender dimension, the development of a more detailed results-based framework for the Programme, and an improved system to document the process of selecting implementing partners. The global evaluation had also raised questions about the governance structure of IPEC, including the role of the ISC in relation to the more regular governance structures of the Organization. With IPEC's performance being reviewed by the PFAC and the TC Committee of the Governing Body, supplemented by the advisory role played by the ISC, Mr. Tapiola

believed that those issues had already been addressed and would only require some further fine-tuning. Finally, he drew attention to the restructuring that had taken place in SECTOR I bringing both IPEC and DECLARATION together in a new Fundamental Principles and Rights at Work (FPRW) Department. The new structure followed recommendations from the global evaluation and provided for a closer integration of the ILO's work on child labour and on other fundamental labour rights. It was expected that the change would yield efficiency gains and enhance coherence in assistance and advice to ILO member States.

5. The agenda of the meeting was approved as proposed. A representative of the Employers' group (*Mr. Anand*) suggested that in the future, before adopting the agenda, there should be a report on any action that had been taken to address the recommendation of the previous ISC meeting.
6. The record of proceedings of the fourteenth meeting of the ISC (held on 11 November 2004) was approved with an amendment to the statement of the spokesperson for the Employers' group concerning the relationship between child labour and the social dimension of globalization.
7. *Mr. Thijs*, Director of the International Programme on the Elimination of Child Labour, welcomed representatives of donors and participating countries. He apologized for the late submission of the implementation report¹, which was beyond IPEC's control. He said that, as always at this time, the facts and figures were provisional, as the year has not yet ended. Overall, however, the trends continued to be promising, with continued growth in absolute delivery and increasing focus of the Programme on consolidation and sustainability. Data for the biennium showed that IPEC had exceeded the target of beneficiaries. Close to 2 million children were reached during the biennium, of which about 400,000 had been direct beneficiaries and 1.6 million indirect beneficiaries. The large increase in the number of indirect beneficiaries was the result of the strategic shift in recent years to greater focus on upstream work, through policy advice, capacity building and sharing of good practices. The number of indirect beneficiaries did not include those reached through awareness-raising campaigns. Progress had been noted in ratifications of child labour Conventions: 157 countries had ratified Convention No. 182 and 142 had ratified Convention No. 138 (including Singapore, for which the instrument of ratification had been received and registration would shortly be formalized). That amounted to an additional 21 ratifications for the biennium – 10 for Convention No. 182 and 11 for Convention No. 138 – but below the target set for the biennium of 20 ratifications for Convention No. 138 alone. While a number of other countries were actively considering ratification, it was clear that progress beyond that point would be slower. Programme delivery in 2005 was projected at US\$60 million, bringing total delivery for the biennium to US\$117 million, an increase of 35 per cent compared to the previous biennium. Annual new approvals continued to fluctuate around US\$60 million per year. With a delivery of US\$60 million in 2005, a sound balance had been achieved for the first time in IPEC's history, with IPEC's annual delivery capacity matching its annual new approvals.
8. Despite slower progress in ratifications, demand for IPEC support still exceeded the funding capacity of the Programme. IPEC had tried to accommodate requests as fully as possible, but was also careful not to "spread itself too thin". Twenty of the participating countries were implementing comprehensive and ambitious time-bound programmes (TBPs) and another 30 had undertaken two or more interventions based on the TBP approach during the biennium. To meet the growing demand for assistance and technical advice in the area of child labour, considerable time and resources had been devoted to strengthening programmatic approaches, guidelines and tools. During the biennium, at least 50 countries had used methodologies, guidelines, research results and good practices developed by IPEC. Many of those tools had been developed through strengthened

¹ ILO: *IPEC action against child labour 2004-05: Progress and future priorities* (Geneva, 2005).

cooperation and synergies with other ILO programmes with a view to contributing to the Decent Work Agenda. Specific examples included instances of collaboration concerning youth employment, hazardous work, small enterprise development, trafficking and forced labour, and activities involving workers' and employers' organizations. Research and data collection through the Statistical Information and Monitoring Programme on Child Labour (SIMPOC) and other units continued to be crucial to ensuring a sound data and knowledge basis for IPEC's work. The cost and benefits study of the elimination of child labour released last year had demonstrated the important political outreach such studies could provide. During 2005, SIMPOC had also devoted substantial attention to developing a new global estimate on the magnitude of the child labour problem, to be released with the second Global Report on child labour in 2006.

9. *Mr. Thijs* said that the current year's implementation report included a number of cross-cutting issues of importance to IPEC strategic development: the important links between child labour and youth employment, highlighting the contribution IPEC could provide to the renewed ILO focus on that issue; the promising developments in the growing consensus on international standards concerning child labour statistics, which was expected to lead to the approval of a new statistical standard during the 18th International Conference of Labour Statisticians; and a report on the World Day against Child Labour in 2005, which had resulted in a global call to action against child labour in mining. As regards management improvements, follow-up activities had been initiated following the 2005 gender audit, by enhancing gender mainstreaming efforts, and methods had been reviewed to ensure more solid involvement of workers' and employers' organizations in the Programme and to identify opportunities for enhanced collaboration with other units and departments in the Office. A recent global IPEC workshop had developed a results-based framework for the Programme in 2006-07, as proposed in the global evaluation. Decentralization from headquarters to regional structures had continued, as had the training of staff in all regions.
10. *The spokesperson for the Employers' group* complimented the former IPEC Director, Mr. Frans Röselaers, for doing a wonderful job during his tenure in IPEC, and welcomed Mr. Guy Thijs as his successor. The Employers looked forward to working with him to enhance the work of IPEC, as in the past. He congratulated IPEC for the current year's implementation report, from which it was clear that IPEC continued to contribute very significantly to the elimination of child labour. He highlighted a number of key elements of importance to employers, and said that impact assessments needed to be done regularly to ensure that past experience was used. The compilation of good practices was a good idea. The Employers appreciated IPEC's critical assessment and its readiness to ask difficult questions in order to achieve further improvements, which they saw as an important strength. They welcomed the update in the report on the follow-up to the global evaluation. The Employers were also pleased to note that the priority target groups for IPEC action remained the worst forms of child labour; priority action had to remain focused there, and initiatives were needed at the national level. For example, TBPs were very good national initiatives. Efforts to assist governments to enact child labour legislation and to reinforce labour inspection mechanisms needed continued strengthening. There were also a number of areas of concern to the Employers. Greater efforts had to be made to work with the social partners. Previously, the Employers had requested a breakdown of funds allocated to different social partners and NGOs. That breakdown was not provided in the current implementation report, and should be included in next year's report, specifying recipient social partners, amounts received, and percentages of total regular and extra-budgetary funding. He referred to the ILO-Norway framework agreement and the Kit for employers on addressing child labour. Within that framework, ACT/EMP had worked with a number of employers' organizations to develop tailor-made programmes designed by employers for employers. He requested donors to earmark part of their funding for strengthening employers' organizations. IPEC should also more fully involve ACT/EMP, for example, in training of IPEC staff on employers' issues.

11. *The spokesperson for the Employers' group* noted that child labour continued to be an issue of the utmost importance and posed major challenges. It was surprising to see a link between child labour and youth employment in the current year's report, and he felt that those issues should be separated. They were two distinct concepts, with corresponding solutions and distinct strategies. Moving away from the topic of the implementation report, since the last meeting in 2004, the world has seen three major natural disasters (the tsunami, Hurricane Katrina, and the earthquake in Pakistan and India). IPEC had been instrumental in sending assistance to Indonesia and Sri Lanka. In the case of the Pakistan earthquake, children were severely affected, many being not only orphaned but also disabled. IPEC, with its specialized focus, could help to improve the lives of those children. That should be taken into consideration for next year's programme.
12. *A representative of the Workers' group (Mr. Ahmed)* introduced the new spokesperson for the Workers' group, Mr. Simon Steyne.
13. *The spokesperson for the Workers' group* assured the Pakistani Worker and Employer representatives that his own organization and the Workers' group stood with the people of Pakistan – and especially the children of Pakistan – in their hour of need. He also thanked his predecessor, Sir Roy Trotman and Mr. Röselaers, and assured Mr. Thijs of the group's support. He congratulated IPEC on the impressive and detailed report, although it was rather heavy and perhaps not very accessible to a wider audience. It was impossible to address all the elements of the report in the available time. He welcomed the greater linkages in the report with the Millennium Development Goals (MDGs) and the ILO Decent Work Agenda, but regretted that the Outcome Document of the United Nations General Assembly, in September 2005, while commendable, referred only to ILO Convention No. 182, not to Convention No. 138. He noted that the report indicated significant progress, and would appreciate still more information on the impact of the activities undertaken (what had been successful and what had not). In its 2003 report, IPEC had prepared a list of its implementing agencies (included in an annex). That had been very useful, and such a list should be included in the next report. He asked that it be included in the revised report to be published in the new year, including transparent details of the financial allocations to the social partners compared with national and international NGOs.
14. He welcomed IPEC efforts to improve project assessment methodology, and invited IPEC to include the results of those evaluations in future reports. Concerning documentation of good practices, the Workers were concerned that the example on page 8 – referring to a strategy for networking and partnership to take child labour concerns to the policy and legislative level – did not mention trade unions. He also welcomed the inclusion in all IPEC field projects of social dialogue as a key strategy for eradicating child labour, and the inclusion of education components. He agreed strongly that the elimination of child labour could not be achieved without universal education, and universal education would not be achieved until child labour was eliminated. The document referred repeatedly not to basic education but to primary education. Basic education provided a better basis for employability than primary education (because it envisaged two or three more years of schooling), and it would also be wholly inconsistent for the ILO to support a general school leaving age of 11 when the minimum age for entry into full-time employment was set by Convention No. 138 at 14 or 15 years. In that regard, he believed that the private education systems referred to on page 10 could never ensure education for all. It would be incongruous to recognize that some children work in order to pay school fees, while supporting fee-paying schools as a solution. Only States could ensure the universal provision, essential to the elimination of child labour, of free, accessible, formal, compulsory education as a quality public service.
15. *The spokesperson for the Workers' group* also noted the Workers' strong support for the integration of child labour issues in the ILO's Decent Work Country Programmes (DWCPs), but more information was needed. They were particularly concerned about the barriers to trade union involvement. He requested more information on the content, implementation and results of Decent Work Country Programmes, the involvement of the

social partners, and how best to integrate work on child labour in those programmes. He was pleased to see the systematic integration of gender concerns in the work of IPEC. That trend had to be sustained in order to tackle adequately the needs of girls with regard to the right to education. He commended IPEC efforts to follow-up on the recommendations of the 2004 evaluation, particularly the greater attention being paid to enhancing tripartite action and greater involvement of constituents in the planning and implementation of child labour activities and projects. He mentioned a number of examples of projects where the capacities of the social partners were being strengthened to enable them to play a strong and meaningful role. He shared the view that national trade union centres needed support from IPEC in developing their coordinating capacity. Regarding the role of governments in monitoring child labour, he stressed the key role of labour inspection services and welcomed the cooperation between IPEC and SafeWork on training for labour inspectors.

16. The Workers reiterated their concern about the low level of core funding and IPEC's insecure staff resource base. Too few IPEC staff held permanent contracts and, despite valiant efforts and unquestionable dedication, the Geneva staff struggled to handle all the demands of strategic planning and management. Solutions should be sought in further discussions with donors and in the Steering Committee. Extra-budgetary resources from private partners needed to meet a number of criteria, in line with those enunciated by the Director-General in March. In that regard, the Workers wished to know the private partners with whom IPEC had been cooperating or planned to cooperate in the future, and the terms of reference of such cooperation. Noting the merger of DECLARATION and IPEC, the Workers would welcome a clearer evaluation of the effects on IPEC's work of the new arrangements. The Workers' group was pleased that many IPEC targets set for the current biennium had been exceeded. The spokesperson invited IPEC, in cooperation with other departments, to work towards increasing ratifications of Convention No. 138 and to continue to assist member States in implementing the provisions of both the child labour Conventions. One question was what resources were allocated to the ratification campaign? He noted that 39 countries had collected and analysed data on their child labour situation, and he would welcome further information about progress being made in that regard in industrialized countries.
17. With regard to the thematic highlight "Child labour and youth employment: Highlighting the links (pp. 52-59)", he stressed that all work related to youth employment should be underpinned by the decent work paradigm and the Global Employment Agenda. The Workers' group had indicated on several occasions its view that the strategy underpinning the Youth Employment Network (YEN) was flawed. The focus on the "four E's" of the YEN (entrepreneurship, employment, equity and employability) was too narrow. While recognizing the need to explore in greater depth the relationship between education, employment and the elimination of child labour, he had doubts concerning the discussion on page 54 about the relationship between levels of education and employment. There was insufficient evidence to support the suggestion that the rate of unemployment was lower for those with little or no education or with higher education, than for those with intermediate education. The report made insufficient reference to the conclusions of the tripartite general discussion on youth employment held last June, which should guide ILO action on youth employment. IPEC activities in the area of youth employment should focus on the 15 to 17 years age range, where there is an overlap between child labourers and young workers. He noted the Workers' satisfaction at the lead role of the ILO at the inter-agency round table discussion on the occasion of the Fifth High-level Group Education for All (HLG-EFA) in Beijing, in November 2005. With its unique tripartite structure, the ILO was best placed to lead a coherent inter-agency approach in work with agencies such as UNESCO, the World Bank and UNICEF. With regard to the theme "International Standards concerning Child Labour Statistics (pp. 59-62)", he recognized the need, identified by the International Conference of Labour Statisticians, to develop an international statistical definition of child labour, including hazardous work. However, the definition of an international statistic should under no circumstances be used to reinterpret

or undermine the two ILO Conventions. Any international standard on child labour statistics should be developed in close consultation with the Standards Department. On the theme “Child labour in mining: A global Call to Action (pp. 63-66)”, the Workers’ group strongly supported linking the World Day against Child Labour with the launch of the global *Call to Action* against child labour in mining, and welcomed the signing of an agreement between the International Federation of Chemical, Energy, Mine and General Workers’ Unions (ICEM) and the International Council on Mining and Metals (ICMM). These sectoral initiatives added to IPEC’s ability to produce authoritative guidelines for multinational enterprises and voluntary social dialogue-based or multistakeholder corporate social responsibility (CSR) initiatives on the practical role they could play in getting children out of work and into school. Regarding the Programme and Budget proposals for 2006-07, the next budget should include provision for the development of social partner focal points in priority countries. The Workers’ group emphasized the need to increase ratification of Convention No. 138 and to maintain a campaign for universal ratification and implementation of both Conventions.

18. As for the schedule of the Steering Committee, *the spokesperson for the Workers’ group* welcomed the clearer governance integration of IPEC into the structures of the Governing Body, while recalling the limited time available to the Committee. Three hours were not sufficient for an in-depth discussion of such a vast flagship programme. The Workers would therefore like the Office to consider moving the Steering Committee meeting from a half day in November to a full day in March, or to extend the November meeting to a full day with a half day in March; or perhaps a half day at both sessions except in budget years, when there could be a full day meeting during the three-week Governing Body session in March. The Office should carry out consultations and make proposals in March at a brief reconvened meeting.
19. *The Government representative of Pakistan* congratulated the Office on the excellent and useful report. Pakistan was committed to the elimination of child labour, in particular its worst forms. He listed a number of achievements under the various IPEC-supported programmes, and noted the TBP for the elimination of the worst forms of child labour, which had been launched in Pakistan in 2003. A new programme under the auspices of IPEC with assistance from the European Commission for 5 million euros was now being discussed, to be launched in early 2006. The recent earthquake in Pakistan had been a major tragedy, killing over 75,000 people and injuring over 80,000 while making more than 3.3 million people homeless. Schools had been destroyed, teachers killed and many children killed, orphaned or disabled. Pakistan needed support to help people to rebuild their lives, and rehabilitation measures to give hope to the children affected.
20. *The Government representative of Germany* expressed her Government’s sincere appreciation for the constructive relationship with IPEC so far. Germany would remain associated with IPEC within available financial means. She was pleased to note that her country had recently financed a new programme entitled “Combating the Worst Forms of Child Labour in Central Asia through Education and Youth Employment”. She considered it very important that closer cooperation between the various ILO departments was taken into account in project development and implementation. While impressed by the financial turnover of IPEC, she was concerned about the very limited share of regular budget resources. Why did the ILO economize in such an obviously crucial area of its work? She requested further information on the distorted proportion of regular budget-funded and extra-budgetary funded staff at headquarters.
21. *The Government representative of Brazil* thanked the Office for a comprehensive report. He recalled that the IPEC programme had begun in 1992, with Brazil as the first country in the Americas to cooperate with ILO-IPEC. He congratulated the Office on its activities in the area of research, such as the initiative to obtain new global estimates. The Government of Brazil was equally pleased to see the dissemination of TBPs at country level. In Brazil, the TBP had achieved significant success and specific results that would lead to the eradication of child labour in the country, in particular in family agriculture, urban

informal work, child domestic labour, drug trafficking and commercial sexual exploitation. He was pleased to report that an addendum to the TBP had been launched in September 2005 with a planned duration of two years, ending in 2008. He agreed with the recommendation for the continued involvement of social actors, as well as the integration of child labour concerns into national and international development plans. He would like to have a clearer idea of the results-based framework (RBF) that was being prepared, and when it would be available to member States. Noting a number of achievements by IPEC-supported programmes in Brazil, he took pleasure in the participation of Brazil in the recent World Day against Child Labour. Through strong cooperation with IPEC, the country's PETI programme for the elimination of child labour was being strengthened, benefiting almost 2 million children who had been withdrawn from child labour. He thanked in particular the Governments of Germany and the United States for their financial assistance for IPEC activities in Brazil.

22. *The Government representative of Switzerland* congratulated IPEC on the quality of the report. She also expressed her country's satisfaction with the contribution of IPEC to the 2005 session of the International Labour Conference, during which the fight against child labour had been given a sufficiently high profile. However, she expressed concern at the decreasing ratification rate. She also expressed her concern at the staffing situation described in the report, and requested more information. With regard to the next International Conference of Labour Statisticians, which would focus on the resolution on the statistical definition of child labour, she stressed that it should not undermine the ILO Conventions on child labour.
23. *The Government representative of Morocco* welcomed the report and congratulated IPEC on its quality. She also expressed her gratitude for the support of donors, and stressed the importance of having IPEC's technical assistance. She listed a number of achievements brought about in Morocco with the support of particular donors, which included: (i) funding for the national plan and the sectoral plans on child labour by the Government of France; (ii) financial support from the Government of Belgium for the awareness-raising campaign on child labour; and (iii) the widening of activities in rural areas funded by the Government of the United States. Real improvements could be seen in the elimination of child labour for 5 to 14 year-olds and the improvement of working conditions for 15 to 17 year-olds. Moreover, in labour legislation, the minimum age for admission to employment had been raised to 15 years. Lastly, she mentioned the importance of child labour monitoring, for which Morocco had been in close cooperation with IPEC on a number of projects. She encouraged donors to continue to support programmes.
24. *The representative of the European Commission* informed the Steering Committee that the European Commission was strengthening its contribution to the promotion of Decent Work for All. The promotion of decent work was part of recent key policy documents, such as the Commission proposals for a new EU development policy, an EU strategy for Africa, and the new European social agenda of February 2005. Decent work issues would also be relevant for ongoing and future country strategy papers, regional strategy papers (RSPs) and thematic programming. Cooperation between the European Commission and the ILO on decent work in third countries was covered by the overall cooperation agreement of May 2001 and the Partnership on development cooperation of July 2004. The European Commission was finalizing the co-funding of the IPEC programme in African, Caribbean and Pacific (ACP) countries on child labour and education, amounting to 15 million euros. In addition, co-funding of IPEC activities was being finalized in a number of other countries such as Turkey, Pakistan and possibly Bangladesh. Other cooperation could be envisaged at country level in the near future, on the basis of country strategy papers and Decent Work Country Programmes (DWCPs).
25. *The Government representative of Italy* thanked the Office for the comprehensive report. Italy remained deeply committed to fighting child labour and continued to support IPEC and its actions in a number of countries as well as the global campaign, especially the SCREAM (Supporting Children's Rights through Education, the Arts and the Media) and

12 to 12 initiatives. He requested precise figures on the delivery rate and the breakdown by regions. He suggested that the ILO's International Training Centre in Turin could often be more involved in IPEC's work programme.

26. *The Government representative of Indonesia* thanked the Office for the report. He expressed his country's appreciation for IPEC's support for the tsunami rehabilitation programme in Aceh Province, and thanked the donor countries for supporting Indonesia in the fight against child labour.
27. *The Government representative of the Netherlands* complimented IPEC for its excellent report. Crucial elements continued to be: preventing the recruitment of new child labourers; removal and rehabilitation; access to quality education; and sufficient income for parents. The Government of the Netherlands was pleased to see that cooperation between IPEC and other ILO programmes was increasing each year. She also welcomed IPEC's efforts to continue to seek partnerships with other international organizations such as UNICEF. She supported the link with the Decent Work Agenda, MDGs and the Poverty Reduction Strategy Papers (PRSPs). Her delegation was still somewhat cautious in its response to the merger between IPEC and DECLARATION, especially in view of the tight staff resource situation in Geneva to which the report referred. She reiterated the need for a strong link between technical cooperation and the two fundamental child labour Conventions. Technical cooperation in the area of child labour should be targeted towards achieving full compliance with those instruments. Her delegation believed that the elimination of child labour, on the one hand, and the promotion of decent work for young people, on the other, were two sides of one and the same coin. Because of the obvious links between child labour and youth employment, ILO activities in that field should go hand in hand. A comprehensive programme of work on the linkages between child labour and youth employment was required. With regard to an international statistical standard for measuring child labour, reliable standards that would be comparable across countries would be essential to obtaining a good overview of the global child labour situation. She welcomed the time-bound initiative to eliminate child labour in mining within five years in 15 countries. Her country fully supported the initiative of a global time-bound programme for the elimination of child labour in mining. She regretted the lack of information on the work of IPEC on HIV/AIDS, and encouraged IPEC to enhance its recently launched activities in that area.
28. *The Government representative of the United States* welcomed the very comprehensive report. She wanted to see more information on impact in future reports, and therefore strongly supported the plan to use tracer studies and tracking systems to assess short-term and longer-term impact. She was interested in knowing when the Office anticipated the first results of those studies, and how the Office had arrived at the estimate that 1.6 million children were indirect beneficiaries, in particular the number of children who had benefited from legislative, policy or social programme changes and the number who had benefited from increased awareness and social mobilization after an education campaign. Her Government was pleased to note that a significant number of activities had been undertaken jointly with other ILO departments and programmes. She noted with satisfaction that SIMPOC studies had been replicated in a number of countries, even after IPEC withdrawal, demonstrating the kind of sustainability which she hoped to see in all the ILO's work.
29. *The Government representative of Canada* thanked the Office for a very comprehensive report and Mr. Röselaers for his contributions to IPEC. She welcomed Mr. Thijs and looked forward to continuing Canada's excellent working relationship with IPEC. She noted the various follow-up initiatives in response to the IPEC evaluations, and welcomed in particular the significant increase in the number of evaluations. She encouraged the Office to ensure that any lessons learned were fully integrated in programme management and delivery. She welcomed the development of tracking systems and the use of tracer studies, and considered the Programme's focus on strengthening partnerships within the Office, with ILO constituents and with other United Nations agencies to be very positive.

The Government of Canada strongly supported the continued IPEC focus on the immediate elimination of the worst forms of child labour as a priority, and in that context welcomed the campaign against child labour in small-scale mining.

30. *The Government representative of the United Kingdom* strongly supported the work of IPEC. He welcomed the progress that had been achieved, in particular in integrating the elimination of child labour with poverty reduction frameworks and the MDGs, which had led to a more intensive collaboration with other United Nations agencies. He also welcomed the integration of IPEC and DECLARATION and the increased participation of the social partners. His Government wanted to know more on the implications for the Decent Work Country Programmes in terms of the future of the IPEC programme, in particular the impact on local constituents in setting priorities, and also the implications for donors in terms of funding.
31. *The Government representative of Kenya* said the report was well written. He expressed his country's appreciation to the Government of the United States, which through IPEC had been able to fund the TBP in Kenya which had resulted in progress. The elimination of child labour remained a central concern of the Kenyan Government, as the enactment of the Children Act has shown. The Act provided for compulsory basic education for all children of school age. The Government had introduced free primary education, which had seen many children return to school, lowered the high drop-out rates, and improved retention rates. He thanked IPEC for supporting the design and development of the National Plan of Action.
32. *The representative of UNICEF* congratulated IPEC on the new report. UNICEF felt that there was an urgent need to analyse and tackle child labour within the broader framework of the MDGs as part of the international community's efforts to ensure their success. Child labour needed to be recognized as a major obstacle to the attainment of the MDGs, particularly with regard to education, gender equality, combating HIV/AIDS and eradicating poverty. IPEC and UNICEF needed to coordinate their approaches more effectively to include child labour concerns in development frameworks and in reporting on the MDG agenda. Regarding partnership, UNICEF and IPEC worked successfully together in the framework of the TBPs. At the country level, UNICEF worked closely with IPEC in the implementation of national programmes of action for the elimination of child labour in the United Republic of Tanzania, Bangladesh, Pakistan, Nepal, Brazil, Morocco and Cambodia. The BGMEA project in Bangladesh to remove children from the garment industry was a very good example of joint action. It would be useful to discuss and analyse lessons learned from other major programme initiatives, such as the sports goods industry project, and to review the separate evaluations of education as a preventative strategy for combating child labour. Joint partnership involving the Work Bank, ILO-IPEC and UNICEF through the Understanding Children's Work (UCW) project for research, database and policy-directed analysis at the country, regional and global levels, was also on track. As regards the development of indicators, the Child Protection Section at UNICEF would start work on the development of indicators on the worst forms of child labour in 2006, as required by the Medium-Term Strategic Plan (MTSP), including rapid assessment methodology. Collaboration with the ILO on the development of such indicators would be very desirable. She mentioned the initiative to combat child labour through education, led by an inter-agency working group including United Nations agencies and development partners. The initiative would be discussed at the third round table discussion on child labour and education to be held on 28 November in Beijing within the framework of the HLG-EFA meetings.
33. *The Government representative of South Africa* thanked IPEC for the comprehensive report. She agreed with the statement made by the Government representative of the Netherlands concerning the linkages between HIV/AIDS and child labour. It was common in sub-Saharan Africa to find households headed by children. She appealed to IPEC to place a particular emphasis on links between HIV/AIDS and child labour. She also agreed with the Workers' comment that the lack of education played a role in children entering

child labour. Lastly, she endorsed the statement about the necessary follow-up once children had been removed from child labour, in particular to ensure that they did not return to work and were given adequate alternatives to child labour.

34. *The Government representative of Nigeria* congratulated the ILO on its efforts to combat the worst forms of child labour and for the well-articulated progress report. The Government of Nigeria wanted to thank the United States Department of Labor for the support given to Nigeria for activities on the elimination of child labour. The two principal child labour Conventions had been ratified by Nigeria, and he looked forward to continued support from IPEC.
35. *A representative of the Employers' group (Mr. Anand)* congratulated the Office on the World Day against Child Labour relating to mining activities. He suggested that consideration be given to small-scale hostelrys and roadside eateries. The experience in Andhra Pradesh was relevant in that regard. In the field of employment, one had to go beyond primary education: polytechnic education was the key. In addition to UNICEF, more initiatives should be promoted with UNESCO, UNIDO and other agencies to build up education programmes and take children from exploitation to education. He urged IPEC to continue to assist Pakistan in the aftermath of the recent earthquake.
36. *A representative of the Workers' group (Mr. Ahmed)* expressed his appreciation for the work done by IPEC. He appreciated the contribution by donors, and the fact that extra-budgetary resources continued to rise by some 35 per cent. On behalf of the Workers, he expressed his appreciation for the Office and IPEC response to the tsunami and the assurances regarding the Pakistan earthquake efforts. The Office should give special attention to the rehabilitation of orphaned children by providing them with education. With regard to the merger of IPEC and DECLARATION, he wanted some assurance that the merger would not mean diluting the work being done by DECLARATION, particularly with workers. He hoped that more collaboration would be achieved with ACTRAV.
37. *Mr. Tapiola* replied to the various comments made by the Steering Committee. He said that as regards the question of information on the allocation of funds to the social partners, those figures and a breakdown would be given to the TC Committee in March. IPEC was open to discussion as to the level of detail needed. With regard to the comment on the lack of information on future action, the forthcoming Global Report would have an elaborate section on future action that would lead to a discussion at the level of the Conference in 2006. As to the use of the terms "basic" or "primary" education, the Office had to go along with the language of the MDGs, even though it was flawed in some respects. On the question regarding IPEC's private partners, he referred to the partnership with the tobacco and cocoa industries, the work with export industries, with FIFA, and one individual who had contributed. With regard to the functioning of the Steering Committee, the current functioning within the overall framework of Governing Body meetings had been decided in the discussions on improvements to the functioning of the Governing Body. A full day instead of half a day would be technically possible, but would mean a clash with other meetings. One possibility might be to divide the meeting into an administrative segment and a thematic segment. On the staffing levels, he noted the recent 5 per cent cut across the board at headquarters, which the levels reflected. On the other hand, IPEC had gained five specialist posts in the field. As to the question of ratification, the Office was not in any way abandoning the campaign for full ratification of Convention No. 182, and ratification of all the fundamental Conventions remained the ultimate target. He reassured the Steering Committee that, with regard to the merger between IPEC and DECLARATION, the Office was proceeding very cautiously: the basic idea of the new Fundamental Principles and Rights at Work (FPRW) Department was to retain IPEC and DECLARATION with their respective strengths, and with qualities and "brand names" that everyone knew. The Office was looking at synergies through common services and through streamlining management.
38. *Mr. Thijs*, replying to the comments made by Committee members, said that IPEC would continue to update ISC members with the follow-up to the global evaluation, as requested

by the Employers. The calamity that had struck Pakistan was taken very seriously, and IPEC responded to the extent possible through existing programmes. Moreover, the Programme was in the process of mobilizing resources for a more targeted response, with considerable success. Any misunderstanding regarding IPEC's role in combating child labour versus its worst forms needed to be taken seriously. IPEC was aware that there were different perceptions, and remained vigilant in promoting the principles set out in Conventions Nos. 138 and 182 because they provided adequate guidance and there should be no reason for confusion. Moreover, in the countries where IPEC worked, child labour trends indicated that in many cases there was an overall decline in child labour and not just of the worst forms, implying that focusing on the worst forms could go hand in hand with addressing all forms of child labour. As Mr. Tapiola had already mentioned, IPEC in March 2006 would provide the Committee with details of the implementing partners, of which there were currently about 2,000. In terms of the involvement of workers and employers in IPEC's work, there had been a clear improvement. There had been a marked increase in the number of action programmes started in 2005 that were implemented by workers and employers. Compared to 2004, there had been an increase of about 66 per cent in respect of both workers and employers. He hoped to show that improvement in the forthcoming report, which would provide a more detailed breakdown. There had also been an increase in the number of action programmes in which the implementing partners reported collaboration with workers' or employers' organizations.

39. As to Decent Work Country Programmes (DWCPs), IPEC was participating in the exercise organized by PROGRAM to integrate its work within those programmes. In terms of funding modalities, he agreed that more flexible funding modalities and core contributions would make it easier to integrate IPEC's work in the DWCPs. On HIV/AIDS and child labour, IPEC had carried out various studies, and in 2005 a pilot programme had been launched in Zambia and Uganda that focused specifically on the link between child labour and HIV/AIDS. IPEC was thus now moving beyond studies. On the youth employment section of the report, he was very happy to learn of the interest it had generated. IPEC had come to the realization that its work was very relevant to youth employment. IPEC wanted to better explore the link between youth employment and child labour, and he agreed that the 15 to 17 years age group was the most relevant to IPEC. He also recognized the importance of basic education (not just primary education), but that had to be combined with quality and relevance to the labour market in order to avoid frustration among young people who completed their education but found that their labour market potential was still poor.
40. On the delivery rate, *Mr. Thijs* expected that the rate would be between 60 and 65 per cent and there was still scope for improvement. He hoped IPEC would be able to include a breakdown of delivery by region in the updated report to be circulated in March. IPEC had also strengthened its cooperation with the Turin Centre, which had appointed an official who would focus specifically on the work of SECTOR I, and in particular the FPRW Department. That would probably make it easier for IPEC to collaborate with the Turin Centre in the future. On staff resources, it was true that the staff resource situation remained precarious at headquarters, but during 2005 IPEC had concluded an agreement with one of its biggest donors, which would provide for a more solid and secure basis for extra-budgetary funding of staff. There had also been an increase in regular budget staff for child labour in the field, resulting in more senior child labour specialists in the field. With regard to the calculation of the number of indirect beneficiaries, the methodology used was very sound and monitored by IPEC's evaluation department. On the tracer studies, preliminary results had been indicated in last year's report, and the full results were expected from February 2006.
41. *A representative of the Workers' group* stressed the importance of cooperation between the European Union and IPEC. ACTRAV and ACT/EMP were ready to be fully involved in decision-making and implementation.

42. *The spokesperson for the Employers' group* emphasized three important points that had emerged from different interventions by Government representatives. First, child labour was an obstacle to the achievement of the MDGs, so efforts should focus on education. Secondly, the impact of HIV/AIDS on child labour remained a highly important issue. Lastly, IPEC should compile an overview by country of the hazardous work that had been identified. That would give an idea of how hazardous work was defined in different regions and in different countries.
43. *The spokesperson for the Workers' group* noted that the evolving debate on the relationship between child labour and youth employment clearly illustrated the need for time for thematic discussions within the Steering Committee. He welcomed the comments made by the UNICEF representative to the effect that UNICEF was also beginning to explore the relationship between the elimination of child labour and achievement of Education for All. In addition to thematic discussions, he had also suggested the showcasing of good practices. The INDUS project supported by the United States Department of Labor was a fine example of the development of effective tripartite activity and cooperation in a major project. He suggested that there should be a showcase presentation on the INDUS project and on other major projects that clearly demonstrated good practices. He also briefly clarified what he had meant by polytechnic education in his statement. The term referred to a comprehensive concept based on equal opportunity and access for all children, regardless of class, gender or any other distinction, to a well-rounded curriculum that valued both the sciences and the arts, both the intellectual and the practical.
44. *Mr. Tapiola* said that the linkage between the elimination of child labour and education was a long-recognized principle in the ILO, as illustrated by Article 427 in Part XIII of the Versailles Peace Treaty of 1919. He agreed that the discussions had provided elements that would provide a good basis for thematic discussions; possibilities for such discussions would be explored. There being no other business, Mr. Tapiola thanked all the participants for their support, participation and contributions to the meeting.