



Fourth item on the agenda: Human resources development and training – Revision of the Human Resources Development Recommendation, 1975 (No. 150)
(standard setting, second discussion)

Report of the Committee on Human Resources

1. The 92nd Session of the International Labour Conference set up the Committee on Human Resources at its first sitting on 1 June 2004. The Committee was originally composed of 188 members (78 Government members, 53 Employer members and 57 Worker members). To achieve equality of voting strength, each Government member entitled to vote was allotted 1,007 votes, each Employer member 1,482 votes and each Worker member 1,378 votes. The composition of the Committee was modified eight times during the session and the number of votes attributed to each member adjusted accordingly.¹
2. The Committee elected its Officers as follows:

Chairperson: Mr. J. Chetwin (Government member, New Zealand)

¹ The modifications were as follows:

- (a) 3 June: 239 members (110 Governments entitled to vote with 2,044 votes each, 73 Employer members with 3,080 votes each and 56 Worker members with 4,015 votes each);
- (b) 4 June: 223 members (115 Governments entitled to vote with 704 votes each, 64 Employer members with 1,265 votes each and 44 Worker members with 1,840 votes each);
- (c) 7 June: 229 members (117 Governments entitled to vote with 20 votes each, 60 Employer members with 39 votes each and 52 Worker members with 45 votes each);
- (d) 7 June: 230 members (118 Governments entitled to vote with 390 votes each, 60 Employer members with 767 votes each and 52 Worker members with 885 votes each);
- (e) 8 June: 226 members (118 Governments entitled to vote with 2,915 votes each, 53 Employer members with 6,490 votes each and 55 Worker members with 6,254 votes each);
- (f) 9 June: 185 members (119 Governments entitled to vote with 1,025 votes each, 25 Employer members with 4,879 votes each and 41 Worker members with 2,975 votes each);
- (g) 10 June: 169 members (119 Governments entitled to vote with 44 votes each, 22 Employer members with 238 votes each and 28 Worker members with 187 votes each);
- (h) 14 June: 144 members (121 Governments entitled to vote with 120 votes each, eight Employer members with 1,815 votes each and 15 Worker members with 968 votes each).

Vice-Chairpersons: Mr. A.J.E.G. Renique (Employer member, the Netherlands); and
Ms. H. Yacob (Worker member, Singapore)

Reporter: Ms. A. Murty (Government member, India)

3. At its 11th sitting, the Committee appointed a Drafting Committee composed of the following members: Mr. F.F. N'zue (Government member, Côte d'Ivoire), Mr. A.J.E.G. Renique (Employer member, the Netherlands), Ms. H. Yacob (Worker member, Singapore) and the Reporter of the Committee, Ms. A. Murty (Government member, India).
4. The Committee had before it Reports IV(2A) and IV(2B) prepared by the Office for a second discussion of the fourth item on the agenda of the Conference: Human resources development and training.
5. The Committee held 15 sittings.

Introduction

6. In his opening remarks, the Chairperson provided the background to the discussion. He reminded the Committee that in March 2001, at its 280th Session, the Governing Body had decided to include in the agenda of the 91st Session of the International Labour Conference (ILC) (June 2003) a first discussion of an item on human resources training and development, with a view to adopting a revised standard in 2004. The Governing Body considered that Convention No. 142 continued to be an appropriate instrument to guide countries in developing their training policies and systems. Recommendation No. 150, however, had lost much of its relevance. A more dynamic instrument was needed to assist member States and social partners to formulate and implement human resources development policies. The Governing Body therefore had established this Committee and its first discussion had taken place during the 91st Session of the ILC in 2003, which had led to the proposed Recommendation that was before the Committee this year. He urged the Committee to work in a spirit of cooperation and consensus and to make every effort to adopt an instrument that would be useful and reflect a common understanding.
7. The representative of the Secretary-General congratulated the Officers of the Committee on their election, pointing out that it was fortunate to have the same Officers as last year. Their commitment, skills and leadership would help ensure a successful second discussion. He encouraged all Government, Employer and Worker members, as well as representatives from other organizations present in the Committee, to actively participate in the challenging task of developing a new Recommendation. He recalled that the Conclusions of the general discussion held at the 88th Session of the ILC in June 2000 called for a more dynamic instrument, which would reflect the new approaches to human resources development and training, and help constituents develop policies in these areas. He recapitulated the process that had led to the proposed Recommendation, starting with the *White Report* prepared for the 91st Session of the ILC, to the present text. In addition to these documents some 500 examples of national policies had been gathered, which could be viewed on the ILO web site.
8. Human resources development was central to ILO's mandate and essential to achieving the four strategic objectives of the ILO's Decent Work Agenda. Human resources development was also one of the core objectives of the ILO's Global Employment Agenda, which sought to place employment at the heart of economic and social policies. Increased labour productivity was considered central to economic progress, and the link between skills development and productivity was undeniable. The importance of human resources

development and vocational training had been further reflected in the Report of the Director-General to the ILC in 2003, *Working out of poverty*, as well as in the report of the World Commission on the Social Dimensions of Globalization. Appropriate education and training would also help make globalization more inclusive by reducing income inequalities. He encouraged the Committee to continue to reflect on these issues.

9. The Chairperson noted that the general discussion provided the opportunity for the Committee to establish its expectations for its work over the next two weeks. It would build on the excellent work accomplished last year and in recent months. The purpose of this year's session was to refine and clarify the instrument in order to ensure its completeness and relevance. To achieve that, the members of the Committee should carefully consider the viewpoint of those who would have to implement the Recommendation. He encouraged the members of the Committee to focus on issues of substance and to ensure clarity of expression.
10. Finally, he identified two issues for the Committee to consider. First, whether the title of the Recommendation should be changed to include the words "lifelong learning". He recalled that Recommendation No. 150 was generally known as the "Human Resources Development Recommendation", while its actual title was "Recommendation concerning Vocational Guidance and Vocational Training in the Development of Human Resources". The second issue was to decide whether the proposed Recommendation would replace Recommendation No. 150 or stand alongside it. He understood that the intention had been to replace it, but the Committee would need to clarify this point.

General discussion

11. The Employer Vice-Chairperson remarked that the world economy had changed considerably since the general discussion at the 88th Session of the ILC in 2000, reflecting lower levels of economic growth and instances of recession. Thus, this was a difficult time to implement a new Recommendation as budgets were constrained for governments, employers and individuals. On the other hand, this period also illustrated that human resources development was crucial: qualified people had less difficulty in finding and retaining jobs, and those enterprises with a high knowledge factor in their goods and services were able to compete more effectively.
12. The Employer Vice-Chairperson recognized that the issue of human resources development in developing countries might deserve greater attention by the Committee. In addition to enhanced international cooperation, bilateral and regional programmes could also be promoted.
13. The Employer Vice-Chairperson noted that good progress had been made during the discussions in 2000 and 2003, and stressed that the Committee's work must build on this progress and avoid a reopening of major issues already covered in earlier discussions. The Committee should seek to improve the instrument by avoiding overlap and presenting more clear formulations of the text. In this regard, he noted that the Employers' and Workers' groups had exchanged proposals to improve the logic and structure of the texts; some discussions had been held and the Committee would be informed of these discussions in due course.
14. The Employer Vice-Chairperson emphasized that the Human Resources Development Recommendation, 1975 (No. 150), focusing on vocational training and guidance, had a narrow focus. Broader issues such as all forms of initial education, the responsibilities of governments and the social partners to implement measures to facilitate lifelong learning

and the concept of employability had now been included in the new text. As a result the Employers' group was in favour of considering a new title for the new proposed Recommendation.

15. The Employer Vice-Chairperson noted that the Committee's discussions stressed that lifelong learning was a tripartite issue on which governments, workers and employers could cooperate with different but often complementary roles and responsibilities. Concerning the issue of the right to education and training, the Employer Vice-Chairperson noted that the objection of the Employers' group in 2003 to the text of the relevant paragraph should be seen in this perspective. The Employers' group wanted to clarify the different roles of the social partners in education and training; the proposed text confused these roles. It should be made clearer that governments were responsible for pre-employment education and training, while the primary role of the social partners was for further training during the course of a career. In both cases, cooperation was possible and often desirable.
16. The Employer Vice-Chairperson also stressed the shared commitment of the worker and the employer to invest in further training, and that this shared commitment should not be interpreted as an indication by the Employers' group that enterprises would lower investments in training. In this regard, he reiterated the statement made in Report IV(1) of the 91st Session of the ILC: "The individual is becoming the architect and builder responsible for developing his or her own skills, supported by public and enterprise investment in lifelong learning". A similar concept was also included in the Human Resources Development Convention, 1975 (No. 142).
17. The Worker Vice-Chairperson recalled the fruitful first discussion that had taken place in 2003. She emphasized that human resources development was an essential tool to eradicate poverty, combat social exclusion and to empower people. Any country that neglected human resources development could not compete effectively in a globalized economy. She added that globalization in its present form was not sustainable, as it resulted in some winners but many losers. She recalled that education and training were a means to provide decent work for all and to place people at the centre of development. She expressed the Workers' group's satisfaction that the Recommendation would be the first international instrument to define the term "employability". She also reaffirmed the importance of tripartism in training and lifelong learning.
18. The Worker Vice-Chairperson highlighted the significance of advances in information and communications technologies, permitting some countries to "leapfrog" the development process, moving from primarily agricultural-based to knowledge-based economies. The power of technology, combined with improved education and skills, could allow people to lead more meaningful lives and to not be exploited. Because human resources development was so crucial, the proposed text clearly indicated in clause 5(a) that training and education is a right for all.
19. The Worker Vice-Chairperson conveyed the concerns of the Workers' group that a key challenge was to ensure that the instrument could be effectively implemented. In this regard, an important aspect was the ability of workers to have paid time off to undertake training. Thus, the Paid Educational Leave Convention, 1974 (No. 140), while reflected in the preamble of the proposed text, should also be reflected in the body of the text.
20. The issue of debt relief should also be emphasized to a greater degree in the proposed text. The Conclusions concerning human resources development, adopted by the ILC at its 88th Session in 2000 noted that debt relief was a principal means by which developing countries could improve the lives of their people and be able to allocate resources for

education and training. The issue of “brain drain” from the developing world also needed to be addressed, with some mechanisms put in place to assist countries in recuperating investments in training lost to more developed regions.

21. The importance of collective bargaining, a fundamental right, was also important to ensure the quality, relevance and effectiveness of training programmes. This would also facilitate social inclusion of those most disadvantaged in the labour market, such as the young, women and older workers. Additionally, education and training was important in assisting individuals to move from the informal to the formal economy.
22. The Worker Vice-Chairperson concurred with the view of the Employer Vice-Chairperson that the Committee should avoid reopening discussions on issues already covered. She also expressed the view of the Workers’ group that the new Recommendation should replace the Human Resources Development Recommendation, 1975 (No. 150).
23. Concerning the title of the proposed Recommendation, her group would prefer the existing title but suggested that this issue be discussed at the end of the Committee’s work, once the substance of the Recommendation had been defined.
24. The Government member of South Africa, speaking on behalf of the African group, outlined four major concerns on which the Committee’s discussions should focus during the course of its work.
25. First, it was important to place the issue of the impact of human development at the heart of the Committee’s discussion. Within the United Nations family, the Millennium Development Goals were the agreed interim targets for development and as such discussions should focus on how training and education will contribute to meeting these targets. Second, it was important to stress that nation States must not be viewed as operating in isolation. For example, if developed nations aggressively recruit graduates from developing countries, will the objectives of the Recommendation not be undermined? Third, the importance of entrepreneurship and self-employment should be emphasized as a major source of job creation and not be restricted, as in clause 20(d), to research and support services. Fourth, it was necessary for terms to be defined to a greater extent than was the case in the proposed text; this would improve the Recommendation’s usefulness to member States. For example, was “training” distinct from “human resources development”, as the title of the proposed text suggested? Similarly, does the text adequately deal with differences between vocational training, professional training and lifelong learning?
26. The Government member of Egypt noted that the proposed text provided a good basis upon which the Committee might build, covering the major concerns such as the need for social dialogue and lifelong learning, recognition of qualifications and improved investment in training.
27. The Government member of Ireland, speaking on behalf of the Government members of the Committee Member States of the European Union (EU), conveyed the support of the European Union for the work of the Committee and encouraged international dialogue on human resources development and lifelong learning.
28. The Government member of Papua New Guinea expressed support for the proposed text. His Government supported the concept of national qualifications frameworks, although one had not yet been developed in his country. He also affirmed that prior learning should be recognized by training institutions. However, he noted that the role of non-governmental organizations (NGOs) had not been sufficiently emphasized and suggested

that the text should better reflect their contribution. Lifelong learning should include skills and knowledge learned in traditional societies.

- 29.** The Government member of Australia noted that substantial progress had been made last year and that the Committee should continue to move forward. His Government would suggest that the proposed Recommendation should recognize the primary responsibility of governments for basic education and pre-employment training. Noting that different member States were at different stages of development, the instrument should be non-prescriptive and should provide an effective framework for the development and implementation of human resources policy.
- 30.** The Government member of France, speaking on behalf of the Group of Industrialized Market Economies (IMEC), noted the vital importance of training for the unemployed and those returning to the labour market and for the economic and social development of the country. She stressed that a human resources strategy needed to be developed that took account of these workers, including their personal development, and development of a general culture supporting active citizenship. She also noted that the development of a human resources strategy required coordination of different economic and social policies.
- 31.** Arguments in favour of streamlining and clarifying the text were advanced by the Government members of Argentina, Australia, Canada, Finland, France and Papua New Guinea.
- 32.** The Government member of New Zealand expressed her full agreement with the views expressed by the IMEC group and reaffirmed her Government's continued support for a revised Recommendation. Thus, the Committee should not reopen the discussion, but should rather focus on fine-tuning. She supported changing the title of the proposed Recommendation from Human resources development and training to Lifelong learning, as it better reflected the content. However, she acknowledged that the term lifelong learning might have different meanings in different countries. The proposed Recommendation should also address the issue of indigenous people and ethnic minorities as they experienced severe disadvantages, particularly in terms of access to education and training. She also suggested that the proposed Recommendation should provide a guide for a regulatory framework as well as the development of policy. This framework should be based upon the following: (1) it should be practical; (2) it should have core principles that were universally acceptable; (3) it should focus upon outcomes or results; and (4) it should have broad application.
- 33.** The Government member of Lebanon commented on the need for both the private and public sectors to invest in education and training; on the importance of informal learning and career guidance; on access to education for all, as well as on policies to ensure sustainable development. Noting that development took time, he stressed the need for programmes that facilitated the transition from the informal to the formal economy.
- 34.** The Government member of Canada, noting that a knowledge-based economy needed a skilled workforce, expressed her Government's support for a revised Recommendation, reflecting on its experience in working together with training providers and social partners to promote education and training for all sectors of the economy. She agreed that training for lifelong learning should be based on shared responsibilities and suggested that further clarification was required on the right to education and training.
- 35.** The Government member of Thailand expressed her satisfaction over the content of the proposed text, as it was compatible with her Government implementing human resources development policies, as well as addressing social issues, such as poverty alleviation, in

order to enable people to achieve a high quality of life and happiness. Her Government was working towards developing a knowledge-based economy, and she affirmed that people should be at the centre. She expressed a preference for the existing title and also highlighted the need to address the needs of people in the informal economy.

36. The Government members of Canada, France and Thailand all urged that the new Recommendation should replace Recommendation No. 150.
37. The Government member of Trinidad and Tobago, speaking on behalf of the Government members of the Bahamas, Barbados (all member countries of the Caribbean Common Market (CARICOM)), stated that the proposed Recommendation was timely, provided a framework and indicated priority areas of action. In the proposed Recommendation the development of education and training should take local conditions into account. She expressed her overall satisfaction with the proposed Recommendation as it adequately reflected the discussions that had taken place last year and the views expressed by CARICOM members.
38. The Government member of Finland expressed appreciation to the Office for its work and noted that, while Finland did not have major concerns on the content of the proposed Recommendation, his Government would support the efforts of the Committee to reach consensus.
39. The Government member of Japan stated that a discussion on this topic at the international level was timely. However, as concerned a framework for recognition and certifications for skills, she expressed reservations about adopting a uniform framework for recognizing prior learning and previous experience acquired in other countries.
40. The Government member of Argentina noted the importance of human resources development in achieving equal opportunity and social inclusion for all. She stressed that the labour market required a higher level of qualifications, noting that skills development was particularly important to cope with technological change in the workplace. Collective bargaining could also be an important tool. She pointed out that some improvement of the Spanish translation might be necessary.
41. The representative of the International Federation of University Women stated that education, training and lifelong learning should also promote personal development. The text should include the role of training in promoting multiskilling, portability and transferability. The education of young women should be stressed in order to address the gender divide.
42. The Government members of Argentina and France noted that the treatment of lifelong learning should address the issue of active citizenship.
43. The Government member of India stressed that workers needed to be trained to meet the requirements of a global labour market. Multiskilling was important in this context, and it was also important that training was part of the work culture. She stressed that government could not face the challenge alone: the importance of investment from industry was crucial. The right to training for all, however desirable, might not be realistic in developing countries. While acknowledging that the proposed text recognized the needs of the developing countries, she again called for the creation of an international skills fund to assist developing countries.
44. The Government member of Brazil highlighted four important points for discussion: the right to education and training; the need to clarify tripartism and collective bargaining; the

importance of education and training to the economy; and the importance of informal education.

- 45.** The Employer Vice-Chairperson, in his summary, noted that overall there was general support for the proposed Recommendation, and he encouraged the Committee to build upon these results and not reopen the lengthy debates of last year. He noted, however, that there was widespread support that the instrument be made more readable and comprehensive, yet not prescriptive. He recalled the interventions from the Government members of Brazil and India concerning the need for a debate regarding the right to education and training, and noted that building broad consensus on this item would require time.
- 46.** The Worker Vice-Chairperson, in her summary, said that she found the interventions to be positive and helpful, and noted that support for the Recommendation was widespread. There was clear consensus that human resources development and training were critical. Many governments had stressed that human resources development and training were not just related to employment but were necessary for active citizenship. Thus, there was a wider role for training, in which the individual was at the centre of development.
- 47.** She agreed with the Employer Vice-Chairperson's suggestion to avoid reopening the debate of last year's core issues and to strive for greater clarity. She observed a clear majority regarding the suggestion by governments that the proposed Recommendation should replace Recommendation No. 150 rather than being a stand-alone document, and noted that the Governing Body and the proposed Conclusions concerning human resources development and training (2003) also supported that suggestion. She emphasized the points raised by the Government members of Brazil and Argentina that collective bargaining could enhance and contribute to training as well as ensure greater equity in training, and also referred to the important roles of social dialogue and tripartism in achieving this end. Lastly, she noted the interventions of the governments of developing countries which had stressed the need to ensure basic universal education.
- 48.** The Chairperson concluded the general discussion by commending speakers on the brevity and clarity of interventions which he felt revealed strong consensus that the present draft was a good basis from which to work and that last year's debate should not be reopened. He noted that many members of the Committee found the present text to be too long and repetitive. He detected broad agreement that lifelong learning was a tripartite responsibility, but there appeared to be a need to be clear about the responsibilities of governments, social partners and individuals.
- 49.** He summarized the main issues of the general discussion as being ones of emphasis:
- the broader contribution of lifelong learning such as active citizenship;
 - the importance of resources for education and training;
 - the importance of social dialogue, collective bargaining and tripartism;
 - the role of human resources development and training in assisting the transition from informal to formal economies;
 - the concern regarding the brain drain, particularly from developing countries;
 - the desirability of recognizing knowledge and skills gained in traditional societies, particularly for indigenous peoples;

-
- the important role played by the private sector and NGOs; and
 - the role of training for multiskilling, portability and adaptability of skills.

50. He observed that there was strong support that the proposed Recommendation should replace Recommendation No. 150. Regarding changing the title, he noted the suggestion that this debate should come at the end of the Committee's discussions rather than at the beginning.

Consideration of the proposed Recommendation concerning human resources development and training

51. The Chairperson announced that the Committee would begin the process of considering amendments and invited the Employer and Worker Vice-Chairpersons to inform it of the outcomes of the discussions between their groups regarding the proposed text.

52. The Employer Vice-Chairperson stressed the importance that his group attached to clarifying the responsibilities of each of the individual tripartite partners. In line with that concern, there had been an intensive discussion with the Workers' group on clause 5(a), which contained a general statement about the right for all to education and training. They had agreed that this paragraph should be complemented by a slightly changed version of the existing Paragraph 2, which clearly set out the responsibilities of the tripartite partners, but would be better located immediately after the existing clause 5(a). He noted that there had also been some tentative agreements on other structural changes, including modifications as to the order of some paragraphs and chapters, but his group would propose those changes when the Committee discussed the relevant parts of the text.

53. The Worker Vice-Chairperson indicated basic agreement with the Employer Vice-Chairperson on the changes proposed to Paragraph 2 and clause 5(a). She re-emphasized that the Committee should now focus as far as possible on refining and improving the clarity of the text and avoid reopening the debate. She stressed that while there had been discussions between her group and the Employers' group, this was not meant to exclude governments or to avoid taking into account concerns of the Government members. The modifications that had been agreed to, regarding the structure of the Recommendation, would be announced in due course to avoid confusion and to form the basis for further discussion in the Committee. They included, among others, moving Paragraph 2 and introducing a new title before Paragraph 20. The Workers' group looked forward to making the Recommendation more practical and easy to implement.

54. The Government member of Switzerland expressed her Government's regret at not having been involved in the discussions between the Employers' and Workers' groups. She also stressed her interest in making the proposed Recommendation more readable and clear.

55. The Worker Vice-Chairperson stated that it had not been the intention of the Employers' and Workers' groups to exclude Government members, whose views and contributions they welcomed. Her group had found it useful to have preliminary discussions with the Employers' group in order to clarify core areas in terms of the proposed changes. The large number of Government members made it difficult to include them in the discussions outside the Committee. The Employers' and Workers' groups would carefully listen to and take into account suggestions from all Government members.

56. The Employer Vice-Chairperson expressed his agreement with the Worker Vice-Chairperson and added that discussions between the two groups would contribute to

achieving important structural changes. It was the intention of the Employers' and Workers' groups to fully inform the Committee of their discussions at the beginning of each sitting, since there was insufficient time to allow a full discussion with all Government members.

57. The Government member of the United States supported the Government member of Switzerland and encouraged the Employers' and Workers' groups to engage in consultations with governments.
58. The Government member of Canada supported the concerns raised by the Swiss Government and added that the Committee should bear in mind that it was important for governments to understand what the key issues were for the social partners. She felt excluded and found it paradoxical that the whole intent of the Conference was to be inclusive and to promote tripartite dialogue. She looked forward to an opportunity to engage in dialogue with the Employers' and Workers' groups.
59. The Chairperson observed that the point had been well made by the Government members and had been duly noted by the Committee.
60. The Chairperson stated that there were two amendments on the title of the Recommendation: D.72 and D.45. He recalled the suggestions in the general discussion to consider the title at the end of the discussion to ensure that it reflected the actual content of the Recommendation. It was therefore agreed that the two amendments on the title be discussed at the end.

Form of the instrument

Preamble

D.73

61. The Government member of South Africa, speaking on behalf of the African group, introduced an amendment to Paragraph 2 of the preamble to delete the reference to "education, training and" and add the words "and entrepreneurship" following reference to the concept of lifelong learning. She noted that a number of similar amendments had been submitted by the African group throughout the text and sought to clarify in general terms the purpose of these amendments.
62. She stressed the importance of not viewing human resources development in isolation from other elements of the ILO's Global Employment Agenda. Introduction of the notion of entrepreneurship was an effort to illustrate the significance of improving both the quality and quantity of employment and a recognition that many workers would need to create their own employment opportunities. Noting that there were some objections to the wording of the amendment, she proposed a subamendment where the terms "employability and productivity" would be included in addition to entrepreneurship.
63. The Employer Vice-Chairperson said that his group was in favour of the inclusion of the concept of entrepreneurship in the proposed text. He questioned its appropriateness in the preamble but suggested that it could be included in a later section.
64. The Worker Vice-Chairperson stated that her group could not support the amendment. While recognizing that there were many important issues related to lifelong learning, the main focus of the text was to equip people with the necessary skills to improve their capacities for employment and not on creating entrepreneurs.

-
65. The Government members of France, India, Portugal and Thailand also opposed the amendment, voicing their concerns that the emphasis should be on lifelong learning and noting the importance of keeping the text clear and succinct.
 66. The Government member of Namibia noted that there was serious opposition to this amendment and suggested it be withdrawn. The Government member of South Africa, in a spirit of compromise, withdrew the amendment.

D.50

67. The Government member of the United Kingdom, speaking also on behalf of the Government members of Australia, Austria, Canada, Finland, Ireland, Japan, Malta, Netherlands, New Zealand, Norway, Slovakia, Sweden, Switzerland, Turkey and the United States, introduced the amendment to replace the word “people” with the word “individuals”, for the sake of consistency.
68. The Employer Vice-Chairperson stated that he could accept both words – “individuals” and “people”, thus proposing to leave this to the Drafting Committee.
69. The Worker Vice-Chairperson also supported the amendment.
70. The amendment was adopted and referred to the Drafting Committee.

D.18

71. The Government member of Brazil, speaking also on behalf of the Government members of Argentina, Paraguay and Uruguay, introduced an amendment proposing to replace the words “contribute significantly to promoting the interests of people, enterprises, the economy and society as a whole,” with the words “and decent work are rights that must be granted to everybody and ought to become strategic policies in achieving the sustainable development of countries.” He explained that decent work was a right that was not clearly highlighted and should be reinforced. He added that decent work should be spelt out in Paragraph 2 of the preamble.
72. The Government member of Venezuela noted that the discussion was clearly important as education, training and lifelong learning were closely linked to the strategic objectives of the ILO and the Decent Work Agenda. He supported the views of the Government member of Brazil.
73. The Employer Vice-Chairperson stated that specific technical points should not be made in the preamble, as it should provide the general context for the Recommendation. He proposed keeping to the main subject of human resources development and did not support the amendment.
74. The Worker Vice-Chairperson stated that this amendment accurately reflected the concerns and core principles of decent work and should be part of a strategic policy for sustainable development. She mentioned that growth should be complementary to human development and sustainable development. However, she noted that the principles of decent work were covered in Paragraph 7 of the preamble along with sustainable development. Therefore the Workers’ group did not support the amendment.
75. The Government members of India, Papua New Guinea and Thailand did not support the amendment for similar reasons.

76. In light of the discussion, the Government member of Brazil withdrew the amendment.

D.74, D.38 and D.53

77. These three amendments (D.74, D.38 and D.53) were considered to be related and were discussed together.

78. The Government member of Kenya, speaking on behalf of the African group, introduced amendment D.74. She explained that the amendment was to insert the words “poverty eradication” after the words “full employment.”

79. The Worker Vice-Chairperson announced her support for amendment D.74 and withdrew amendment D.38.

80. The Government member of France, speaking also on behalf of the Government members of Belgium, Canada, Germany, Ireland, Italy, Japan, Malta, Netherlands, Norway, Portugal, Slovakia, Spain, Sweden, Switzerland, Turkey and United Kingdom, introduced amendment D.53, expressing the view that poverty reduction was a more realistic approach but said that she would be prepared to support amendment D.74, in the spirit of compromise.

81. The Employer Vice-Chairperson stated that education, training and lifelong learning contributed in very important ways to employment and he therefore supported the addition of the words “poverty eradication”.

82. Amendments D.38 and D.53 were withdrawn and amendment D.74 adopted.

D.54

83. The Chairperson stated that this amendment dealt with linguistic issues and it was decided to refer it to the Drafting Committee.

D.70

84. The Government member of Trinidad and Tobago, speaking also on behalf of the Government members of Barbados and Jamaica, introduced an amendment to include NGOs and community-based organizations, explaining that in the CARICOM countries, NGOs and community-based organizations made numerous and important contributions to the countries’ wider training efforts and were expected to play an even greater role in the future. These organizations had worked in support of reducing poverty, helping the unemployed and workers in the informal sector, which needed to be reflected in the text. She thus proposed replacing the words “employers and workers” with the words “employers, workers and non-governmental and community-based organizations”.

85. The Employer Vice-Chairperson recognized the importance of the abovementioned groups. However, he felt that the focus of Paragraph 3 should remain on the main actors in the labour market. While NGOs and community-based organizations worked effectively with the wider government frameworks, the government was the first and most important actor. In order to keep Paragraph 3 as clear as possible, he could not support the amendment.

86. The Worker Vice-Chairperson stated that the Workers’ group did not support the amendment. She thought that Paragraph 3 adequately reflected the roles of the three major parties. Adding a reference to the role of NGOs and community-based organizations would

add to the length and blur the focus. She also pointed out that the Committee had discussed these different roles last year and that this issue should therefore not be reopened.

- 87.** The Government representative of Thailand stated that her Government did not support the amendment.
- 88.** The Government representative of Papua New Guinea recalled that in his opening remarks, he had referred to the role of the NGOs and community-based organizations in human resources development and training. He also recognized, however, the overarching role of the social partners and he wondered whether these other organizations could be considered elsewhere in the text.
- 89.** The Government representative of Trinidad and Tobago felt the importance of NGOs and community-based organizations would be lost if they were not specifically recognized. She appealed to the social partners to include these groups in forthcoming discussions on other parts of the instrument.
- 90.** In light of the discussion, the amendment was withdrawn by the Government member of Barbados.

D.75

- 91.** In light of the previous discussion, the Government member of South Africa, speaking on behalf of the African group, withdrew the amendment.

D.42

- 92.** The Government member of Australia, speaking also on behalf of the Government members of Ireland, New Zealand, Norway, Sweden, Switzerland, Turkey, United Kingdom and the United States, introduced an amendment to delete the text following “lifelong learning” in order to shorten and clarify the text, and it was felt that details on the roles of the social partners would be reflected in later parts of the document.
- 93.** The Employer Vice-Chairperson opposed the amendment. The remaining text gave important guidance on the organization of lifelong learning. It was important to clarify the role of the three actors early on, even though the issue might be dealt with in more detail at a later stage.
- 94.** The Worker Vice-Chairperson also opposed the amendment because of the importance of providing clarity in terms of the responsibilities of the three actors.
- 95.** The Government member of Australia withdrew the amendment while stressing the need to further streamline the text and make it more readable.

D.76

- 96.** The Government member of South Africa, speaking on behalf of the African group, introduced an amendment to replace the word “investing” with the words “creating the conditions” after the word “governments”. She explained that the existing text gave the impression that only governments needed to invest in education, training and lifelong learning whereas, in reality, this burden could and should be shared more widely. This, however, did not mean a reduction in the government role but rather a wider facilitating one. She then proposed a subamendment to add the words “and providing experience opportunities for the young” to reflect the important role enterprises can play in this area.

-
97. The Employer Vice-Chairperson expressed concerns with the proposed second subamendment. While acknowledging that companies had a role to play in this area it was mainly an expression of corporate social responsibility and did not belong in the instrument.
 98. The Worker Vice-Chairperson stressed that the intention of the paragraph was to clarify the responsibilities of all three actors. She supported the first part of the amendment and proposed a second subamendment to insert the words “investing in the” after the words “enterprises by”.
 99. The Government member of Saudi Arabia proposed a third subamendment to add the words “and creating the conditions” after “investing”, rather than replacing “investing” with “creating the conditions”, since both were important and mutually supportive.
 100. The Government member of Guinea supported the original amendment, as governments should create the necessary conditions to intervene as appropriate.
 101. The Government member of Côte d’Ivoire explained that creating the necessary conditions allowed investment to achieve results. Investments might be made, but the wider enabling conditions leading to job creation were also necessary.
 102. The Employer Vice-Chairperson stated that the phrase “creating the conditions” would considerably weaken the text and make it more complicated. He therefore rejected the amendment.
 103. The Government member of Saudi Arabia clarified and restated his subamendment. He stressed that countries needed to ensure that their investments were worthwhile or they would be wasted, and that governments could do much to create the right conditions in this respect.
 104. The Government member of Venezuela supported the third subamendment proposed by the Government member of Saudi Arabia to include both “investment” and “creating the conditions”.
 105. The Government members of Australia, Switzerland and the United States opposed the third subamendment, since they felt the text was already sufficiently clear on the key role of governments.
 106. The Government member of Guinea supported the third subamendment proposed by the Government member of Saudi Arabia and noted that the addition of the words “creating the conditions” would help workers access opportunities that would otherwise not be available.
 107. The Worker Vice-Chairperson also supported the third subamendment, as it was important for the government to create the necessary conditions.
 108. The Government members of Thailand and Venezuela also stressed the importance of including both aspects and supported the third subamendment.
 109. The Employer Vice-Chairperson supported the third subamendment.
 110. The amendment was adopted as subamended.

D.78

- 111.** It was decided that this amendment be referred to the Drafting Committee, as it concerned the wording of the French version of the text only.

D.90

- 112.** This amendment was withdrawn in light of the earlier discussion.

D.44

- 113.** The Government member of Australia, speaking also on behalf of the Government members of Austria, Canada, Finland, France, Ireland, Japan, Malta, Netherlands, Norway, Portugal, Slovakia, Spain, Switzerland, Turkey, United Kingdom and the United States, introduced an amendment to replace the existing text of Paragraph 4 of the preamble with the following text: “Recognizing that education, training and lifelong learning are fundamental and should form an integral part of comprehensive economic, social and labour market policies and programmes that are important for economic growth and employment creation, and”. He explained that this amendment was proposed in the interests of streamlining the text, as the current wording of Paragraphs 4 and 5 of the preamble was repetitive and unclear. The proposed text combined both paragraphs into one that should be easier to understand.

- 114.** The Employer Vice-Chairperson appreciated the effort to streamline the text, but emphasized that the word “consistent”, which would disappear if the text of Paragraph 4 were replaced, was very important. The word “fiscal” would also be missing if Paragraph 5 were deleted. He therefore proposed a subamendment to insert the word “fiscal,” in the third line after the word “economic”. On that basis, he could accept the deletion of the existing Paragraph 5.

- 115.** The Worker Vice-Chairperson felt that the proposed second subamendment did not adequately address all the issues reflected in the existing Paragraphs 4 and 5. She proposed inserting a second subamendment in the proposed text of Paragraph 4, in the second line after the word “economic”, the words “growth and employment creation”, and in the fourth line, after the words “comprehensive economic”, inserting the word “fiscal”, as suggested by the Employer Vice-Chairperson.

- 116.** The Government member of Australia stated that he was considering withdrawing the amendment because if the additional text was adopted, the objective of streamlining the text would be lost. However, he supported the subamendment proposed by the Employer Vice-Chairperson and suggested a third subamendment to insert the words “and be consistent with” after the words “part of” in the second line of the proposed new text of Paragraph 4.

- 117.** The Employer Vice-Chairperson supported that subamended text.

- 118.** The Worker Vice-Chairperson stated that she could also support the subamended text.

- 119.** The amendment was adopted as subamended.

D.77, D.87 and D.79

- 120.** In view of the adoption on the previous amendment, these amendments were not considered.

D.80 and D.43

- 121.** Amendment D.80, submitted by the African group, and D.43, submitted by the Government members of Australia, Austria, Canada, Finland, France, Ireland, Japan, Malta, Netherlands, Norway, Portugal, Slovakia, Spain, Switzerland, Turkey, United Kingdom and the United States, proposed the deletion of existing Paragraph 5. In line with the discussion on and adoption of D.44, both amendments were adopted.

D.81, D.19 and D.69

- 122.** All three amendments were concerned with finding alternative wording for the word “modern”, and they were therefore discussed together. Amendment D.81, submitted by the African group, and D.19, submitted by the Government members of Argentina, Brazil, Paraguay and Uruguay, proposed to replace the word “modern” with the word “appropriate”. The Government member of Trinidad and Tobago, speaking also on behalf of the Government members of Barbados and Jamaica, introduced a similar amendment (D.69) to replace the word “modern” with the word “contemporary”, but she found the word “appropriate” equally acceptable.

- 123.** The Employer Vice-Chairperson stressed that it was important to ensure that education and training should keep up with developments. For that reason, he preferred to retain the word “modern” in the existing text.

- 124.** The Worker Vice-Chairperson supported the word “appropriate”.

- 125.** The Government members of Finland, Ireland, Lebanon, Thailand and the United Kingdom, similarly supported the word “appropriate”.

- 126.** The Employer Vice-Chairperson recognized that the amendment proposing the word “appropriate” had received wide support, but pointed out that the word “modern” could also be used in the context of developing countries. He nevertheless, in a spirit of compromise, supported the amendment.

- 127.** The amendment was adopted.

D.82

- 128.** The Government member of Côte d’Ivoire, speaking on behalf of the African group, introduced an amendment to insert the words “eradicate poverty” after the words “policies to” in the second line. He noted that poverty eradication was an important objective of education and training policy.

- 129.** The Employer Vice-Chairperson proposed a subamendment to place the same words at the end of the paragraph, a proposal supported by the Worker Vice-Chairperson and the Government member of Côte d’Ivoire.

- 130.** The amendment was adopted as subamended.

D.36

- 131.** The Worker Vice-Chairperson introduced an amendment to insert after the word “attain” the word “human”, thus referring to “human development” rather than “development”. The amendment was supported by the Employer Vice-Chairperson and the Government member of Lebanon.

132. The Government member of South Africa proposed a subamendment to include a reference to “supporting the goals of the United Nations and its specialized agencies”. The Employer Vice-Chairperson did not support the subamendment since he felt that the text should be able to be read on its own. The Worker Vice-Chairperson, while expressing understanding of its purpose, did not support the subamendment since it would lengthen the text. Furthermore, most United Nations goals were time bound and therefore not appropriate to the present instrument. The Government members of Papua New Guinea and Thailand supported the amendment as originally introduced.

133. The subamendment was withdrawn and the amendment was adopted.

D.83

134. The Government member of Kenya, speaking on behalf of the African group, proposed an amendment to insert the words “employment intensive” after the words “development and” in the third line, as job creation was a key objective of economic development.

135. The Employer Vice-Chairperson, while understanding the intention, felt that this wording was restrictive and might focus attention on certain economic sectors over less employment-intensive sectors which nevertheless were important for overall development, and he therefore did not support the amendment.

136. The Worker Vice-Chairperson noted the phenomenon of economic growth without employment growth and therefore felt the amendment, which she supported, added a useful dimension to the text.

137. The Government members of Saudi Arabia and the United States did not support the amendment.

138. The Government member of Finland, acknowledging the useful contribution of the amendment to the text, proposed a subamendment to replace the words “employment intensive” with the words “to increase employment”. The Employer Vice-Chairperson supported that subamendment.

139. The Government member of Australia found that this proposal diluted the text and therefore he did not support the subamendment. The Government member of Côte d’Ivoire expressed support for the amendment as originally formulated.

140. The Worker Vice-Chairperson proposed a second subamendment to insert the words “full employment” rather than the words “employment intensive” as proposed in the amendment. The Government member of Lebanon felt that the Committee should avoid over-burdening the text and did not support the second subamendment.

141. The Employer Vice-Chairperson did not support the second subamendment and proposed a third subamendment to read: “to attain human development, economic employment growth and eradicate poverty”.

142. The Worker Vice-Chairperson and the Government member of Australia supported the third subamendment.

143. The amendment was adopted as subamended.

- 144.** The Worker Vice-Chairperson introduced an amendment to add a new paragraph to the preamble as follows: “Recognizing that lifelong education and training are contributing factors to personal development, access to culture and active citizenship and”. She stressed that this was a critical objective of education and training, broadening the understanding of lifelong learning beyond economic concerns to include social concerns and concerns of human development.
- 145.** The Employer Vice-Chairperson did not support the amendment, pointing out that the proposed text was unclear and certain terms were not easily understandable.
- 146.** The Government member of France supported the amendment, noting the importance of its inclusion in the preamble and that it reflected the guiding principles of the IMEC group. The Government member of South Africa also supported the amendment, as did the Government member of Brazil, on behalf of MERCOSUR.
- 147.** The Government member of Namibia supported the amendment, suggesting that the term “lifelong learning” be used rather than “lifelong education”. The Worker Vice-Chairperson suggested a subamendment to insert the words “lifelong learning,” before the words “education and training”. The Government members of Thailand and Canada supported the subamendment.
- 148.** The Government member of Papua New Guinea suggested that, to be more consistent, the text should read “education, training and lifelong learning”, a subamendment supported by the Worker Vice-Chairperson.
- 149.** The Employer Vice-Chairperson requested clarification of the terms “access to culture” and “active citizenship”. The Government member of Venezuela supported the subamendment, pointing out that active citizenship implied rights and responsibilities as well as participation in civic life. The amendment reflected important fundamental values. The Government member of Guinea noted that education and training contributed to an individual’s ability to participate fully in society.
- 150.** The Worker Vice-Chairperson referred to Report IV(1), *Learning and training for work in the knowledge society*, of the 91st Session (2003) of the ILC which she felt provided useful insights into the concepts introduced by the amendment, in particular the European Commission’s Memorandum on Lifelong Learning.
- 151.** The Employer Vice-Chairperson indicated that he was prepared to accept the amendment and subamendment.
- 152.** The Government member of the United Kingdom suggested the Drafting Committee consider whether the phrase “social inclusion” was more appropriate than “social inclusivity”.
- 153.** The amendment was adopted as subamended.
- 154.** The preamble was adopted as amended

Objective, scope and definitions

Paragraph 1

D.84

- 155.** The Government member of South Africa, speaking on behalf of the African group, presented an amendment to insert a new paragraph before Paragraph 1, to introduce the concept that lifelong learning and entrepreneurship policy outcomes should be measured and assessed to determine whether activities undertaken do indeed contribute in the ways intended.
- 156.** The Employer Vice-Chairperson did not disagree with the assessment of policies and strategies but thought that Paragraph 1, which focused on objectives, was not the appropriate place for the proposed new text. He suggested that assessment should be addressed in the section on policy implementation and indicated that he did not support the amendment in this section.
- 157.** The Worker Vice-Chairperson stated that while she understood the intention and purpose of the amendment and agreed that evaluation and assessment were critical, she concurred with the views expressed by the Employer Vice-Chairperson. She suggested that these issues would be better reflected in section VIII.
- 158.** The Government member of Papua New Guinea felt that the word “measure” was covered by the word “review” in the text of Paragraph 1.
- 159.** The Government member of Australia did not support the amendment and agreed that it would be better placed later in the text. The Government member of Portugal supported the position of Australia.
- 160.** The Government member of South Africa explained that the intention of the amendment was to establish clearly that lifelong learning was related to broader goals. By putting the paragraph later in the text it would have less prominence. However, she agreed, in a spirit of compromise, to withdraw the amendment.

D.89

- 161.** The Government member of South Africa, speaking on behalf of the African group, explained the background of the amendment. At its meeting in May 2004, the World Health Assembly had adopted a resolution on the migration of health professionals from developing to industrialized countries. Her Government felt this should be linked to the human resources development agenda, which was why the wording of the proposed amendment aligned it closely to the World Health Assembly resolution. She also wanted to see a linkage to the discussion that was taking place in the Committee on Migrant Workers at this session of the Conference.
- 162.** The Employer Vice-Chairperson understood the concern of the African group, yet he had two problems with the amendment: it was not an objective and thus was not appropriate for this section, and he doubted whether the issue should be treated within an education and human resources development instrument. Therefore, he did not support the amendment.
- 163.** The Worker Vice-Chairperson stated that she fully understood the objective and intention of the amendment. It was an important issue because developing countries needed their scarce skilled resources, yet skilled workers were leaving, resulting in substantial lost

investment in education and training. However, she felt that including the amendment in section I: Objective, scope and definitions, was inappropriate and suggested that it might be better placed under section IX: International and technical cooperation.

- 164.** The Government members of Thailand and Venezuela agreed with the Worker Vice-Chairperson's position.
- 165.** The Government member of South Korea opposed the amendment, stating that the contents of the proposal would place excessive pressure on limited resources.
- 166.** In light of discussions, the Government member of South Africa, withdrew the amendment.

D.15

- 167.** The Employer Vice-Chairperson introduced an amendment to insert the words “, with the involvement of the social partners,” after the words “Members should” in the first line. This would streamline the text and, if adopted, would mean that clause 5(b) could be deleted.
- 168.** The Worker Vice-Chairperson supported the amendment, but did not agree to the deletion of clause 5(b).
- 169.** The Government member of Switzerland opposed the amendment as it was redundant and repetitive, given that at the end of Paragraph 1 it was stated that policies should be based on social dialogue. She believed that the social partners should participate in the development of human resources development policy, as was the case in Switzerland.
- 170.** The Government members of Argentina, Canada, France, Namibia, New Zealand, Thailand, United Kingdom and the United States opposed the amendment for the same reasons.
- 171.** The Employer Vice-Chairperson agreed with the need to avoid redundancy. He proposed a subamendment to delete the words “based on social dialogue” as the proposed amendment would include the notion of social dialogue.
- 172.** The Worker Vice-Chairperson did not support the subamendment and wished to retain the words “social dialogue”.
- 173.** The Government member of Saudi Arabia supported the subamendment proposed by the Employer Vice-Chairperson.
- 174.** The Government member of Trinidad and Tobago agreed with the position of the Worker Vice-Chairperson.
- 175.** The Worker Vice-Chairperson proposed a second subamendment to insert the words “Members should, based on social dialogue,” and to delete the words “based on social dialogue” from the third line.
- 176.** The Employer Vice-Chairperson noted that the wording of the proposed amendment was “, with the involvement of the social partners”. He would agree to move the words “, in dialogue with the social partners” as proposed.

177. The Government member of France proposed a third subamendment to delete the words “and which reflect the different roles of government and the social partners” in the interests of further streamlining the text.

178. The Employer and Worker Vice-Chairpersons supported this third subamendment.

179. The amendment was adopted as subamended.

D.20

180. The Government member of Brazil, speaking also on behalf of the Government members of Argentina, Paraguay and Uruguay, introduced an amendment stating that national development policies should guarantee the right to education and training. He emphasized the importance of the right to education and training as a fundamental right, and that this needed to be clearly reflected in the text, perhaps in as many as three different places.

181. The Employer Vice-Chairperson did not support the amendment, as it would introduce a new redundancy with Paragraph 5, and change the content of the text.

182. The Worker Vice-Chairperson expressed appreciation of the importance accorded to the right to education and training and supported the sentiment behind the proposal. However, she could not support the amendment, as the issue of the right to education and training was already reflected in clause 5(a).

183. The amendment was withdrawn.

D.91

184. The Government member of Côte d’Ivoire, speaking on behalf of the African group, introduced an amendment to replace the words “human resources development and education and training” with the words “lifelong learning and entrepreneurship development”. He stressed the critical importance of entrepreneurship in particular for developing countries and felt that this needed to be reflected in the text.

185. While expressing appreciation for the support for entrepreneurship, the Employer Vice-Chairperson did not support the amendment. The paragraph dealt with policy in the context of objectives, scope and definition, and while entrepreneurship could be considered a policy issue, he felt that it was not appropriate in this paragraph.

186. The Worker Vice-Chairperson did not support the amendment, as it made the text misleading and distorted the meaning of the paragraph.

187. The Government members of India, Papua New Guinea, Switzerland and Thailand opposed the amendment.

188. The amendment was withdrawn.

D.55

189. The Government member of France, speaking also on behalf of the Government members of Finland, Netherlands, Portugal and Spain, introduced an amendment to replace the words “human resources development and education and training” with the term “lifelong learning”. She had proposed the amendment in anticipation of a new title for the proposed Recommendation, which would now be discussed at a later stage. However, she proposed

retaining the second part of the amendment to delete the words “and complementary to” to avoid redundancy.

190. The Employer Vice-Chairperson supported the second part of the amendment on the understanding that there would be no other change.

191. The Worker Vice-Chairperson also agreed to the proposed deletion.

192. The Government member of France, in order to reach a consensus, agreed to the deletion of the words “and complementary to”. She proposed that the Drafting Committee should ensure that the remainder of the text was consistent with the eventual title.

193. The amendment was adopted as subamended.

D.88

194. The Chairperson proposed that the amendment, which concerned the Spanish and French texts only, be referred to the Drafting Committee.

D.16

195. The Employer Vice-Chairperson introduced an amendment to insert the word “fiscal” after the word “economic”. By inserting the word here it could be deleted in clause 5(d).

196. The Worker Vice-Chairperson supported the amendment.

197. The Government member of Canada supported the amendment, noting that the issue was critical and should be reflected in the preamble.

198. The Government member of Finland also supported the amendment.

199. The amendment was adopted.

D.29

200. The amendment was withdrawn as the point had already been dealt with.

201. Paragraph 1 was adopted as amended.

Paragraph 2

D.14

202. The Chairperson explained that if the first amendment to Paragraph 2 were adopted, all the other amendments to that paragraph would normally fall. However, the Employer Vice-Chairperson had announced earlier that his proposed amendment was to delete the text of Paragraph 2 from its present location in order to insert it as a new clause 5(b). Therefore the option to raise the issues contained in the other amendments to Paragraph 2 would remain.

203. The Employer Vice-Chairperson recalled that the idea of moving the content of Paragraph 2 to Paragraph 5 was based on the discussion with the Workers’ group about the right to education and training. The two groups had agreed that Paragraph 2 belonged with Paragraph 5. The issue would be discussed with governments at an informal tripartite

meeting the next day. He therefore proposed to postpone the discussion of all the amendments to Paragraph 2.

- 204.** The Worker Vice-Chairperson supported the proposal for the reasons mentioned by the Employer Vice-Chairperson. The discussion of amendments D.14, D.56, D.21 and D.57 was thus deferred to the Committee's discussion of Paragraph 5.

Paragraph 3

D.92

- 205.** The Government member of South Africa, speaking on behalf of the African group, introduced an amendment to replace the existing text of clause 3(a) with a new text. She explained that the intention of the African group was to clarify the meaning of "lifelong learning" in the Recommendation. Using the words "education, training and lifelong learning" throughout the text implied that they were three distinct items. In the African group's view, however, the term "lifelong learning" was broader and encompassed both education and training. In addition, she felt that using the word "learning" to define lifelong learning was a tautology. In order to simplify the discussion, she proposed a subamendment to replace the word "learning" with the words "education and training" in the first line.
- 206.** The Employer Vice-Chairperson acknowledged the improvements made by the subamendment, which made the text simple and short. However, he thought that the word "learning" was broader, whereas the words "education and training" referred more to formal learning. He could therefore not accept the amendment as subamended.
- 207.** The Worker Vice-Chairperson found the proposed definition much narrower than the existing one, since the words "all learning" included more than education and training. She noted that the term "lifelong learning" referred to competencies and qualifications, as well as to knowledge, skills and know-how. It also included experience and skills acquired by a person. She did not support the amendment.
- 208.** The Government member of South Africa expressed her concern at defining a term by using the same word, but in a spirit of compromise, the amendment was withdrawn.

D.93

- 209.** The Government member of South Africa, speaking on behalf of the African group, introduced this amendment to include a new clause defining entrepreneurship development. She then volunteered to postpone the discussion of this amendment, since it had been agreed by the members of the Committee that the issue of including the term "entrepreneurship development" in the Recommendation would be discussed at the tripartite informal meeting.
- 210.** The Chairperson replied that it was not possible to postpone the discussion.
- 211.** The Employer Vice-Chairperson explained that it had been agreed that the Committee would look for ways to include the term "entrepreneurship development" in the Recommendation, but that this was not an appropriate place to include it. As the concept was well understood, it was not necessary to include it under section I: Objective, scope and definitions. For that reason, he did not support the amendment.

212. The Worker Vice-Chairperson stated that since the emphasis of the Recommendation was to assist individuals to acquire skills in order to be able to find employment, acquiring entrepreneurship skills was one such way. She agreed it should be addressed in the text beyond Paragraph 20 but not in this section. She therefore opposed the amendment.

213. The Government member of Kenya indicated her intention to raise the concept of entrepreneurship later in the text, and the amendment was withdrawn.

D.94

214. The amendment was withdrawn.

D.66

215. The Government member of the United States, speaking also on behalf of the Government members of Australia, Austria, Canada, Finland, Japan, Malta, Netherlands, New Zealand, Norway, Slovakia, Sweden, Switzerland, Turkey and the United Kingdom, stated that they strongly supported the issue of employability and the amendment was simply to make clause (d) more readable.

216. The Employer Vice-Chairperson pointed out that the two elements proposed for deletion were very important for him and he therefore could not support the amendment.

217. The Worker Vice-Chairperson stressed that the words they wanted to delete were the essence of the term “employability”. The changes proposed would completely alter that meaning and the significance of the term. The second proposed deletion would transfer the responsibility for finding and retaining work to the individual. For all those reasons, she opposed the amendment.

218. The Government member of the United States appreciated the comments made by the Employer and Worker Vice-Chairpersons and emphasized that the intention of the amendment had never been to weaken the text. She then withdrew the amendment.

D.22

219. The Government member of Argentina, speaking also on behalf of the Government members of Brazil, Paraguay and Uruguay, explained that the amendment to delete the word “portable” from clause 3(d) applied to the Spanish text and that she wished to refer to the Drafting Committee the question of finding a better word for “portable” in the Spanish version. She understood and supported the reasons given by the Employers’ and Workers’ groups for the importance of that word for the definition of employability. However, the proposed amendment also recommended deleting the words “to make use of the education and training opportunities available in order”.

220. The Chairperson accepted to refer the linguistic issue to the Drafting Committee and invited the Vice-Chairpersons to express their views on the second part of the amendment.

221. The Employer Vice-Chairperson did not support the amendment on the basis of the arguments made for the previous amendment. The definition of the term “employability” would be weakened if the phrase were deleted.

222. The Worker Vice-Chairperson understood that there were some problems in the translations of the Recommendation. She did not support the second part of the amendment for the same reasons expressed in the discussion of the previous amendment.

-
- 223.** The correction of the word “portable” in Spanish was referred to the Drafting Committee and the amendment was withdrawn.

D.85

- 224.** Amendment D.85 was referred to the Drafting Committee since it concerned only the French version of the text.

D.68

- 225.** The Government member of Trinidad and Tobago, speaking also on behalf of the Government members of Barbados and Jamaica, introduced an amendment to insert a new clause defining the term “training”. She pointed out that this term, which appeared throughout the Recommendation, was interpreted differently and needed to be more clearly defined. The definition should also include pre-employment training, developmental training and training in a current job.

- 226.** The Employer Vice-Chairperson found it useful to add this definition, but wished to subamend it by deleting from the proposed text the words “present and prospective”.

- 227.** The Worker Vice-Chairperson did not understand the objective of the amendment and the subamendment. It narrowed the definition of training and did not add any value to the Recommendation. She did not want to add rigidity and confusion. She therefore opposed the amendment and subamendment.

- 228.** The Government member of France thought that the proposed definition was too restrictive and did not cover all the situations. She did not support the amendment.

- 229.** The Government member of Thailand did not support the amendment.

- 230.** The Government member of India did not agree with the need to define the word training. The term was also used for people who were not employed or who were looking for a job for the first time. The proposed definition was restrictive because it did not take these people into account. She could not support the amendment.

- 231.** The Government member of Trinidad and Tobago clarified that the word “prospective” in the definition was intended to include unemployed people.

- 232.** The Employer Vice-Chairperson thought that if a definition prompted so much discussion, it should not be adopted.

- 233.** In light of the discussion, the Government member of Trinidad and Tobago withdrew the amendment.

D.58

- 234.** The Government member of Switzerland, speaking also on behalf of the Government members of Australia, Austria, Belgium, Canada, Dominican Republic, Finland, France, Ireland, Italy, Japan, Malta, Netherlands, New Zealand, Norway, Portugal, Slovakia, Spain, Sweden, Turkey, United Kingdom and the United States, introduced an amendment to insert a new clause defining education and pre-employment training. The text of the new clause was in fact the text of existing Paragraph 6(2). However, since the subparagraph was a definition it should be placed among the other definitions in Paragraph 3 to ensure clarity and coherence of the Recommendation.

-
235. The Employer Vice-Chairperson felt that it made sense to put all the definitions together and supported the amendment.
236. The Worker Vice-Chairperson disagreed and stated that the proposed text should remain in Paragraph 6(2) because it really dealt with how education and pre-employment training should be provided. It was more a policy matter than a definition. She could not support the amendment.
237. The Government member of Canada supported the views of the Government member of Switzerland to move the reference to this section as it added greater clarity.
238. The Government member of South Africa thought that Paragraph 6(2) did not contain a definition, but a non-conclusive list of what education and pre-employment training should include. She was particularly concerned about the exclusion of “work experience” from the list if it was to be considered a definition. She did not support the amendment.
239. The Government member of Switzerland asked whether the Committee would accept a subamendment in accordance with the intervention of the Government member of South Africa.
240. The Government member of South Africa responded that the text would require considerable re-working and therefore it would not be possible to achieve the changes outlined earlier.
241. The Government member of Australia appreciated the comments made by the Government member of South Africa and would support the subamendment proposed by the Government member of Switzerland as it would not change the wording of the first part of Paragraph 6(2).
242. The Worker Vice-Chairperson felt the Committee had not had an extensive discussion of the terms education, pre-employment training, basic knowledge and basic education. There were a number of terms like these that might need definition. The Committee could have a debate on many of these terms. She agreed with the Government member of South Africa that other forms of training were not adequately covered.
243. The Government member of the United States reaffirmed her support for the amendment. She pointed out that the Committee had discussed the term “pre-employment” last year.
244. The Government members of Greece, Kenya, Lebanon and Thailand did not support the amendment. The Government member of Greece also noted that the amendment was too limiting.
245. The Government member of Switzerland reminded the Committee that the purpose of the amendment had been to add clarity, not confusion. Since that objective had not been achieved, the amendment was withdrawn.
246. Paragraph 3 was adopted unchanged, subject to clarification on the issues referred to the Drafting Committee.

Paragraph 4

D.95

- 247.** The Government member of South Africa, speaking on behalf of the African group, introduced an amendment to the introductory sentence of Paragraph 4 to replace the words “human resources development and training” with the words “lifelong learning and entrepreneurship development”. Recalling earlier discussions on similarly worded amendments, she proposed a subamendment in which the word “entrepreneurship” was not included.
- 248.** The Employer Vice-Chairperson recalled the views expressed at the beginning of the Committee’s work that the language used throughout the text of the proposed Recommendation should reflect that used in the title of the instrument. As a result, he opposed the amendment as subamended.
- 249.** The Worker Vice-Chairperson also opposed the amendment for the same reasons expressed by the Employer Vice-Chairperson.
- 250.** The Chairperson suggested that, since the Committee would discuss a possible change in the title of the instrument at the end of its work, the wording of the introductory sentence could be referred to the Drafting Committee to ensure that it reflected that used in the title. With this understanding, the amendment was withdrawn by the Government member of South Africa.

D.59

- 251.** The Government member of France withdrew a similarly worded amendment with the understanding that the matter would be deferred to the Drafting Committee. The Government member of the United Kingdom added that the Drafting Committee needed to be conscious of repetition throughout the text.

D.23

- 252.** The Government member of Brazil, speaking also on behalf of the Government members of Argentina, Paraguay and Uruguay, introduced an amendment to the introductory sentence of Paragraph 4 to add the words “in the framework of active employment policies”. He noted that human resources development and training should be viewed in the context of its contribution to employment, and that this concern was widely shared by the social partners of the MERCOSUR countries. Many of the MERCOSUR countries, for example, had invested heavily in training systems but the result had not been a significant reduction in their primary objective of reducing poverty levels.
- 253.** The Employer Vice-Chairperson, while agreeing that it was important that there be a link between human resources development and employment policy, could not support the amendment as it detracted from the principal focus of the paragraph, which was human resources development and training. He thought that the amendment subordinated education and training policy under employment policy.
- 254.** The Worker Vice-Chairperson supported the amendment, noting that with many countries experiencing jobless economic growth it was important to place human resources development and training policies in the context of employment policy.
- 255.** The Government members of India and Peru supported the amendment.

-
- 256.** The Government member of Finland, while recognizing the importance of the issue raised by the amendment, opposed its adoption as it restricted interpretation of the text. The Government members of Greece and Thailand also opposed the amendment.
- 257.** The Government member of Côte d'Ivoire emphasized that employment and poverty alleviation were crucial objectives of human resources development and training policies, and therefore supported the amendment. The Government member of Trinidad and Tobago also expressed her support for the amendment, noting the importance of the link between the policies.
- 258.** The Government member of Portugal, recognizing the importance of the issue raised by the Government member of Brazil, proposed a subamendment, supported by the Government member of France, emphasizing that human resources development policies should be linked, but not subordinated to, active employment policies.
- 259.** The Government member of Switzerland did not support the subamendment as she felt it complicated the text.
- 260.** The Government members of Saudi Arabia and the United Kingdom opposed the amendment.
- 261.** The Government member of Canada did not support the amendment as the implications of human resources development and training policies extended beyond employment policies, such as those related to good citizenship that had been included in the preamble. This view was shared by the Government member of Australia.
- 262.** The Government members of Indonesia, Lebanon, Netherlands, Papua New Guinea, Poland, Sweden and the United States opposed the amendment.
- 263.** In view of the many Government members opposed to the amendment, the amendment and subamendment were withdrawn.

D.13

- 264.** This amendment to the English language text was referred to the Drafting Committee.

D.96

- 265.** The Government member of Kenya, speaking on behalf of the African group, withdrew an amendment to include the concept of human resources development in promoting active citizenship, noting that this issue was now covered by previously adopted amendments.

D.30

- 266.** The Government member of Canada, speaking also on behalf of the Government members of Australia, Belgium, Ireland, Japan, Malta, Netherlands, New Zealand, Norway, Switzerland, Turkey, United Kingdom and the United States, introduced an amendment to replace the words "quality and safe jobs" with the words "decent jobs" as this was broader and encompassed terminology that was widely understood.
- 267.** The Employer Vice-Chairperson appreciated the intent of the amendment but introduced a subamendment to include the words "decent and productive jobs".
- 268.** The Worker Vice-Chairperson supported the amendment but not its subamendment.

-
- 269.** The Government member of India supported the amendment.
- 270.** The Government member of Thailand supported the subamendment.
- 271.** The Government member of Papua New Guinea suggested another subamendment to use the term “decent work” rather than “decent jobs”.
- 272.** The Employer Vice-Chairperson, noting the opposition to the subamendment by his group, asked for the reasoning behind those Members’ preference for the amendment as originally worded. The Government member of Namibia pointed out that the concept of decent work implied productive work.
- 273.** The Government member of Peru requested a clarification on the meaning of productive. The Employer Vice-Chairperson stated that productive jobs resulted in direct economic benefits to the enterprise and to society as a whole, and that there was a relationship with the return on investment.
- 274.** The Government member of Argentina remarked that work was necessarily productive in nature but then raised the issue of sustainable productivity. She supported the amendment but not the subamendment.
- 275.** The Government member of Lebanon supported the subamendment.
- 276.** The Government member of Switzerland shared the view of the Government member of Namibia that the notion of productivity was inherent in the concept of decent work and that the introduction of the productivity issue would complicate understanding of the text. This view was shared by the Government members of France and South Korea.
- 277.** The Employer Vice-Chairperson, in response to a question raised by the Worker Vice-Chairperson concerning the proposed subamendment, noted that social and economic issues were treated together in a number of instances in the proposed text. He noted that lifelong learning, education and training support and sustain productivity in jobs. It was extremely important that if the Committee wishes to draw attention to decent work, it should also draw attention to productivity.
- 278.** By a show of hands, there was greater support among Government members for the amendment proposed by the Government member of Canada and not its subamendment to include “decent and productive jobs”. In light of the opposition to this subamendment it was withdrawn by the Employer Vice-Chairperson, who stated emphatically that this withdrawal was based on the understanding that the Committee viewed decent jobs as productive jobs.
- 279.** Concerning the subamendment introduced by the Government member of Papua New Guinea to refer to “decent work” rather than “decent jobs”, the Worker Vice-Chairperson noted that the words “decent jobs” were used in subsequent paragraphs and that changing the introductory sentence to refer to decent work would be inappropriate.
- 280.** The Government member of Peru agreed that the use of “decent jobs” was more appropriate, while the Government member from Lebanon supported “decent work” for the sake of consistency with ILO policies overall.
- 281.** The Employer Vice-Chairperson stated that in the context of Paragraph 4, “decent jobs” was the preferable choice.

282. The Worker Vice-Chairperson supported this view and the amendment was adopted as originally introduced.

D.97

283. This amendment was withdrawn in light of the earlier discussion.

D.67

284. The Government member of the United States, speaking also on behalf of the Government members of Australia, Austria, Canada, France, Ireland, Italy, Japan, Netherlands, New Zealand, Norway, Portugal, Slovakia, Spain, Sweden, Switzerland, Turkey and the United Kingdom, introduced an amendment to delete sections of clause 4(b). She stressed that the intention was to remove repetition but not the concepts, as they were already included elsewhere in the text.

285. The Employer Vice-Chairperson agreed that the concepts appeared elsewhere in the text and supported the amendment.

286. The Worker Vice-Chairperson expressed difficulty in accepting the amendment. If the words “decent work, job retention, and social development” were deleted it would remove the most important aspects of the paragraph. What was left would have no link or relation to lifelong learning, employment and training. Social inclusion and poverty reduction needed to be achieved through the development of competencies. For these reasons she opposed the amendment.

287. The Government member of the United States noted that the human resources development and training context for clause 4(b) was furnished by the introductory sentence of Paragraph 4. She recalled that the importance of social inclusion and poverty reduction had been well acknowledged during the discussion last year and stressed that she was not recommending to delete these from the text of clause 4(b).

288. The Government member of Australia supported the amendment as it helped to streamline the text.

289. The Government member of Greece endorsed the view expressed by the Worker Vice-Chairperson that the words “develop competencies, and promote decent work, job retention, social development” were of key importance and if they were deleted, the paragraph would lose its meaning. He therefore opposed the amendment.

290. The Government members of Argentina, India, Kenya and Thailand expressed their support for the position taken by the Worker Vice-Chairperson and did not support the amendment.

291. The Government member of Switzerland expressed her concern with the credibility of the work of the Committee. She reiterated that the amendment was an attempt to simplify the text and pointed out that the French text was not “reader friendly”. She observed that no one, in the interests of increased readability, seemed willing to amend last year’s text.

292. The Government member of Morocco found that the original text was clear and there was no need to change it. The concepts were something that all governments sought to achieve. For these reasons she did not support the amendment.

293. The Government member of the United States expressed her frustration with the discussion, noting that the amendment was not meant to attack the basic concepts and had carefully pointed out where the concepts appeared elsewhere in the text. However, since the amendment did not enjoy support, she reluctantly withdrew the amendment with deep regret and under protest.

D.39

294. The Worker Vice-Chairperson withdrew the amendment, noting that “active citizenship” was already captured in the preamble.

D.60

295. The Government member of Switzerland, speaking also on behalf of the Government members of Australia, Austria, Canada, Ireland, Japan, Netherlands, Norway, Slovakia, Turkey, United Kingdom and the United States, introduced an amendment with the objective of simplifying the text by deleting the words “as well as the creation of decent jobs and the employability of people”, noting they were already included in other places in the text.

296. The Employer Vice-Chairperson agreed that the terms were redundant and supported the amendment.

297. The Worker Vice-Chairperson did not support the amendment. She explained that while “innovation, competitiveness, productivity and growth of the economy” were important, they themselves were not enough to create jobs. She cited the example of the United States where there had been a steady increase in productivity but no increase in jobs.

298. The Government member of Switzerland withdrew the amendment due to lack of support.

D.98

299. The Government member of Côte d’Ivoire, speaking on behalf of the African group, withdrew the amendment in light of previous discussions.

D.86

300. The Chairperson noted that the amendment dealt with a linguistic issue and referred it to the Drafting Committee.

D.31

301. The Government member of Australia, speaking also on behalf of the Government members of Austria, Canada, Ireland, Japan, Netherlands, New Zealand, Norway, Slovakia, Sweden, Switzerland, Turkey, United Kingdom and the United States, introduced an amendment to replace Paragraph 4(d) in order to streamline the text. He also proposed a subamendment to the amendment to make a grammatical correction by replacing the word “validating” with “validate”.

302. The Employer Vice-Chairperson agreed that the amendment would streamline the text, noting that the change also gave a clearer focus to the paragraph concerning transition from the informal to the formal economy. He proposed a subamendment to replace the word “individuals” with “workers and employers”.

-
- 303.** The Worker Vice-Chairperson expressed support for the subamendment proposed by the Employer Vice-Chairperson. She proposed an additional subamendment to insert after “economic life” the words “by creating opportunities for education and training”. She explained that the notion of creating opportunities for education and training for people working in the informal economy was missing in the amendment and needed to be included.
- 304.** The Government member of Australia supported the subamendment by the Employer Vice-Chairperson but noted that the notion of “creating opportunities” was dealt with elsewhere in the text.
- 305.** The Government member of Saudi Arabia found the original amendment was more productive and comprehensive, as the paragraph concerned transforming the informal economy into the formal economy.
- 306.** The Worker Vice-Chairperson clarified her point. She stated that the text, if amended as proposed, would only refer to transforming activities in the informal economy into the formal economy by validating prior learning, which was insufficient. She stressed that it also required opportunities for education and training.
- 307.** The Government member of Saudi Arabia noted that once workers moved to the formal economy, the text would apply to them.
- 308.** The Government member of Australia, in light of the discussion, withdrew the amendment.

D.24

- 309.** The Government member of Argentina, speaking also on behalf of the Government members of Brazil, Paraguay and Uruguay, introduced an amendment to replace the words “address the challenge of” with the words “are aimed at” in Paragraph 4(d), to put the wording in policy terms.
- 310.** The Employer Vice-Chairperson preferred the word “challenge” and did not support the amendment.
- 311.** The Worker Vice-Chairperson supported the amendment as it added greater clarity to the text.
- 312.** The Government member of Australia supported the original text, as the issue was truly a challenge. The Government members of Canada, Côte d’Ivoire, France, India, Morocco, Papua New Guinea, Peru, Thailand, United Kingdom and the United States, also preferred the existing text.
- 313.** The Government member of Argentina withdrew the amendment due to lack of support.

D.25

- 314.** The Government member of Brazil, speaking also on behalf of the Government members of Argentina, Paraguay and Uruguay, introduced an amendment to not only clarify the text but to broaden its scope. While enthusiastic about new technology, he noted that access to new technology was not easy for developing countries. The amendment aimed to keep the information and communication technologies (ICT) focus of the paragraph while introducing the notion of teacher training.

-
- 315.** The Employer Vice-Chairperson did not support the amendment, noting that the amendment would change the character of the paragraph. The text was about ICT and the greater use of ICT in education and training.
- 316.** The Worker Vice-Chairperson, while understanding the intention of the amendment, noted that the paragraph focused on ICT for education and training, including teacher training, and thus she could not support the amendment.
- 317.** The Government member of Saudi Arabia proposed a subamendment to delete the third line of clause 4(e), suggesting that “teacher training, hardware and software” were all repetitive.
- 318.** The Employer Vice-Chairperson suggested that the idea of the Government member of Saudi Arabia be taken up when the Committee examined proposed amendment D.35.
- 319.** The Government member of Brazil explained further the rationale behind the amendment. He stressed that in addition to public and private investment in ICT infrastructure, it was important to invest in education methodologies and in trainers. Even if ICT was in place, there was no guarantee that it would deliver appropriate training methodologies.
- 320.** The Government member of Jamaica pointed out that ICT infrastructure included both physical and human infrastructure. He proposed a subamendment to replace the words “the infrastructure” with “ICT and all infrastructure needed”.
- 321.** The Government member of Canada supported the original text. Although ICT and education were important, the text of Paragraph 5(g) already addressed the issue of qualified teachers.
- 322.** The Government members of New Zealand and Thailand supported the original text.
- 323.** In view of lack of support, the Government member of Brazil withdrew the amendment.

D.35

- 324.** The Government member of Australia, speaking also on behalf of the Government members of Austria, Belgium, Finland, France, Ireland, Japan, Malta, Netherlands, New Zealand, Norway, Portugal, Slovakia, Spain, Sweden, Switzerland, Turkey and the United States, introduced an amendment to streamline the text of Paragraph 4(e) by deleting the words “in hardware and software for training purposes”. He agreed with the intervention by the Government member of Saudi Arabia. He explained how it was sometimes difficult in the sector to distinguish between hardware and software.
- 325.** The Employer Vice-Chairperson supported the amendment as it helped to streamline the text.
- 326.** The Worker Vice-Chairperson also supported the amendment, and the amendment was adopted.

D.61

- 327.** The Government member of Portugal, speaking also on behalf of the Government members of Australia, Austria, Belgium, Canada, Finland, France, Germany, Greece, Ireland, Italy, Japan, Malta, Netherlands, New Zealand, Norway, Slovakia, Spain, Sweden, Switzerland, Turkey, United Kingdom and the United States, introduced an amendment the

purpose of which was not to simplify, but rather to expand the meaning of the text of Paragraph 4(f). The text gave the impression that inequalities in participation in education and training only affected adults, but actually affected everyone, not only adults. By deleting the word “adults”, the meaning of the paragraph would be broadened.

- 328.** The Employer Vice-Chairperson agreed and supported the amendment.
- 329.** The Worker Vice-Chairperson agreed, noting that the word “adults” gave the impression that inequality was only felt among this group. She supported the amendment.
- 330.** The amendment was adopted.
- 331.** Paragraph 4 was adopted as amended.

Paragraph 5

D.99

- 332.** The Government member of South Africa, speaking on behalf of the African group, introduced an amendment to replace the text of clause 5(a) with the text: “recognize that education is a right for all, and work together with the social partners, to extend this right to lifelong learning”. She noted that many countries faced a challenge in making the right to training a reality due to resource constraints, but that this should be seen as an objective for countries to strive toward.
- 333.** The Employer Vice-Chairperson agreed that developing countries faced a difficult situation in ensuring access to this right and that it should be viewed as an ambition and a way to guide member States. The original text included an important matter of principle and as a result he could not support the amendment.
- 334.** The Worker Vice-Chairperson recognized the concerns of developing countries, but highlighted that this clause gave recognition to the vision that all countries aspired to. She drew on the example of Singapore, where great strides had been made towards achieving this goal. Although many countries would take longer to reach this goal, clause 5(a) provided the vision. Therefore, she could not support the proposed amendment.
- 335.** The Government member of Jamaica did not support the amendment as he felt it was clear that the current text expressed an ideal which would be achieved within the constraints of each country’s means.
- 336.** The Government member of South Africa, noting the broad support for recognizing the right to training as an objective to which countries aspired, withdrew the amendment.

D.34

- 337.** The Government member of Australia, speaking also on behalf of the Government members of Canada, Germany, Netherlands, New Zealand, Norway, Slovakia, Turkey, United Kingdom and the United States, introduced an amendment to qualify the responsibilities of government concerning the provision of basic education and pre-employment training. However, recognizing the preference of the Employers’ and Workers’ groups for the original text, as well as the fact that the idea was captured elsewhere in the text, the amendment was withdrawn.

D.26

- 338.** The Government member of Brazil, speaking also on behalf of the Government members of Argentina, Paraguay and Uruguay, introduced an amendment that sought to clarify the role of the social partners. Recognizing the general support for the original text, the amendment was withdrawn.

D.4

- 339.** The Employer Vice-Chairperson introduced an amendment to insert a new clause after clause 5(a). The effect would be to move the text currently found in Paragraph 2 to Paragraph 5. The amendment was an effort to clarify the respective roles of governments, employers and individuals concerning the right for education and training, and was slightly modified to improve its clarity. The Employer Vice-Chairperson, recognizing the support for the original text of Paragraph 2, proposed a subamendment to retain the original Paragraph 2.
- 340.** The Worker Vice-Chairperson noted that informal discussions had resulted in a greater understanding of the positions of the various members on this topic, but agreement on precise wording had not been reached. She therefore supported the amendment as subamended.
- 341.** The Government member of South Africa proposed a second subamendment to reflect governments' responsibility to create the conditions necessary to realize the objective of the right to training.
- 342.** The Employer Vice-Chairperson recalled that the Committee had had a similar discussion with regard to the preamble. On that basis, he supported the subamendment proposed by the Government member of South Africa.
- 343.** The Government members of Canada and the United States felt that the second subamendment was repetitive and could not support it.
- 344.** The Government member of Venezuela supported the amendment as subamended by the African group as it was consistent with the preamble.
- 345.** The Government member of Switzerland, expressing support for the amendment as subamended, proposed a third subamendment to delete the word "explicit".
- 346.** The Worker Vice-Chairperson noted the strong support to retain the original text of Paragraph 2. Nevertheless, the subamendment proposed by the African group helped simplify the Recommendation and she expressed her support.
- 347.** The Government member of Papua New Guinea supported the subamendment proposed by the African group, as it was consistent with the preamble.
- 348.** The amendment was adopted as subamended, and referred to the Drafting Committee to make the wording consistent with the rest of Paragraph 5.

D.14

- 349.** The amendment to delete Paragraph 2, the discussion of which had previously been postponed, was adopted as a consequence of the adoption of amendment D.4.

D.56

- 350.** The Government member of Switzerland, speaking on behalf of the Government members of Australia, Austria, Belgium, Canada, Finland, France, Ireland, Italy, Japan, Netherlands, New Zealand, Norway, Portugal, Slovakia, Sweden, Turkey, United Kingdom and the United States, introduced an amendment to delete the word “explicit” from the clause, as the word “commitment” was already very strong and that it was difficult, not only for governments but also for the social partners, to be “explicit” in their commitment.
- 351.** The Employer Vice-Chairperson supported the amendment as the word “explicit” did not really add any value to the clause.
- 352.** The Worker Vice-Chairperson did not support the amendment, arguing that governments should be more explicit in their commitments and demonstrate the fundamental role they needed to play in this area.
- 353.** The Government member of Switzerland pointed out that, for consistency, “explicit” should be deleted since it was not included in the preamble. She reminded the Committee that the demand for an explicit commitment was not only from governments but also from the social partners.
- 354.** The Government member of Peru did not support the amendment. He felt the word “explicit” was necessary in the text because it emphasized the commitment of the social partners.
- 355.** The Government member of Venezuela argued that it was useful to clarify the significance of the paragraph. He did not support the amendment; nor did the Government members of Kenya and Thailand.
- 356.** The Government member of Greece supported the amendment because he found the word “commitment” sufficiently strong.
- 357.** In a spirit of consensus, the Government member of Switzerland withdrew the amendment.

D.21

- 358.** The Government member of Brazil, speaking also on behalf of the Government members of Argentina, Paraguay and Uruguay, presented the amendment, stating that it had two basic objectives: to clarify the role of enterprises, not just in training but also in facilitating training; and to identify, more clearly, all parties dealing with training, including trade unions.
- 359.** The Employer Vice-Chairperson considered the wording of the original text to be clear and that it was obvious that training employees included “facilitating training”. He acknowledged that the social partners played an important role, which was clear from the current wording. He therefore did not support the amendment.
- 360.** The Worker Vice-Chairperson expressed appreciation for the comments of the Government member of Brazil on the important role of trade unions and employers’ organizations in training. She felt, however, that the amendment did not clarify the paragraph and therefore could not support it.
- 361.** The Government members of Lebanon and Thailand did not support the amendment.

362. Noting the lack of support, the Government member of Brazil withdrew the amendment.

D.57

363. The amendment was referred to the Drafting Committee as it dealt with a linguistic issue.

364. The new clause 5(b) was adopted, as subamended.

D.17

365. The Employer Vice-Chairperson introduced the amendment to move the title of section II – before existing clause 5(b) – in order to reflect that the subsequent clauses concerned a strategy for the implementation of education and training policies.

366. The Worker Vice-Chairperson supported the amendment, as it added greater clarity to the text.

367. The Government member of Lebanon expressed his support for this proposal and the amendment was adopted.

D.100

368. The Government member of South Africa, speaking on behalf of the African group, explained that the intention of this amendment was not to introduce substantive changes, but rather to reduce duplication. She introduced a subamendment to include the words “education, training and” before the words “lifelong learning” and to delete the words “entrepreneurship development.”, to reflect earlier discussions.

369. The Employer Vice-Chairperson supported the amendment and subamendment as long as the issue of entrepreneurship was addressed later in the text. He queried whether “competencies” would be more appropriate than “abilities”, referring this to the Drafting Committee.

370. The Worker Vice-Chairperson could not support the amendment because it affected the substance: important aspects of clause 5(c) had been deleted, including establishing a guiding framework for training policies at different levels.

371. The Government member of Lebanon supported the amendment as he found the phrase “guiding framework” unclear and preferred to see it deleted. For this reason, he supported the amendment.

372. The Government members of Peru, Portugal and Thailand agreed with the position of the Workers’ group and did not support the amendment.

373. The Government member of Australia appreciated the effort to streamline the existing text and supported the amendment as subamended.

374. The Government member of South Africa felt that the “guiding framework” was implicit, but proposed a subamendment that would include, after the words “lifelong learning and”, the words “which include a guiding framework for training policies at different levels”, and then list the different levels for this guiding framework.

375. The Employer Vice-Chairperson supported the amendment to the subamended paragraph and proposed a subamendment to end the phrase after “levels,”.

-
- 376.** The Worker Vice-Chairperson stated that she could not agree to the subamendment as it did not add clarity as intended.
- 377.** The Government member for Switzerland expressed sympathy for the African group's intention but stated that the amendment as subamended added confusion.
- 378.** The Government members of Poland, Portugal, Spain and the United Kingdom did not support the amendment as subamended for the reasons expressed by the Government member of Switzerland.
- 379.** Acknowledging the comments, the Government member of South Africa withdrew the amendment.

D.12

- 380.** The Employer Vice-Chairperson proposed to delete clause 5(b) as the issues had been captured in the adoption of previous amendments.
- 381.** The Worker Vice-Chairperson did not support the amendment, as previous discussions had indicated that the issues would be an important introductory clause to the first paragraph under the section on development and implementation of education and training policies.
- 382.** The Government member of France also felt that it was important to retain the clause, given the structural changes to the text, and did not support the amendment. The Government members of Kenya and Namibia also did not support the amendment for similar reasons.
- 383.** In light of reactions from the Committee, the Employer Vice-Chairperson withdrew the amendment.

D.27

- 384.** The Government member of Argentina, speaking also on behalf of the Government members of Brazil, Paraguay and Uruguay, introduced this two-part amendment: to stress the need to place more emphasis on tripartite dialogue, which had been diluted in the existing text; and changes to the text so that clause (c) could be deleted. She withdrew the second part of the amendment as it would be addressed in subsequent amendments.
- 385.** The Employer Vice-Chairperson indicated that the involvement of the social partners was clear and the term "tripartite dialogue" implied institutionalized interaction. He did not support the amendment.
- 386.** The Worker Vice-Chairperson agreed with the Government member of Argentina that it was important to promote tripartite dialogue and supported the amendment.
- 387.** The Government member of New Zealand stated that tripartite dialogue was only one type of activity involving the social partners and did not reflect all the ways that social partners could cooperate. She did not support the amendment. The Government member of Papua New Guinea agreed, adding that the term "social partners" could include contributions made by other partners. The Government members of Canada, Kenya, Thailand and the United States concurred.

-
- 388.** Considering the views expressed in the Committee, the Government member of Argentina withdrew the amendment, reminding the Committee that there were few references to trade unions in the text.
- 389.** The Worker Vice-Chairperson drew attention to the fact that the term “social partners” had a special meaning in the ILO context: governments, employers and workers. She expressed concern that the statements of a number of Government members seemed to imply that “social partners” was taken to include other parties.
- 390.** The Government member of Thailand nominated Ms. Murty, Government member of India, citing her knowledge of human resources development issues and experience as Joint Secretary and Director-General for Education and Training of the Ministry of Labour. The Government member of South Africa, speaking on behalf of the African group, seconded the nomination. There being no other nominations, Ms. Murty was appointed Rapporteur.

D.62

- 391.** The Government member of Portugal, speaking also on behalf of the Government members of Australia, Canada, Finland, France, Japan, Netherlands, New Zealand, Norway, Slovakia, Switzerland, Turkey, United Kingdom and the United States, introduced an amendment to clause 5(b) that sought to simplify the text by combining elements of clause 5(b) and (c) into a single clause.
- 392.** The Employer Vice-Chairperson welcomed this amendment as it simplified the text, and proposed a subamendment to delete the reference to national, regional, local, sectoral and enterprise levels in the clause.
- 393.** The Worker Vice-Chairperson supported the amendment but not the subamendment. She proposed three subamendments. The first was to add the word “and training” after the word “education”, as this brought clarity to the nature of the strategy to be defined. The second was to delete the words “different levels” but retain the list. The third subamendment proposed to replace “with the involvement of the social partners” with “based on social dialogue”.
- 394.** The Government member of Portugal welcomed the first two subamendments by the Worker Vice-Chairperson but preferred to retain the reference to the involvement of the social partners. The Worker Vice-Chairperson agreed.
- 395.** The Employer Vice-Chairperson supported the amendment as subamended by the Worker Vice-Chairperson to retain the list of levels and add “and training” after “education”.
- 396.** The amendment, as subamended, was adopted.

D.11 and D.52

- 397.** These amendments, to delete clause 5(d) in order to avoid repetition, were adopted.

D.40

- 398.** As a consequence of the previous amendments, D.11 and D.52, this amendment was not considered.

D.10

- 399.** The Employer Vice-Chairperson introduced an amendment to clause 5(e) that urged Members to “develop supportive social policies” in addition to creating a favourable economic environment to encourage investments in training, which was in keeping with other references in the text. He proposed a subamendment to delete the word “general” before the words “economic environment” to simplify the text.
- 400.** The Worker Vice-Chairperson, noting her support for the amendment and subamendment, proposed a subamendment to add the words “and other” before the word “policies”, and to replace the word “them” by the word “all”, as this would result in a more inclusive text. The Employer Vice-Chairperson supported these subamendments.
- 401.** The Government member of Trinidad and Tobago proposed a subamendment to read “develop and create an economic and social environment that encourages”, as some countries already had an environment that encouraged investments in education and training.
- 402.** The Employer Vice-Chairperson wanted to retain the reference in the text to incentives and did not support the latest subamendment, nor did the Worker Vice-Chairperson and the Government member of Thailand.
- 403.** The Government member of Greece proposed a subamendment to combine the ideas of both the Employers’ group and the Government member of Trinidad and Tobago’s proposed subamendments.
- 404.** The Worker Vice-Chairperson supported the amendment but not the subamendments proposed by the Government members of Trinidad and Tobago or Greece. The amendment, as subamended by the Employers’ and Workers’ groups, was adopted.

D.71 and D.63

- 405.** As a result of the adoption of the previous amendment, D.10, these amendments were withdrawn.

D.9

- 406.** The Employer Vice-Chairperson introduced an amendment to delete clause 5(f) because in his view, the delivery of training was not the responsibility of government. Furthermore, if the word “delivery” was removed from clause 5(f), it would have no meaning.
- 407.** The Worker Vice-Chairperson thought that clause 5(f) did not imply that governments were responsible for delivering training, but that it was a government responsibility to facilitate the development of a training delivery system. In many countries, the government was active in developing such systems, ensuring that the training delivery system respected standards and were aligned with other policies, for example. For these reasons she did not support the amendment.
- 408.** The Government member of the United States supported the amendment as the clause had become redundant in light of the adoption of previous amendments.
- 409.** The Government member of Papua New Guinea supported the amendment, as he felt that the reference to training delivery in the text referred more to a process than a policy

statement. The Government members of Australia, Switzerland, Trinidad and Tobago and the United Kingdom also supported the amendment.

- 410.** The Government member of South Africa pointed out that from the perspective of developing countries, where private training systems were not well developed, governments did have a role to play in training delivery. For that reason, she did not support the amendment. For the same reasons, the Government members of Argentina, Greece, Morocco, India, Italy and Thailand opposed deletion of clause 5(f).
- 411.** The Government member of Portugal agreed that the issue was already covered by other parts of the text. However, she felt that in some countries the government needed more clear directives on its responsibility to facilitate an adequate framework for training. For this reason, she did not support the amendment.
- 412.** The Government member of Canada noted that in her country, the Government facilitated and provided training, which was seen as a critical role for governments. However, in light of the comments made on behalf of the African countries, she did not agree to delete the clause.
- 413.** The Employer Vice-Chairperson, reiterating his desire to shorten the text, withdrew the amendment in light of the discussion.

D.102

- 414.** The Government member of South Africa, speaking on behalf of the African group, introduced the amendment to include “and training” after the word “education” to make the clause more readable and inclusive.
- 415.** The Employer Vice-Chairperson and Worker Vice-Chairperson supported the amendment and the amendment was adopted.

D.8 and D.33

- 416.** These amendments were withdrawn as they were covered under the adoption of previous amendments.

D.103

- 417.** The Government member of Kenya, speaking on behalf of the African group, introduced an amendment to make the clause more consistent with the rest of the text. She encouraged governments to work together with the social partners to address pre-employment training.
- 418.** The Employer Vice-Chairperson thought that the existing clause 5(g) was a clear statement of the responsibilities of governments. He did not deny the importance of collaboration with the social partners, but he thought it would be better addressed elsewhere in the text. For these reasons he did not support the amendment.
- 419.** The Worker Vice-Chairperson did not support the amendment for the same reasons. In addition she felt it would restrict the clause if pre-employment training addressed only young people. She appreciated the substance of the amendment but did not feel it should be included in this section.
- 420.** The Government member of Australia noted that pre-employment training was for people of all ages, and did not support the amendment.

-
421. The Government member of Greece proposed a subamendment to replace the words “young people” with the word “all”.
422. The Government member of Kenya, noting the commitment to address the issue elsewhere in the text, withdrew the amendment.

D.64

423. The Government member of Australia, speaking also on behalf of the Government members of Belgium, Canada, France, Germany, Ireland, Italy, Japan, Netherlands, New Zealand, Norway, Portugal, Slovakia, Spain, Sweden, Switzerland, Turkey, United Kingdom and the United States, introduced an amendment to clause 5(g) to delete the remainder of the text after the words “quality education” in the third line, in the interest of streamlining the text as well as issues of substance. He wanted to see an improvement in training outcomes but believed that this was covered by the words “quality education”. He did not agree to the words “children and adults”.
424. The Employer Vice-Chairperson supported the amendment, as there were other results from quality education than those listed, such as on the quality of teachers and trainers.
425. The Worker Vice-Chairperson supported the amendment, as the deleted text only elaborated characteristics of “quality education”.
426. The Government member of Saudi Arabia supported the proposed changes, but proposed a subamendment to add the words “and training” after the word “education” as it helped to replace the concept of vocational competencies lost in the proposed amendment.
427. The Worker Vice-Chairperson and the Government member of Papua New Guinea supported this subamendment. The Employer Vice-Chairperson would have preferred to add the words “pre-employment training” but supported the amendment.
428. The Government member of Australia opposed the subamendment, believing it raised issues unintended in the original amendment. The Government member of India did not support the subamendment because she thought it was difficult for developing countries to ensure quality education and training.
429. The Government member of Australia proposed a new subamendment to end the clause after the words “of fundamental importance”.
430. The Government member of Papua New Guinea supported the new subamendment because it balanced the text.
431. The Employer Vice-Chairperson proposed retaining the words “in providing quality”, which in his view were essential. The Government member of Australia believed that the clause would appear unfinished: it would be preferable to end the clause with the words “quality education and pre-employment training”. The Worker Vice-Chairperson felt that the proposed changes would be confusing. She emphasized that if there were quality teachers and trainers working under decent conditions, they would ensure quality education and training.
432. The Government member of South Africa proposed a subamendment to insert the word “quality” in the first line before the word “education”, and to replace the words after the word “are” with the words “prerequisite for success”, which would consolidate the text.

-
- 433.** The Employer Vice-Chairperson supported the inclusion of the word “quality” in the first line but preferred to end the clause with the words “of fundamental importance”. The Worker Vice-Chairperson supported the subamendment.
- 434.** The Government members of Australia, Jamaica and Saudi Arabia supported the subamendment.
- 435.** The Worker Vice-Chairperson felt that the modified clause sounded incomplete and proposed a sub-subamendment to add “for success” at the end. The Employer Vice-Chairperson preferred for the clause to end with “of fundamental importance”. The Worker Vice-Chairperson withdrew her subamendment.
- 436.** Amendment D.64 was adopted, as subamended.

D.7

- 437.** The Employer Vice-Chairperson introduced an amendment to delete clause 5(h) as the text would be better placed under “Framework for recognition and certification of skills”, section V, which addressed national qualifications frameworks.
- 438.** The Worker Vice-Chairperson stated that it was important to retain the clause under the section on training policies. The clause was much broader than recognition and certification of skills, and addressed the guidance of individuals in their choice of training as well as technological change. She felt that these were important ideas that should be retained under the policies section and did not support the amendment.
- 439.** The Government member of Peru stated that she was flexible regarding the placement of the text. She thought, however, that it was important to bring out the important role of the social partners in this context and proposed adding the words “with the participation of the social partners” after the words “establishing a national qualifications framework”.
- 440.** The Government member of Jamaica explained how a national qualifications framework included the certification of skills and felt the clause would be well placed under section V.
- 441.** The Worker Vice-Chairperson indicated that the clause did not just concern a national qualifications framework. She reiterated that it was necessary for the framework to be responsive to changing technologies and trends in the labour market, and that the policy dimension would be lost if it were to be moved.
- 442.** The Government member of Canada supported leaving the clause where it was and noted that amendment D.32 made some useful suggestions regarding wording. She agreed with the Workers’ group that national qualifications frameworks encompassed many other issues and linkages with policy.
- 443.** The Government member of South Africa noted that the first sentence of the clause dealt with the list of different items to which the Workers’ group had referred, yet the second sentence, beginning with “This framework”, made it seem as though the text only concerned the framework. She suggested that it might be clearer if the second sentence were moved to section V but the first sentence retained in clause 5(h).
- 444.** The Government member of Thailand would prefer to keep the entire text in clause 5(h).
- 445.** The Government member of Jamaica noted that a national qualifications framework referred to the certification of skills and would be better placed in section V.

446. The Employer Vice-Chairperson stated that he did not want to lose the content of clause 5(h) but thought the core message would be clearer if it were placed under section V. However, in the interests of time he withdrew the amendment.

D.32

447. The Government member of the United Kingdom, speaking also on behalf of the Government members of Australia, Austria, Belgium, Canada, Germany, Japan, Netherlands, Norway, Slovakia, Sweden, Switzerland, Turkey and the United States, introduced an amendment to clarify the text of clause 5(h), by replacing the word “establish” with the word “develop”, to reflect the fact that some member States already had a national qualifications framework but should be encouraged to develop it. The proposal also included replacing the word “guide” with the word “inform,” since in English the word “guide” might imply direction, when the objective was rather to inform and advise individuals.

448. The Employer Vice-Chairperson agreed with this reasoning and supported the amendment.

449. The Worker Vice-Chairperson agreed to replacing the word “establish” with the word “develop,” since this would not affect the substance of the clause. She expressed concern, however, at changing the word “guide” to the word “inform”, as this changed its meaning. She explained that “guide” was a more active term, whereas “inform” was more passive. She noted that in today’s complex world, people needed guidance and this applied also to workers with jobs. She opposed the amendment to change the word “guide”.

450. The Employer Vice-Chairperson proposed a subamendment to use the word “support”. He agreed with the Government member of the United Kingdom that the word “guide” had the connotation of taking someone by the hand.

451. The Worker Vice-Chairperson still felt that the text ought to retain the word “guide”, particularly since other parts of the instrument included this term, for example, in Paragraph 20, and its reference to “vocational and career information and guidance”.

452. The Government member of the United Kingdom explained that the intention was to avoid the connotation that governments should be telling people what to do. She then proposed a subamendment to replace the word “guide” with the words “inform and advise”.

453. The Government member of Argentina stated that the problem was one of semantics. In Spanish, the word “orientar” meant “guide”, and she felt this was more appropriate than “inform and advise”. She supported the first part of the amendment, but reiterated that the word “guide” should be retained.

454. The Government member of France proposed a subamendment to replace the word “guide” with the word “advise”.

455. The Government member of South Korea supported the amendment, as the word “guide” implied that the government was imposing its will on individuals, which he felt was inappropriate.

456. The Government member of India thought that the word “develop” appropriately replaced the word “establish”. She felt the word “guide” should be retained as neither “inform” nor “advise” were sufficient. The Government member of Saudi Arabia agreed, stating that he did not feel that the word “guide” had a negative connotation, but rather had a positive sense, as it was more productive than simply advising.

-
- 457.** The Government members of Kenya and Papua New Guinea supported retaining the word “guide”, which they felt was more appropriate. The Government member of Greece noted that the EU used the term “lifelong guidance,” which included career guidance among other things. He therefore felt that the word “guide” should be retained in the text.
- 458.** The Government member of the Czech Republic suggested the word “accompanying” in place of the word “guide”.
- 459.** The Government member of the United Kingdom, in response to the discussion, stated that as the word “develop” was accepted, then she could accept retaining the word “guide”. The amendment was adopted as subamended.

D.6

- 460.** As the issues were covered through the adoption of previous amendments, the amendment was withdrawn.

D.5

- 461.** The Employer Vice-Chairperson introduced an amendment to merge clause 5(i) and Paragraph 7, as the two dealt with similar issues. He felt that the enumeration of the different levels in clause 5(i) should be deleted.
- 462.** The Worker Vice-Chairperson supported the amendment but proposed a subamendment to replace “at different levels” with “international, national, regional, local, sectoral, enterprise levels”.
- 463.** The Government member of Argentina proposed a subamendment to include the words “and particularly collective bargaining” after the words “strengthen social dialogue”. She explained that collective bargaining was fundamental and was a basic tool for promoting training.
- 464.** The Employer Vice-Chairperson responded first to the proposal by the Worker Vice-Chairperson to enumerate the different levels, stating he preferred to keep the text consistent with clause 5(c) and because social dialogue at the international level was difficult. Regarding the proposal by the Government member of Argentina, he stated that what would come out of social dialogue was up to the social partners and that he was not prepared to list the outcomes of social dialogue. Whether or not it will lead to collective bargaining is up to the social partners and no issue for governments to interfere with. He did not support either subamendment.
- 465.** The Government member of Argentina noted that there was substantial international experience in social dialogue, for example with works councils.
- 466.** The Government member of Sweden supported the subamendment as she thought collective bargaining was important in this context. However, she proposed deleting the word “particularly”.
- 467.** The Worker Vice-Chairperson stated her support for the subamendment as well as for the sub-subamendment to delete the word “particularly”. She agreed that collective bargaining was an important concept and that it was a part of social dialogue.

-
- 468.** The Employer Vice-Chairperson drew attention to the fact that collective bargaining was already referred to in the text under clause 10(c). He felt that this was sufficient reference and that it was not necessary to add “collective bargaining” to clause 5(i).
- 469.** The Government members of Canada and the United States expressed support for the arguments presented by the Employer Vice-Chairperson.
- 470.** The Worker Vice-Chairperson noted that the reference to collective bargaining in clause 10(c) concerned employed and unemployed workers. She argued that it should also be reflected in the section on policies.
- 471.** The Government members of Australia and Trinidad and Tobago reiterated that collective bargaining was already covered adequately in clause 10(c).
- 472.** The Government member of Italy felt that it was important to include a reference to collective bargaining in clause 5(i).
- 473.** The Employer Vice-Chairperson reiterated that his group did not support the inclusion of the term “collective bargaining” in clause 5(i). Not only was the term already covered in clause 10(c), but he stressed that collective bargaining was not the only, or necessarily the best, way to address the issues raised in this clause.
- 474.** The Government member of Switzerland did not support the inclusion of “collective bargaining”, as that was not what the clause referred to. The term collective bargaining was not useful and was repetitive. The Government member of the United Kingdom supported the position taken by the Employer Vice-Chairperson. She stated that social dialogue could include collective bargaining, and did not support the inclusion of the term in clause 5(i). The Government member of Thailand also supported the Employers’ group’s position not to include the term.
- 475.** The Government member of Brazil supported the inclusion of the term “collective bargaining”. He noted that clause 10(c) addressed a different subject and stressed that the inclusion of the term in clause 5(i) attempted to strengthen the concept of social dialogue. Collective bargaining could help resolve problems and belonged in the policy section.
- 476.** The Government member of Portugal stressed the importance of strengthening social dialogue through collective bargaining and supported the inclusion of the term. Collective bargaining was not only an instrument but also a forum through which to strengthen all aspects of training.
- 477.** The Government member of France endorsed the statement made by the Government member of Portugal and supported the inclusion of the term, stressing that collective bargaining was an important principle in France.
- 478.** The Government members of Finland, India, Ireland and the Netherlands did not support the inclusion of the term, as the term social dialogue included the element of collective bargaining.
- 479.** The Government members of Greece, Namibia and Peru supported the inclusion of the term.
- 480.** The Chairperson proposed to hold a straw vote as a quick way to solicit the views of the Government members.

-
- 481.** The Employer Vice-Chairperson requested a normal vote for the sake of clarity.
- 482.** Put to a vote, the amendment, as subamended, was accepted with 48,900 votes in favour, 39,676 votes against and no abstentions.
- 483.** The amendment was adopted as subamended.
- 484.** The Employer Vice-Chairperson expressed concern over the Committee's decision to adopt clause 5(i), as subamended. He emphasized that the adopted wording of this clause was completely unacceptable to the Employers' group.
- 485.** The Worker Vice-Chairperson, intervening on a point of order, stressed that it was important not to reopen a debate that had been closed as a result of the adoption of amendment D.5.
- 486.** The Employer Vice-Chairperson stated that should the text as subamended remain in the proposed Recommendation, the Employers' group would vote against the adoption of the instrument. While accepting the formal outcome of the proceedings, he noted that the majority of governments did not seem to accept the proposed text, and, clearly, the Employers' group did not. Therefore the adopted text was not based on a consensus. He expressed regret that the Employers' group was in a position where it could not accept the proposed Recommendation, considering the valuable content of the instrument, the inclusion of many new concepts and clear commitments and the progress made to date. He appealed to the Workers' group to continue the discussion of this clause on an informal basis.
- 487.** The Worker Vice-Chairperson stressed that the Workers' group had expressed their views at the time of consideration of clause 5(i). She reminded the Committee that a vote had been held and the amendment, as subamended, had been adopted. She recalled that the Workers' group had not called for a vote nor had they submitted the subamendment. The fact that a vote had been taken and an outcome had been reached meant there was a consensus. Furthermore, she emphasized that collective bargaining was a right enshrined in the Declaration on Fundamental Principles and Rights at Work, and in the Right to Organise and Collective Bargaining Convention, 1949 (No. 98), which many countries had ratified. She therefore supported the reference to collective bargaining in the proposed text and expressed concern that the issue of collective bargaining had not been supported by some Government members of developed countries.
- 488.** Noting that the Workers' group did not wish to create a precedent in reopening a closed debate where a decision had been reached based on a democratic process, the Worker Vice-Chairperson agreed to accept an invitation to discuss the matter with the Employers' group. She stressed that the Workers' group did not support a discussion among all the members of the Committee, as they had already participated in the discussion and adopted the subamendment.
- 489.** The Government member of Papua New Guinea noted that a consensus had been reached on the subamendment through the vote. The Employer Vice-Chairperson agreed that a consensus had been reached in a formal sense but there was not a broad consensus in the Committee. The Worker Vice-Chairperson again expressed concern about reopening a closed debate.
- 490.** The Chairperson noted that the Committee had endeavoured to find solutions that met the needs of all those involved in human resources development and expressed appreciation that there was agreement to hold informal discussions on this matter.

D.104, D.28, D.3 and D.46

491. As a result of the adoption of amendment D.5, as subamended, these amendments were not considered.

D.41

492. The Worker Vice-Chairperson withdrew the amendment, as the content was covered in the adoption of previous amendments.

D.106

493. The Government member of the United Republic of Tanzania, speaking on behalf of the African group, introduced an amendment to include lifelong learning in clause 5(j) concerning the promotion of equal opportunities in education and training, and proposed a subamendment to delete “entrepreneurship development”, remarking that this topic had been included in earlier discussions. The Employer and Worker Vice-Chairpersons supported the subamendment.

494. The Government member of Trinidad and Tobago, speaking on behalf of CARICOM, also supported the amendment.

495. The amendment was adopted, as subamended.

D.107

496. The Government member of the United Republic of Tanzania, speaking on behalf of the African group, introduced an amendment, recalling the reasons expressed in the previous amendment. He introduced a subamendment to read “education, training and lifelong learning” and to delete the reference to “entrepreneurship development” which would be addressed elsewhere in the text.

497. The Employer and Worker Vice-Chairpersons supported the amendment, as subamended, and it was adopted.

D.2

498. The Employer Vice-Chairperson introduced the amendment by explaining that, since it was impossible to list in the clause every possible group with special needs, it was more appropriate that the groups be identified nationally. He proposed that the list of groups be deleted.

499. The Worker Vice-Chairperson did not support the amendment, recalling that the Committee had had extensive discussions on this issue in 2003. She reminded the Committee that it had been agreed at that time to list the groups with special needs in one clause of the text, rather than including them in many paragraphs. She urged the Committee not to reopen the debate on this issue.

500. The Government member of Switzerland supported the amendment not only because she agreed that it would simplify the text, but also because she feared some groups would be overlooked. She emphasized that there were too many groups with special needs to be able to include them here and, therefore, it was appropriate to address the definition of the groups at the national level.

-
- 501.** The Government member of Trinidad and Tobago, speaking on behalf of CARICOM, did not support the amendment and proposed a subamendment to insert the words “nationally defined” after the words “people with” in the first line; to replace the word “notably”, after the word “needs” with the word “including”; and to delete the last sentence of the clause. She pointed out that the subamendment ensured that the list would not be exhaustive and the importance of defining the groups at the national level would be addressed.
- 502.** The Worker Vice-Chairperson supported the subamendment because she felt it was logical and would prevent reopening the debate on this matter.
- 503.** The Government member of Saudi Arabia supported the subamendment and proposed a further subamendment, to replace the word “including” with the words “such as”, which reflected the proposal in amendment D.65.
- 504.** The Employer Vice-Chairperson, although concerned about extending the list, supported the subamendment as further subamended by the Government member of Saudi Arabia. The Worker Vice-Chairperson also expressed support.
- 505.** The amendment was adopted, as subamended.

D.65

- 506.** As a result of the adoption of amendment D.2, amendment D.65 was not considered.

D.48

- 507.** The Government member of Netherlands, speaking also on behalf of the Government members of Belgium, Canada, Finland, France, Portugal, Slovakia and the United Kingdom, introduced an amendment to include “low-skilled people” in the list of groups with special needs, as they were particularly vulnerable to long-term unemployment and social exclusion.
- 508.** The Employer Vice-Chairperson recognized that low-skilled people had special needs in this context, but by having introduced the words “such as” into the clause, it was clearly indicated that not all groups would be included in the already long list. He did not support the amendment.
- 509.** The Worker Vice-Chairperson supported the amendment, acknowledging the need to assist low-skilled people to have access to learning opportunities.
- 510.** The Government members of Brazil, Ireland and Thailand supported the amendment.
- 511.** The Government member of Australia proposed a subamendment to replace “low-skilled” with “less-skilled”, which in his view was more appropriate.
- 512.** The Government member of Canada indicated that “low-skilled” was the appropriate terminology and did not support the subamendment.
- 513.** The Employer Vice-Chairperson, noting the amendment had the support of many Government members, supported the amendment.
- 514.** The amendment was adopted.

D.49

- 515.** The Government member of New Zealand, speaking also on behalf of the Government members of Canada, Finland, Netherlands, Norway, Slovakia, Turkey and the United Kingdom, presented an amendment to add two more groups to the list: indigenous people and ethnic minority groups. In her view, those two categories needed to be explicitly mentioned because they were particularly vulnerable. She drew the attention of the Committee to the fact that the conclusions of the report of the World Commission on the Social Dimension of Globalization identified these two groups as particularly disadvantaged by globalization.
- 516.** The Employer Vice-Chairperson reiterated his concern on the length of the list and did not support the amendment.
- 517.** The Worker Vice-Chairperson pointed out that indigenous people and ethnic minority groups were a major concern of the ILO and supported the amendment.
- 518.** The Government member of Australia stated that his Government had a strong commitment towards indigenous people and ethnic minority groups. However, he proposed a subamendment to change the order of the listing of groups with special needs.
- 519.** The Government members of Peru and Thailand supported the amendment but not the subamendment proposed by the Government member of Australia.
- 520.** The Employer Vice-Chairperson, noting the interventions from the Government members, supported the amendment.
- 521.** The amendment was adopted.

D.47

- 522.** The Government member of the United Kingdom, speaking also on behalf of the Government members of Austria, Canada, Finland, Greece, Ireland, Japan, Netherlands, Norway, Portugal, Slovakia, Sweden and the United States, withdrew the amendment as it had been addressed in the adoption of previous amendments.

D.105

- 523.** The Government member of South Africa, speaking on behalf of the African group, withdrew this amendment, given the discussions concerning other parts of the text.

D.51 and D.1

- 524.** The Government member of the United States, speaking also on behalf of the Government members of Australia, Austria, Belgium, Canada, Finland, France, Germany, Italy, Japan, Netherlands, New Zealand, Norway, Portugal, Slovakia, Spain, Sweden, Switzerland, Turkey and the United Kingdom, explained that the purpose of amendment D.51 was to keep repetition to a minimum. She noted that the issue of equality to access had been covered in clauses 5(e), 5(f), 5(j), and 5(k).
- 525.** The Employer Vice-Chairperson supported the views expressed by the Government member of the United States, stating that the Employers' group's proposal (amendment D.1) was based on the same logic.

526. The Worker Vice-Chairperson objected to the amendment because she wanted to consider the issues that would be raised in the amendment to follow.

D.101

527. The Government member of South Africa, speaking on behalf of the African group, introduced a subamendment to read: “Members should, through education, training and lifelong learning and institutional support, assist individuals to develop and apply entrepreneurial skills to create decent work for themselves and others. The social partners should work with members to increase the impact of these measures”. She recalled that the African group had tabled their discussion on entrepreneurship on other occasions. She felt strongly, however, that because of the high unemployment level that existed in their countries, the issue of entrepreneurship should be highlighted at this point in the text and her subamendment reflected this.

528. The Employer Vice-Chairperson supported the subamendment, as it was appropriate to raise the issue of entrepreneurship here. Nevertheless, he proposed three further subamendments: (1) to delete the words “institutional support”; (2) to add the words “support and” before the word “assist”; and (3) to delete the last sentence, as the cooperation of the social partners had been mentioned many times in the text.

529. The Worker Vice-Chairperson stated that for clarity the paragraph should begin with the words “assist individuals”. She did not agree with the subamendment to delete the words “institutional support”, as that was critical: deletion of this phrase would undermine the paragraph. She explained that people needed institutional support, for example, policies and programmes to promote entrepreneurship, such as access to credit, information and guidance on how to set up a business. However, she supported the deletion of the last sentence, as it was referred to elsewhere in the text.

530. The Employer Vice-Chairperson responded that he could agree to “assist and support individuals” at the beginning of the phrase, but that the text did not need to identify institutional support explicitly, as any support would be welcome, not just institutional.

531. The Government member of South Africa, speaking on behalf of the African group, said that her group shared the view of the Worker Vice-Chairperson that for entrepreneurship to succeed, support must be broader and go beyond education, training and lifelong learning. She opposed the deletion of “institutional support” but accepted the deletion of the last sentence.

532. The Government member of Saudi Arabia reiterated that the instrument needed to emphasize institutional support and he supported the position of the African group and the Workers’ group.

533. The Employer Vice-Chairperson proposed a subamendment to replace “institutional support” with “other policies and programmes”.

534. The Government members of Canada, Greece, India, Lebanon, Papua New Guinea, Poland, Thailand, Trinidad and Tobago, United Kingdom and the United States supported this subamendment.

535. Given the wide support for D.101, amendments D.1 and D.51 were withdrawn.

536. Amendment D.101, as subamended, was adopted.

-
- 537.** The full text of the new Paragraph 4 was then adopted.
- 538.** The Chairperson recalled that at the closing of the seventh sitting, the Committee had been preparing to adopt Paragraph 5 of the proposed Recommendation, as amended, but that the Employers' group had proposed to defer adoption. The secretariat had sought legal advice on the proposal. The Standing Orders of the ILC specified that the Committee must adopt or reject the text of each paragraph, as amended, before proceeding to consider amendments to subsequent paragraphs.
- 539.** The Employer Vice-Chairperson stated his understanding that adoption of Paragraph 5 did not mean endorsement of its content but was rather a procedural means to verify that the text was in conformity with the decisions reached by the Committee. He asked the Secretariat to provide an interpretation of the meaning of the wording of clause 5(i). The Chairperson indicated that only the Committee could provide an interpretation of the proposed text, and the Legal Adviser was asked to comment.
- 540.** The Legal Adviser summarized the procedure by which the amendment, as subamended, had been adopted. He explained that, at this stage, it would not be possible to reopen the discussion on Paragraph 5. A possible solution could be found in article 67 of the Standing Orders of the ILC: "Amendments to a text submitted to a committee by its drafting committee may be admitted by the Chairman after consultation with the Vice-Chairmen". If the Committee decided that there was a problem of comprehension, it could amend any portion of the text prior to final adoption of the full instrument. At the present time, Paragraph 5 had to be adopted or rejected. If rejected, the entire paragraph would be deleted.
- 541.** The Employer Vice-Chairperson acknowledged the explanations provided by the Chairperson and Legal Adviser, and informed the Committee that the Employers' group would propose an amendment concerning clause 5(i) before final adoption of the proposed Recommendation.
- 542.** The Government member of the United Kingdom, while noting that the Committee had followed the correct procedure, urged the Committee to reconsider the issue at the end of its work.
- 543.** The Government member of the United States noted the difficult situation faced by the Committee, where one of the social partners could not support the proposed Recommendation if clause 5(i) were to remain unchanged. The Committee had worked for a number of years on a revision of the current Human Resources Development Recommendation, and all Committee members agreed that the proposed Recommendation was an improvement over Recommendation No. 150. She therefore hoped that a way could be found to resolve the current problem.
- 544.** The Government member of Lebanon emphasized the importance that the proposed Recommendation be clearly understandable.
- 545.** The Government member of Canada expressed the hope that the proposed Recommendation would be a useful guide for the development of a skilled and productive workforce and expressed her reservations about the meaning of the wording of clause 5(i). She encouraged the Employers' and Workers' groups to find language for the proposed Recommendation that all Committee members could embrace.
- 546.** The Government member of Brazil expressed concern that following the positive discussions last year and this year, the Committee appeared to be deadlocked, and

encouraged the Employers' and Workers' groups to informally discuss how the situation could be resolved.

- 547.** The Government member of France regretted the disagreement following the vote on clause 5(i), and stated that she was ready to assist in any possible way to help reach a consensus.
- 548.** The Government member of Thailand supported the statements of other Government members on the issue.
- 549.** The Worker Vice-Chairperson was very concerned at the way in which the Committee was proceeding on the matter. While she appreciated the statements made by Government members, she noted that during the first discussion of the Committee there had been several amendments supported by the Workers' group that had gone to a vote and had not been adopted by the Committee, and the Workers' group had respected the Committee's will. She recalled that in her statement during the general discussion she had expressed the Workers' group's concern that collective bargaining was not adequately reflected in the proposed text. She noted that all agreed on the need for certain methods to promote education and training, including collective bargaining; and she could not understand the Employers' group's objection to its inclusion in clause 5(i).
- 550.** The Worker Vice-Chairperson recalled that a vote had been taken and a proposed text, as amended, had been adopted. She noted that all recognized that collective bargaining was a part of social dialogue and therefore its inclusion in clause 5(i) should not pose a problem. She referred to a number of international and regional agreements between workers and employers that were the result of social dialogue. In addition, the Declaration on Fundamental Principles and Rights at Work as well as the Right to Organise and Collective Bargaining Convention, 1949 (No. 98), gave a fundamental role to collective bargaining. The Workers' group would take note of the Committee's concerns but that she did not want to create a precedent in overturning decisions already taken.
- 551.** The Chairperson noted that the views expressed by the Government members were put forward in the spirit of reaching consensus and that, while there should be no reopening of the debate, if it was the Committee's will to consider the issue at a later time, this could be done in conformity with the Standing Orders. The objective was to have a meaningful, practical and well-structured instrument that the Committee could be proud of.
- 552.** The Employer Vice-Chairperson noted that the Employers' group recognized the importance of collective bargaining and hoped that a new formulation of the text of clause 5(i) could be agreed upon. He noted that a simple majority of the Committee was not the same as a broad consensus, and hoped that the Committee could deliver a modern instrument with full tripartite consensus.
- 553.** The Government member of Argentina was surprised at the objection of the Employers' group to the inclusion of collective bargaining in clause 5(i), as it simply called on Members to strengthen social dialogue and collective bargaining, but did not compel them to do so.
- 554.** The Government member of Morocco agreed with the Worker Vice-Chairperson that the accepted practice was to accept the result of a vote as a consensus and insisted that this practice should be respected.
- 555.** The Chairperson felt that the issue had been well discussed and proposed to move on to the adoption of Paragraph 5, noting the reservations of the Employers' group.

556. Paragraph 5 was adopted as amended.

Paragraph 6

D.123

557. The Government member of Germany, speaking also on behalf of the Government members of Australia, Japan, Malta and Norway, introduced an amendment to subparagraph 6(1) to delete in the second line, after the words “further improvements”, the words “to it, within the concept of lifelong learning”. He reminded members of the Committee that this matter had already been discussed and the mention of education and training implied the concept of lifelong learning.

558. The Employer Vice-Chairperson did not support the amendment, preferring to retain the reference to lifelong learning in the text.

559. The Worker Vice-Chairperson did not support the amendment, as the reference to lifelong learning was very important and its removal would affect the substance of the text.

560. Noting the positions of the Employer and Worker Vice-Chairpersons, the Government member of Germany withdrew the amendment.

D.152

561. The Government member of Côte d’Ivoire, speaking on behalf of the African group, presented a subamendment to add at the end of subparagraph 6(1) the words “, in particular the vital role of employers in providing work experience opportunities”. He noted that the African group felt this was the best place to include this wording that had been previously removed from the text. They were convinced of the important role that employers could play in helping young people enter working life.

562. The Employer Vice-Chairperson did not disagree with the vital role that employers could play, within the context of national systems, in providing opportunities to young people. However, he did not think it was appropriate to include it in a paragraph on general policy. He found it more appropriate to insert it in clause 10(g), for which a similar amendment had been submitted.

563. The Worker Vice-Chairperson supported the amendment as it was indeed important to give work experience opportunities to young people. She also found it important to reflect the idea in the general policy section of the text.

564. The Government member of Portugal supported the idea of giving more opportunities to young people. She noted that the latter clause referred to by the Employer Vice-Chairperson addressed opportunities given in the workplace, while the idea of including it in this section was to provide work experience that would help gain access to the labour market.

565. The Government members of Belgium, India, Morocco, Thailand and Trinidad and Tobago supported the amendment, as did the Employer Vice-Chairperson. The amendment was adopted as subamended.

D.158

- 566.** The Government member of Peru, seconded by the Government member of Greece, presented an amendment to insert in subparagraph 6(2), in the first line after the word “include”, the words “vocational and career guidance,”. She felt that vocational guidance was not adequately covered in the text, appearing only in Paragraph 20, yet it was an important part of pre-employment training.
- 567.** The Employer Vice-Chairperson stated that vocational guidance was already mentioned in Paragraph 20 and there was no need to repeat it here. He did not support the amendment.
- 568.** The Worker Vice-Chairperson supported the amendment, agreeing on the importance of vocational guidance as a part of pre-employment training.
- 569.** The Government member of Australia agreed on the importance of vocational training in pre-employment training, but did not support the amendment.
- 570.** The Government members of Belgium, Brazil, Indonesia, Lebanon, and Trinidad and Tobago supported the amendment.
- 571.** The Government member of the United States thought the issue was already adequately covered elsewhere in the text and did not support the amendment in the interest of streamlining the text. The Government members of Canada, France, India, Ireland, Mexico, Poland, Portugal, Switzerland and Thailand did not support the amendment for the same reasons.
- 572.** The Government member of Morocco proposed to discuss the issue during the discussion on Paragraph 20.
- 573.** The Government member of South Africa stated that the contents of subparagraph 6(2) identified cross-cutting issues that should be highlighted in any policy or programme. Vocational guidance also was a cross-cutting issue, and should be included in the subparagraph.
- 574.** The Chairperson, noting that the Government members seemed to be divided on the amendment, proposed to take an informal vote among the Government members. The vote revealed that a majority of Government members were not in support of the amendment. Consequently, the Government member of Peru withdrew the amendment.

D.150

- 575.** The Worker Vice-Chairperson withdrew the amendment in the interest of moving forward.

D.147

- 576.** The Government member of Brazil, speaking also on behalf of the Government members of Argentina, Paraguay and Uruguay, introduced an amendment to add the words “to guarantee personal development and citizenship” after the word “technology”, as education had an important objective of guaranteeing personal development. They felt that this objective was in addition to the objective of preparing individuals for the workforce.
- 577.** The Employer Vice-Chairperson noted that personal development was already referred to in the preamble and did not support the amendment.

578. The Worker Vice-Chairperson, while understanding the intention behind the amendment, felt that by changing the text in this manner, the scope of the clause might be restricted and therefore did not support the amendment.

579. The Government member of Brazil withdrew the amendment.

580. Paragraph 6 was adopted as amended.

Paragraph 7

D.118 and D.109

581. Amendments D.118, submitted by the Employers' group, and D.109, submitted by the Government members of Australia, Austria, Canada, Germany, Japan, Malta, Netherlands, Norway, Switzerland, United Kingdom and the United States, both proposed to delete paragraph 7. The Worker Vice-Chairperson and the Government member of Lebanon supported the deletion of the paragraph, since the text now appeared in clause 5(i).

582. Amendments D.118 and D.109 were adopted.

D.146

583. As a consequence of previous discussions, the amendment was not considered.

Paragraph 8

D.133

584. The Government member of the United States, speaking also on behalf of the Government members of Austria, Belgium, Canada Finland, Japan, Malta, Netherlands, New Zealand, Norway, Portugal, Sweden, Switzerland, Turkey and the United Kingdom, explained that the intention of the amendment was to improve the wording of Paragraph 8. Investments were not capable of making decisions but rather people were and she proposed replacing the words "Investment in education and training" with the word "Members" and adding at the end of the sentence the words "when making decisions about education and training".

585. The Employer Vice-Chairperson supported the amendment and offered a subamendment to introduce the word "investments" after the words "decisions about".

586. The Worker Vice-Chairperson supported the subamendment as it retained the original intention of the clause.

587. The Government member of the United States noted that the subamendment reflected the intention of the amendment and supported it.

588. The Government member of the United Republic of Tanzania believed that what was being considered was limited. He agreed with the subamendment and proposed a further subamendment to add the words "internationally agreed goals for human development and" after the word "consider".

589. The Employer Vice-Chairperson regretted that he could not support the latest subamendment as it changed the character of the paragraph. He noted that the purpose of the benchmarks was related to investments in education and training.

-
- 590.** The Worker Vice-Chairperson did not support the subamendment, noting that reference was already made to comparable countries.
- 591.** The Government member of the United States noted that it was not the intention to change the content of Paragraph 8, but to make it clearer. Thus, she did not support the subamendment. The Employer Vice-Chairperson supported the position of the Government member of the United States.
- 592.** The Worker Vice-Chairperson responded that she could understand the position of the Government member of the United Republic of Tanzania, but she thought it would add unnecessary complexity to the paragraph.
- 593.** The Government member of United Republic of Tanzania withdrew the subamendment.
- 594.** The amendment was adopted, as subamended, and Paragraph 8 was adopted, as subamended.

Paragraph 9

D.153

- 595.** The Government member of Kenya, speaking on behalf of the African group, explained that they recognized that the responsibility for education and pre-employment training rested with governments but that it was necessary for governments to have the support of the social partners. While governments could provide education and pre-employment training, they could not provide access to employment. She therefore proposed inserting the words “in cooperation with the social partners,” after the words “training and”.
- 596.** The Employer Vice-Chairperson stated that although he agreed that the social partners had a role to play and should work with governments, he did not support the amendment, as this cooperation was already referenced elsewhere in the text.
- 597.** The Worker Vice-Chairperson supported the amendment, even though the issue was mentioned elsewhere in the text.
- 598.** The Government member of Kenya stated that the issue of cooperation with social partners was being introduced in Paragraph 8 for emphasis.
- 599.** The Government member of Lebanon noted that although it was clear that governments were responsible for education and pre-employment training, this responsibility did not rest exclusively with governments. Examples of this shared responsibility could be found in Europe and he supported the amendment.
- 600.** The Government member of Brazil expressed his support for the amendment.
- 601.** The Government members of Portugal, Switzerland and the United Kingdom supported the amendment, particularly because improving access to employment should be developed in collaboration with the social partners.
- 602.** The Government members of Canada, France, Germany, India, Ireland, Poland, Spain, Thailand and the United States supported the amendment for similar reasons.

603. The Employer Vice-Chairperson responded that while regretting the repetition, he accepted the amendment because of the wide support given by the Government members. The amendment was adopted.

D.124

604. The Government member of Australia, speaking also on behalf of the Government members of Finland, Germany, Italy, Japan, Malta, Norway, Sweden and Turkey, introduced an amendment to turn a negative into a positive by replacing the words “to prevent social exclusion” with the words “to facilitate social inclusion”.

605. The Employer and Worker Vice-Chairpersons supported the amendment.

606. The amendment was adopted.

D.122

607. The Government member of Portugal, speaking also on behalf of the Government members of Australia, Canada, France, Germany, Japan, New Zealand, Norway, Sweden, Turkey, United Kingdom and the United States, introduced an amendment to broaden the coverage of the text, as non-formal education and training were not just for adults, but also for other groups, particularly youth.

608. The Employer Vice-Chairperson agreed that the scope of the paragraph should be broadened and supported the amendment.

609. The Worker Vice-Chairperson noted that the original text concerned approaches for non-formal education and training, which was very specific. She felt that young people needed access to formal education and training, and was concerned that this amendment might imply a preference for non-formal education for the young.

610. The Government member of Portugal responded that both young people and older individuals should have the opportunity to benefit from non-formal measures.

611. The Worker Vice-Chairperson noted that the present wording “especially for adults” would include young people who had missed out on education and training opportunities. She reiterated her concern that there was the risk that the proposed wording might imply that providing non-formal education to young people was acceptable.

612. The Government member of Portugal, not wanting to complicate the text, withdrew the amendment following withdrawal of the subamendment.

D.145

613. The Government member of Brazil, speaking also on behalf of the Government members of Argentina, Paraguay and Uruguay, introduced an amendment to recognize the important role of community organizations and employers’ and workers’ organizations in providing non-formal education and training. He emphasized that the experiences of community organizations were particularly important in developing countries.

614. While agreeing that community organizations can play a role in non-formal education and training, the Employer Vice-Chairperson did not support the amendment, as he felt that the main message of the clause concerned education and training opportunities for those who had missed them when young.

-
- 615.** The Worker Vice-Chairperson agreed that community organizations and workers' and employers' organizations did organize such programmes. She proposed a subamendment to replace the words "by promoting" with the words "taking into account the successful experiences found in the community including that of employers' or workers' organizations".
- 616.** The Government member of Brazil agreed with the reasoning of the Worker Vice-Chairperson and supported the subamendment, as did the Government members of South Africa and Trinidad and Tobago.
- 617.** The Government member of France preferred the original text.
- 618.** The Government member of the United Kingdom stated that there were a number of other actors that could be taken into account, and listing any of them was restrictive. The original text was clear; she did not support the subamendment or amendment.
- 619.** For the same reasons the Government members of Canada, Greece, Lebanon, Sweden, Switzerland, Thailand and the United States did not support the amendment.
- 620.** The Government member of Brazil stated that the objective of the amendment was to draw attention to a new type of education. As this objective seemed to have been achieved, the amendment was withdrawn.

D.128

- 621.** The Government member of the Netherlands, speaking also on behalf of the Government members of Australia, Belgium, Canada, Finland, Germany, Japan, Norway, Sweden, Switzerland, Turkey, United Kingdom and the United States, introduced an amendment to clarify that it was training providers who made use of new information and communication technology, while the role of government was to "encourage" this use.
- 622.** While hoping that governments would also make use of information and communication technologies, the Employer Vice-Chairperson supported the amendment.
- 623.** The Worker Vice-Chairperson also supported the amendment.
- 624.** The amendment was adopted.

D.129

- 625.** The Government member of the Netherlands, speaking also on behalf of the Government members of Australia, Canada, Japan and Norway, introduced an amendment to clarify the text and to introduce the notion that education and pre-employment training programmes should be relevant to the needs of the labour market.
- 626.** The Employer Vice-Chairperson agreed and supported the amendment.
- 627.** While supporting the point made by the Government member of the Netherlands, the Worker Vice-Chairperson noted that the Committee had agreed to include in the preamble that an objective of education and training was active citizenship. The proposed amendment might be too limiting in this regard.

-
- 628.** The Government member of the Netherlands stated that the primary aim was that people find jobs. She proposed a subamendment to add the words “and participation in society” at the end of the proposed wording.
- 629.** The Worker Vice-Chairperson stated that she could support either the amendment as subamended or its withdrawal.
- 630.** The Employer Vice-Chairperson stated that if the original amendment were not accepted, he would prefer the original text.
- 631.** The amendment was withdrawn.

D.134

- 632.** The Government member of the United States, speaking also on behalf of the Government members of Australia, Austria, Canada, Japan, New Zealand, Norway, Turkey, Switzerland and the United Kingdom, introduced an amendment to delete clause 9(f) to eliminate repetition, as the substance of the clause was already found elsewhere in the text.
- 633.** While noting the various references made elsewhere in the text, the Employer Vice-Chairperson did not support the amendment, as the original clause made specific reference to relevance to the labour market.
- 634.** The Worker Vice-Chairperson did not support the amendment, noting that certification of skills was an integral part of employability.
- 635.** In light of these views, the amendment was withdrawn.

D.154

- 636.** The Government member of South Africa, speaking on behalf of the African group, introduced an amendment to insert the words “professional and” after the words “ensure that”. She noted that “vocational education and training” tended to be given lower status by some, and suggested that the use of both terms, vocational and professional, would give them more equal status.
- 637.** The Employer Vice-Chairperson did not support the amendment, as he believed that education and training encompassed both terms.
- 638.** The Worker Vice-Chairperson supported the amendment.
- 639.** The Government member of Switzerland suggested that the amendment be referred to the Drafting Committee, as there was no problem with the French text.
- 640.** The Employer and Worker Vice-Chairpersons agreed, and the amendment was referred to the Drafting Committee.

D.130

- 641.** The Chairperson noted that the amendment appeared to concern a linguistic problem and there being no objections, referred it to the Drafting Committee.
- 642.** Paragraph 9 was adopted as amended.

Paragraph 10

D.144

- 643.** The Government member of Argentina, speaking also on behalf of the Government members of Brazil, Paraguay and Uruguay, introduced an amendment to add to the title of section IV the word “qualifications” to reflect the discussion on competencies and qualifications, which took place under Paragraph 3.
- 644.** The Employer Vice-Chairperson did not support the amendment, noting that qualifications were an important yardstick to measure competencies of individuals, but could not be “developed” in the sense that competencies could.
- 645.** The Worker Vice-Chairperson supported the amendment, noting that section IV referred to both competencies and qualifications and, therefore, the title should be more comprehensive. The Government members of Germany, Jamaica, Papua New Guinea, Portugal and Saudi Arabia also supported the amendment.
- 646.** The Government members of Australia, India and Trinidad and Tobago did not support the amendment. The Government member of Australia indicated that the proposed amendment made the title long, complicated and confusing.
- 647.** The Government member of Kenya, recognizing the concern over “the development of qualifications”, proposed a subamendment regarding the development of competencies and the enhancement of qualifications. The Government member of Switzerland felt that the proposed change complicated the text.
- 648.** The Government members of United States and Ireland did not support the amendment or the subamendment.
- 649.** The Government member of South Africa proposed a subamendment to refer only to the development of the employed and unemployed, noting that the specifics were covered in Paragraph 9.
- 650.** The Government member of Jamaica, in support of the amendment, noted that qualifications should be included in the title, as these were needed in the labour market.
- 651.** The Worker Vice-Chairperson noted that the EU referred to development of qualifications and competencies.
- 652.** After a lengthy discussion and many proposals to subamend the amendment in order to try to reach agreement on an acceptable wording for the title of section IV, the Government member of Argentina withdrew the amendment, as no consensus had been reached.

D.117

- 653.** The Employer Vice-Chairperson introduced an amendment reminding the Committee that the Worker Vice-Chairperson had proposed a subamendment, in the discussion of the previous amendment, to delete the word “workers”. He supported the subamendment.
- 654.** The amendment was adopted as subamended.

D.132

655. The Government member of Trinidad and Tobago, speaking also on behalf of the Government members of Barbados and Jamaica, informed the Committee that the amendment submitted to replace the word “skills” with the word “competencies” in clause 10(a) would be referred to the Drafting Committee, as it dealt with a linguistic matter.

D.143

656. The Government member of Argentina, speaking also on behalf of the Government members of Brazil, Paraguay and Uruguay, introduced an amendment to address a conceptual problem with the issue of competencies.

657. The Employer Vice-Chairperson did not support the amendment, as it neglected the important references to the needs of enterprises and individuals in the clause.

658. The Worker Vice-Chairperson agreed that the subamendment narrowed the focus of the text and did not support it.

659. Given the responses from the Employer and Worker Vice-Chairpersons, the amendment was withdrawn.

D.120

660. The Government member of Canada withdrew the amendment in light of the previous discussion.

D.116

661. The Employer Vice-Chairperson introduced an amendment to delete the words “contributing to” in clause 10(b) because they were redundant. The Worker Vice-Chairperson supported the amendment and it was adopted.

D.115

662. The Employer Vice-Chairperson presented an amendment to delete clause 10(e). He indicated that the role of the government regarding the unemployed was already addressed in clause 14(a).

663. The Worker Vice-Chairperson agreed to the deletion of clause 10(e).

664. The amendment was adopted.

D.114

665. The Employer Vice-Chairperson introduced an amendment to replace the word “informal” in clause 10(f) with the word “non-formal”. He remarked that “non-formal” was used throughout the proposed Recommendation and it was a more appropriate word in this context.

666. The Worker Vice-Chairperson agreed and the amendment was adopted.

D.159

667. This amendment was not considered.

D.155

668. The Government member of Kenya, speaking on behalf of the African group, presented an amendment to add the words “encouraging employers to” after the words “training by” in the first line of clause 10(g). She expressed concern that the current wording of the clause related solely to the role of governments and neglected that of employers.

669. The Employer Vice-Chairperson agreed that employers have a role in promoting workplace learning, but the amendment put responsibility only on employers. He put forward a subamendment to move the phrase “by encouraging”, which appears in sub-clause 10(g)(iii), earlier in the text.

670. The Worker Vice-Chairperson had difficulties with both the amendment and the subamendment, as only sub-clauses (i) and (ii) clearly referred to employers, while (iii) dealt more with governments since it referred to policies. She preferred to retain the existing text and did not support the amendment, as subamended.

671. The Government members of Kenya and Saudi Arabia supported the amendment, as subamended. The Government member of Greece supported the amendment.

672. The Worker Vice-Chairperson stated that she understood what the Committee was trying to do, but opposed the amendment because, as she explained, putting the word “encouraging” in the introductory sentence weakened the text. She reiterated her preference for retaining the original text.

673. The Government member of South Africa explained that the current wording implied that only governments should be using high-performance work practices. The role of employers was also not reflected.

674. The Government members of Australia, France and Papua New Guinea supported the retention of the original text.

675. Numerous subamendments were proposed to try to reach consensus on the wording of the clause to reflect the concerns of the Committee. The Government member of France proposed a subamendment to replace “by” with “through” and replace “utilizing” with “the utilization of”, “organizing” with “the organization of” and delete “encouraging”. She indicated that the proposed formulation would make it clear that the government was not the one “utilizing”.

676. The Employer and Worker Vice-Chairpersons supported the amendment as subamended by the Government member of France. The Government member of South Africa also supported the subamended text.

677. The amendment was adopted as subamended.

D.142

678. The Government member of Argentina, speaking also on behalf of the Government members of Brazil, Paraguay and Uruguay, introduced an amendment to replace “high performance” with “appropriate” because, to her, the term “high performance work

practice” meant the intensification of labour, which was not what the Committee wished to convey. The second part of the amendment was to add, “that improve skills” to the end of sub-clause 10(g)(i).

679. The Employer Vice-Chairperson stated that the concept of high performance work practice was well established and did not support the amendment.

680. The Worker Vice-Chairperson also acknowledged that the meaning of the term “high performance work practice” was well established and did not support the first part of the amendment. However, she supported the second part of the amendment to add the words “that improve skills”. The Employer Vice-Chairperson agreed.

681. The amendment was adopted as subamended.

D.156

682. The amendment was withdrawn as the issue was covered by a previous amendment.

D.127

683. The Government member of Australia, speaking also on behalf of the Government members of Canada, Japan, Malta, Netherlands, Turkey and the United States, introduced an amendment to insert the word “appropriate” before the words “best practices”, as circumstances varied between enterprises.

684. The Employer Vice-Chairperson preferred to retain the original wording and did not support the amendment. He agreed that the context needed to be taken into account but felt enterprises would select best practices accordingly.

685. The Worker Vice-Chairperson questioned whether the amended text would add clarity to the clause, as it was unclear what “appropriate best practices” would mean, and did not support the amendment.

686. The amendment was withdrawn.

D.157

687. The Government member of Kenya, speaking on behalf of the African group, introduced an amendment to insert the words “and young people” after the word “women”. She explained the need to include young people as a special group, noting that youth employment was a particular concern.

688. The Employer Vice-Chairperson noted that clause 5(k) already included a list of special groups and preferred the original text.

689. The Worker Vice-Chairperson supported the amendment, stating that youth employment was a challenge for both developed and developing countries as was ensuring social inclusion.

690. The Government member of Portugal did not support the amendment, pointing out that the main focus of clause 10(i) was to promote equality of opportunity among men and women, and that the issue of young people was already covered elsewhere in the text.

691. The Government member of Switzerland did not support the amendment for the same reasons, noting that the focus of the clause was on equal opportunity for women. The Government members of Morocco, Papua New Guinea and Thailand concurred.

692. The amendment was withdrawn in light of the discussion.

D.141

693. The Government member of Argentina, speaking also on behalf of the Government members of Brazil, Paraguay and Uruguay, introduced the amendment. First, to replace the words “call upon” with the word “urge”, as the word was a more active term. Second, to insert the words “in the framework of social dialogue” after the word “enterprises”. Third, to insert the word “similar” after the word “provide”, in order to ensure quality of training.

694. The Employer Vice-Chairperson noted that social dialogue was already referred to several times in the text. He also noted that the word “similar” could be misleading and might imply “same”. For these reasons, he wished to retain the original text.

695. The Worker Vice-Chairperson agreed that the word “urge” was more positive and supported the first part of the amendment. She also supported the inclusion of “social dialogue”. However, she felt that the word “similar” was misleading and proposed a subamendment to replace the word “similar” with the word “relevant”.

696. The Government member of France did not support the subamendment and preferred to retain the original text. She found that the word “relevant” did not add meaning to the text, and the word “similar” was unsuitable.

697. The Government members of Canada, India, Ireland, Lebanon, Papua New Guinea, Thailand, United Kingdom and the United States supported the existing text for the same reasons.

698. In light of the views expressed, the amendment was withdrawn.

D.113

699. The Employer Vice-Chairperson introduced an amendment to insert the word “relevant”, after the word “provide” in the first line of clause 10(k), recalling that several speakers had expressed the wish to insert the word “relevant” in the clause. He recalled that the word was included in the proposed Conclusions the Committee had adopted in 2003. He noted that this clause was, in fact, the same wording contained in the Tripartite Declaration of Principles concerning Multinational Enterprises and Social Policy (MNE Declaration). He wondered why the Office had deleted the word when preparing the brown report.

700. The Deputy Representative of the Director-General explained that the Drafting Committee had deleted the word in the process of changing the text from the form of conclusions to that of a proposed Recommendation, in an attempt to enhance the clarity of the text.

701. The Worker Vice-Chairperson felt that during the previous discussion, there was a strong consensus to maintain the text of the clause as it was. She did not support the amendment.

702. The Government member of Saudi Arabia indicated that the inclusion of the word “relevant” made the clause stronger, which would benefit workers. He added that it was important that enterprises provide their workers with relevant training, not simply any

training. The Government member of Cameroon agreed, adding that the word “relevant” reinforced the quality of the training provided.

- 703.** The Government member of France did not agree with the insertion of the word “relevant”, as no multinational enterprise would provide irrelevant or inappropriate training.
- 704.** The Government member of Liberia explained that in countries emerging from conflict, there was a problem of brain drain, which could be better addressed if the training provided by enterprises was relevant to the needs of the country. He supported the amendment.
- 705.** The Government member of India pointed out that the clause already stated that training provided by multinational enterprises should meet the needs of enterprises and contribute to the development of the country and it was therefore unnecessary to insert the word “relevant”.
- 706.** The Government members of Thailand and Trinidad and Tobago preferred the existing text.
- 707.** The Government member of France introduced a subamendment to rearrange the text to read “training that meets the needs of the enterprise, and”.
- 708.** The Government member of Morocco proposed a further subamendment to add after the words “needs of enterprises” the words “and of their employees”.
- 709.** The Employer Vice-Chairperson stressed that it would have been in the interests of both employers and workers to insert the word “relevant”. He recognized that the idea was implicit in the last sentence of the clause and withdrew the amendment.

D.125

- 710.** The Government member of Japan, speaking also on behalf of the Government members of Australia, Canada, Switzerland, United Kingdom and the United States, presented an amendment to delete the words “all levels” after the words “training for” in the first line of clause 10(k). She questioned the need to include the words, as it was imperative that multinationals provide training to workers who needed it most.
- 711.** The Employer Vice-Chairperson supported the amendment.
- 712.** The Worker Vice-Chairperson did not support the amendment, as deleting the words “all levels” would affect the substance of the text. She argued that it was important to emphasize that resources for training should be evenly distributed among all workers in an enterprise because in some countries, certain categories of workers might be neglected with regard to access to training opportunities.
- 713.** The Government members of Finland and Thailand wished to retain the existing text.
- 714.** The Government member of Japan, taking into account the various views, withdrew the amendment.

D.112

- 715.** The Employer Vice-Chairperson presented an amendment to delete the reference to access to training, as it was already well covered in several parts of the text, notably in clause 10(i).
- 716.** The Worker Vice-Chairperson did not agree with the amendment because in her view, the clause had two parts: the promotion of training policies by government; and the provision of equitable training opportunities to all workers in the public sector. If the second part were to be deleted, the clause would be unbalanced. The acceptance of this clause was a powerful signal of government commitment to set a good example for employers.
- 717.** The Government member of South Africa introduced a subamendment to insert the word “equitable” before the word “training” in the first line and the word “all” before “their employees”, to address the concerns raised by the Worker Vice-Chairperson.
- 718.** The Employer Vice-Chairperson supported the subamendment.
- 719.** The Worker Vice-Chairperson appreciated the attempt made by the Government member of South Africa to find an adequate formulation, but pointed out that promoting equitable training policies was not the same thing as providing equitable training opportunities.
- 720.** The Government member of South Africa further subamended the subamendment by proposing to insert the words “and opportunities” after the word “policies”.
- 721.** The Worker and Employer Vice-Chairpersons supported the proposal.
- 722.** The amendment was adopted as subamended.

D.151

- 723.** The Worker Vice-Chairperson introduced an amendment to add a new clause after clause 10(l), indicating that the lack of supportive policies represented a major hindrance in access to training, especially for women and low-paid, low-skilled workers.
- 724.** The Employer Vice-Chairperson stated he was supportive of the intention of the amendment, but noted that reference to such policies was already included in clause 5(m) and that the Paid Educational Leave Convention, 1974 (No. 140), was referenced in the preamble and opposed the amendment.
- 725.** The Government member of Finland proposed a subamendment to delete the examples of types of supportive policies to enable individuals to balance their work, family and lifelong learning interests. The Employer and Worker Vice-Chairpersons and many Government members supported the subamendment. The amendment, as subamended, was adopted.
- 726.** The title of section IV and Paragraph 10 were adopted as amended.

Paragraph 11

D.108

- 727.** The Government member of the United Kingdom, speaking also on behalf of the Government members of Australia, Austria, Canada, Germany, Japan, Malta, Netherlands, New Zealand, Norway, Sweden, Switzerland, Turkey and the United States, introduced an

amendment to delete Paragraph 11 because it was repetitive. She supported the text in principle, but the ideas were covered elsewhere in the text.

728. The Employer and Worker Vice-Chairpersons agreed to the deletion for the same reason and the amendment was adopted.

D.140

729. The amendment was not considered in view of the adoption of the previous amendment.

D.149

730. The Worker Vice-Chairperson introduced an amendment to reverse the order of sections V and VI in order to ensure a better flow of the text. The Employer Vice-Chairperson agreed that this would provide a better, more logical order for the text.

731. The amendment was adopted.

732. The Chairperson asked the Committee for the nominations of representatives to work on the Drafting Committee. For the representative of the Government members, the Government member of Canada nominated the Government member of Côte d'Ivoire, Mr. F.F. N'zue. The Government member of Thailand seconded the nomination. The Employers' group elected Mr. A.J.E.G. Renique whilst Ms. H. Yacob was elected to represent the Workers' group.

D.148

733. The Worker Vice-Chairperson introduced the amendment to delete the entire text of section VI, which was consistent with the decision taken with amendment D.149.

734. The Employer Vice-Chairperson supported the amendment.

735. The amendment was adopted and section VI was deleted.

Paragraph 14

D.119

736. The Employer Vice-Chairperson introduced the amendment to replace the word "responsibility" with the word "role". This would make wording consistent with other references in the text and better express governments' commitments in relation to the groups specified.

737. The Worker Vice-Chairperson supported the amendment, also citing consistency with other references in the text.

738. The Government member of Jamaica had difficulty in accepting that the government had sole responsibility for training for unemployed persons and the Government member of India also preferred the word "role".

739. The Government member of South Africa noted a problem of language inconsistency between clauses, as governments would have responsibility while others would have roles.

-
- 740.** The Employer Vice-Chairperson responded that the prime responsibility should be with the government, although the social partners could play supporting roles.
- 741.** While appreciating the concerns expressed by the Government members, the Worker Vice-Chairperson stated that it was important to make it clear what were the roles of the respective actors. For training of the unemployed, the social partners had a more limited role in comparison to the government. The amendment therefore added clarity.
- 742.** The Government member of Kenya highlighted that both the government and social partners needed to take responsibility and preferred the word “role” for all three actors. The Government member of Finland also preferred to retain the original text.
- 743.** The Worker Vice-Chairperson pointed out that the previous deletion of clause 10(e) had been agreed to based on the understanding that the issue of government responsibility would be reflected elsewhere in the Recommendation.
- 744.** The Government member of Thailand preferred the word “responsibility” to the word “role”.
- 745.** The Government member of France recognized the primary responsibility of government, while noting that this was already included in the earlier section on training for the unemployed. However, to be consistent with the rest of the text, it would be better to use the word “responsibility” in all clauses of the paragraph.
- 746.** The Government member of Lebanon stated that responsibility for training of the unemployed should be shared by the government and social partners and did not support the amendment. The Government members of Australia and Kenya also did not support the amendment for the same reason.
- 747.** The Government member of Canada pointed out that the amendment was consistent with clause 6(1), which stated “prime responsibility of government for education and pre-employment training and for training the unemployed” and supported the amendment. The Government members of Belgium, Finland, Germany, Ireland, Papua New Guinea and Portugal supported her position.
- 748.** As a result the amendment was adopted.

D.110

- 749.** The Government member of the United Kingdom, speaking also on behalf of the Government members of Australia, Austria, Belgium, Canada, Finland, France, Italy, Japan, Malta, Netherlands, New Zealand, Norway, Portugal, Sweden, Switzerland, Turkey and the United States, introduced this amendment to recognize “other interested parties” involved in training people with special needs, without listing them all.
- 750.** The Employer Vice-Chairperson supported the amendment.
- 751.** The Worker Vice-Chairperson requested a clarification of “other interested parties” and whether the word “community” was not sufficiently broad.
- 752.** The Government member of the United Kingdom responded by stating it could include other members of community such as training providers and academics. The Government member of Australia added that a number of organizations provided useful services for

people with special needs and it was important to recognize their very valuable contributions.

- 753.** The Government members of India, Kenya, Papua New Guinea and Trinidad and Tobago all supported the amendment and stressed the critical role played by NGOs and community-based organizations in assisting people with special needs.
- 754.** In response to a question from the Worker Vice-Chairperson about whether NGOs were to be considered as social partners, the Government member of the United Kingdom indicated that the meaning of “social partners” in the ILO context was well understood and was limited to governments, workers and employers.
- 755.** The Employer Vice-Chairperson supported the amendment, noting that the role of the social partners was clearly stated in clause 14(b).
- 756.** The Government member of South Africa proposed to replace the word “interested” with the word “service providers”, as all the references made were to those providing services.
- 757.** The Worker Vice-Chairperson supported the subamendment proposed by the Government member of South Africa. She also acknowledged that the term “social partners” referred only to governments, employers and workers.
- 758.** The Government member of the United Kingdom did not support the subamendment, as it seemed to unduly narrow the scope since not all interested parties could be considered service providers.
- 759.** The Government members of Brazil, Mexico and Namibia also supported the original amendment and the view expressed by the Government member of the United Kingdom.
- 760.** The Government member of Saudi Arabia did not support the amendment, expressing his concern that “other interested parties” could include ones from outside the country, while the Government member of Papua New Guinea stressed the welcome support from outside the country.
- 761.** The Government member of France was concerned that the words “service providers” might be interpreted too broadly and therefore did not support the subamendment.
- 762.** The Employer Vice-Chairperson preferred the original amendment.
- 763.** The Worker Vice-Chairperson also supported the amendment, after having heard all the views put forward.
- 764.** The amendment was adopted. Paragraph 14 was adopted.

Paragraph 15

D.121

- 765.** The Government member of Canada, speaking also on behalf of the Government members of Finland, Portugal, Switzerland, United Kingdom and the United States, introduced an amendment to delete Paragraph 15 as it was repetitive, taking into account that clauses 5(k), 10(i) and 14(a) covered all the issues addressed in this paragraph.

-
- 766.** The Employer Vice-Chairperson did not support the amendment because there was an important difference between Paragraph 15 and the three clauses mentioned, namely the concept of lifelong learning. People with special needs should have access to training outside the workplace, and the concept of lifelong learning addressed that issue. It was therefore important to maintain that concept.
- 767.** The Government member of Canada pointed out that the amended clause 5(k) included the concept of lifelong learning.
- 768.** The Worker Vice-Chairperson agreed that the key points from Paragraph 15 were covered by other clauses and supported the amendment.
- 769.** The Employer Vice-Chairperson, observing that the substance of Paragraph 15 was indeed included in other parts of the Recommendation, agreed to support the amendment.
- 770.** The Government member of Lebanon also supported the amendment.
- 771.** The amendment was adopted.
- 772.** Section V (previously section VI) was adopted as amended.

Paragraph 12

D.139

- 773.** The Government member of Argentina, speaking also on behalf of the Government members of Brazil, Paraguay and Uruguay, presented an amendment to delete the words “framework for” from the title of the new section VI in order to simplify the proposed Recommendation.
- 774.** The Employer Vice-Chairperson supported the amendment because the important issue in the title was the recognition and certification of skills.
- 775.** The Worker Vice-Chairperson wished to retain the wording to maintain consistency with Paragraphs 12 and 13.
- 776.** The Government members of Canada, Germany, Lebanon, Thailand and the United Kingdom did not support the amendment.
- 777.** The Government member of Argentina withdrew the amendment.

D.160

- 778.** The amendment was not considered.

D.138

- 779.** The Government member of Brazil, speaking on behalf of the Government members of Argentina, Paraguay and Uruguay, presented an amendment to ensure that the Recommendation took into account current trends in the development of regional partnerships.
- 780.** The Employer Vice-Chairperson, noting previous discussions on this issue, indicated that the situation was different in every country. As there were other possibilities than national

and regional, he proposed a subamendment to delete the word “national” from the existing text.

- 781.** The Worker Vice-Chairperson, seeking clarity on what was meant by the word “regional”, drew the attention of the Committee to the fact that the regional level was covered in clause 23(e).
- 782.** The Government member of Brazil explained that, in this case, “regional” referred to a group of countries. The Worker Vice-Chairperson acknowledged that MERCOSUR was advanced in this regard, but this was not the case in other places. As it was already covered in clause 23(e), she did not support the amendment.
- 783.** The Government members of Canada and France feared that the insertion of the word “regional” might be interpreted as a sub-national issue and thus result in obstructing workers’ mobility between regions within a country.
- 784.** The Government members of India, Lebanon, Namibia, Papua New Guinea, and Thailand preferred the original text and did not support the amendment.
- 785.** The Employer Vice-Chairperson noted that the interpretation of the word “regional” by MERCOSUR left room for the kind of developments MERCOSUR was highlighting. He therefore withdrew the subamendment and supported the amendment.
- 786.** The Government member of Brazil clarified that regional partnerships were intended to aid mobility, and withdrew the amendment.

D.111

- 787.** The Employer Vice-Chairperson introduced an amendment to streamline the Recommendation, noting that the word “implementation” included the idea of financing.
- 788.** The Worker Vice-Chairperson did not support the amendment because the assessment, certification and recognition of skills required an explicit commitment of resources. The Government members of Lebanon, Thailand and the United Kingdom concurred.
- 789.** The Employer Vice-Chairperson, acknowledging the views of the Government members, withdrew the amendment.

D.131

- 790.** The Government member of Jamaica, speaking also on behalf of the Government members of Barbados and Trinidad and Tobago, introduced an amendment that deleted reference to the certification of competencies irrespective of where they were acquired or whether they were acquired formally or informally. He then proposed a subamendment to insert the words “against internationally accepted standards” after the word “framework” and the words “knowledge, skills and attitudes” after the words “recognition of”, and to delete the remainder of the text.
- 791.** The Employer Vice-Chairperson opposed the amendment and its subamendment, noting that these changes complicated the text and deleted important aspects concerning how competencies are acquired, particularly those acquired outside educational settings. He then proposed another subamendment, which deleted reference to the words “of the countries” as he thought this might imply limitation to national contexts.

792. The Worker Vice-Chairperson opposed the amendment and subamendment for similar reasons as those expressed by the Employer Vice-Chairperson. Additionally, she questioned how attitudes could be assessed.

793. The Government member of Jamaica, in view of the Employers' and Workers' groups' position, withdrew the amendment.

D.126

794. The Government member of Japan, speaking also on behalf of the Government member of Canada, introduced an amendment to delete the reference to the certification of competencies irrespective of where they were acquired or whether they were acquired formally or informally.

795. The Employer Vice-Chairperson and Worker Vice-Chairperson both opposed the amendment, remarking that essential detail would be lost from the text.

796. The Government member of Saudi Arabia suggested that reference to prior learning and previous experience could also be deleted from the text.

797. The Worker Vice-Chairperson, in response to a request for clarification from the Government member of Japan, recalled the Committee's discussions in 2003 on the importance of the assessment and recognition of prior learning. Many workers might have no formal training, and yet have acquired, during their many years of work experience, specific competencies that could be assessed and certified as equivalent to formal training. There was therefore a need for a system of governance for recognition of prior learning.

798. The Government members of India, Kenya, Namibia, Papua New Guinea and South Africa also opposed the amendment because important concepts would be deleted.

799. The Government member of Australia suggested additional changes and the Government member of Jamaica remarked that an important aspect of the recognition of skills was that it could be assessed in different national contexts.

800. The Government member of Japan, recognizing the lack of support, withdrew the amendment.

D.161

801. The amendment was not considered.

D.137

802. The Government member of Argentina, speaking also on behalf of the Government members of Brazil, Paraguay and Uruguay, introduced an amendment and subamendment to replace the word "fair" with the word "objective".

803. The Employer and Worker Vice-Chairpersons supported the amendment as subamended.

804. The amendment was adopted as subamended.

D.136

- 805.** The Government member of Argentina, speaking also on behalf of the Government members of Brazil, Paraguay and Uruguay, introduced an amendment to replace the word “credible” with the word “reliable” in reference to national qualifications frameworks. She then proposed a subamendment to delete the words “that skills are portable and recognized across enterprises, sectors, industries and educational institutions”, and adding the words “that a reliable system of certification should be in place that is recognized by the social partners”.
- 806.** The Employer Vice-Chairperson opposed the amendment, noting that the recognition of the social partners was already included in Paragraph 12(1) and that much of the necessary detail would be missing.
- 807.** The Worker Vice-Chairperson, while supporting the introduction of the recognition by the social partners, did not support the amendment or the subamendment.
- 808.** The Government member of France did not support the amendment, as the issue of portability of skills would be lost.
- 809.** The Government member of Jamaica, in response to a request for clarification from the Government member of Saudi Arabia, noted that accreditation usually referred to actions of institutions while certification referred to the competencies of individuals.
- 810.** The Government members of Australia, Canada, Kenya, Finland, India, Lebanon, and Thailand opposed the amendment and subamendment.
- 811.** The Government member of Argentina withdrew the amendment but requested that the translation of the word “credible” be referred to the Drafting Committee.
- 812.** The title of section VI, and Paragraph 12, were adopted as amended.

Paragraph 13

D.135

- 813.** The amendment was withdrawn.
- 814.** Paragraph 13 was adopted.

Paragraph 16

D.174

- 815.** As the amendment dealt with the wording of the Spanish text, it was referred to the Drafting Committee.

D.173

- 816.** The amendment was withdrawn.
- 817.** Title VII, and Paragraph 16, were adopted.

Paragraph 17

D.172

- 818.** The Government member of Brazil, speaking also on behalf of the Government members of Argentina, Paraguay and Uruguay, stated that the objective of the amendment was to clarify the text. As presently worded, it implied that the public system did not have any control over ensuring quality, whereas there was quality control throughout the private sector.
- 819.** The Employer Vice-Chairperson responded that the government had the responsibility for the quality of its own systems, but in the private market the government could only promote quality. He added that the Committee explicitly made this distinction in last year's discussion and supported the original text.
- 820.** The Worker Vice-Chairperson expressed concern that the amendment might end up weakening the text and could not support it. The Government member of Switzerland expressed her support for the views of the Workers' group and opposed the amendment. The Government member of Namibia also opposed the amendment.
- 821.** The Government member of Brazil withdrew the amendment, but stressed that governments did have a role to play regarding the private market.
- 822.** Paragraph 17 was adopted.

Paragraph 20

D.190

- 823.** The Worker Vice-Chairperson presented the amendment, stating that it was in line with structural changes previously agreed upon to introduce clarity in the flow of the text. She proposed that the entire Paragraph 20 of the present text be placed under a new title, namely, "Vocational and career information, guidance and training support services".
- 824.** The Employer Vice-Chairperson agreed that career information and guidance were important and should have an independent chapter at this point.
- 825.** The Government member of South Africa supported the amendment. However, she proposed a subamendment so that the title would read, "Professional, vocational and career information, guidance and training support services" because of the sometimes limited interpretation of "vocational".
- 826.** The Government member of Australia proposed a further subamendment with the wording, "Career guidance and training support services", as it was not necessary to include career information, which was generally included in the concept of guidance.
- 827.** The Government member of Kenya proposed a further subamendment for the new title to read "Career guidance, counselling and training support services", because she felt that guidance and counselling go together.
- 828.** The Employer Vice-Chairperson responded that he felt counselling was included in guidance. He added that the Organisation for Economic Co-operation and Development (OECD) and the EC used the term "career guidance". He supported the subamendment presented by Australia.

829. The Worker Vice-Chairperson stated her support for the subamendment presented by the Government member of Australia.

830. The amendment was adopted as subamended.

D.191

831. The Chairperson indicated this was a technical amendment, which was adopted without discussion.

D.163

832. The Employer Vice-Chairperson introduced the amendment to retain the clause in line with the new title of section VIII. He indicated that the substance of the text that he proposed to delete was addressed elsewhere in the text.

833. The Worker Vice-Chairperson agreed that the text should be aligned with the title and proposed a subamendment to add “training support services” after “job search techniques”.

834. The Employer Vice-Chairperson supported the subamendment and the amendment was adopted as subamended.

D.177

835. As a result of the adoption of amendment D.163, as subamended, this amendment was not considered.

D.178

836. The Government member of Trinidad and Tobago, speaking also on behalf of the Government members of Barbados, Guyana and Jamaica, introduced an amendment, explaining that the intent was to give focus to “career” guidance in the clause.

837. The Employer Vice-Chairperson supported the amendment, noting it was in line with the title.

838. The Worker Vice-Chairperson agreed and proposed a subamendment to add the words “and training support services ” after the words “career guidance”.

839. The Employer Vice-Chairperson did not support the subamendment, as the Committee had just agreed to include those same words in the previous clause and also it was not appropriate in the framework of the current clause.

840. The Government member of Australia did not support the subamendment, stating that clause 20(b) had a clear focus that would be lost if subamended as proposed. The Government member of New Zealand agreed.

841. The Government member of Papua New Guinea supported the subamendment, noting that in his country, employment services gave guidance on employment and available training opportunities. The Government member of Finland also supported the subamendment, as there was no clear definition of career guidance in his country. The Government members of Belgium, France, Portugal, South Africa and Sweden concurred.

842. Given the strong support by the Government members, the Employer Vice-Chairperson agreed to include the subamended text.

843. The amendment was adopted as subamended.

D.188

844. The amendment was withdrawn.

D.179

845. The Government member of Trinidad and Tobago, speaking also on behalf of the Government members of Barbados, Guyana and Jamaica, explained that the amendment was proposed to highlight the role of educators in secondary schools, technical and vocational training institutions in providing vocational and career information and guidance.

846. The Employer Vice-Chairperson did not support the amendment, as the clause concerned institutions and organizations, not individuals.

847. The Worker Vice-Chairperson did not support the amendment, indicating it was ambiguous.

848. Since there was no support from the Employer and Worker Vice-Chairpersons, the Government member of Trinidad and Tobago withdrew the amendment.

D.195

849. The Government member of South Africa, speaking on behalf of the African group, presented an amendment to add text in clause 20(d) to reflect the situation in many African countries where information and guidance on entrepreneurship was often fragmented.

850. The Employer Vice-Chairperson agreed that the kind of guidance addressed in the amendment was important, as is coordination, but guidance on entrepreneurship should cover the areas mentioned. For this reason, he did not support the amendment.

851. The Worker Vice-Chairperson indicated that the substance of the amendment was addressed in clause 5(m). Furthermore, the inclusion of the wording proposed would change the complexion of the instrument. Therefore she could not support the amendment.

852. The Government member of South Africa withdrew the amendment.

853. The title of section VIII, and Paragraph 20 was adopted as amended.

Paragraph 16

D.187

854. The Worker Vice-Chairperson introduced an amendment to delete the words “and training support services” from the title of section VIII (now section IX), as the adoption of previous amendments meant that the paragraphs in this section no longer addressed this issue.

855. The Employer Vice-Chairperson supported the amendment.

-
- 856.** The Government member of the United Kingdom proposed a subamendment to reduce the title to “Research” because, in her opinion, it was clear that in a Recommendation on human resources development and training, the research would apply to those areas. The Employer and Worker Vice-Chairpersons did not support the subamendment.
- 857.** Several subamendments were proposed, but no agreement was reached on an appropriate wording of the title. The Government member of France suggested that the Committee revisit the issue once a title for the proposed Recommendation was adopted. The Worker Vice-Chairperson supported the proposal.
- 858.** The Chairperson explained that the Committee could agree that the title of the new section IX would begin with the word “Research” followed by the wording of the new title of the proposed Recommendation, upon its adoption. The Committee agreed.
- 859.** The amendment was adopted subject to the decision of the Committee.

D.194

- 860.** The Government member of South Africa presented an amendment on behalf of the African group, to insert a new paragraph in section IX to address the need for Members to assess what had been achieved, not only in terms of the goals defined in the instrument, but in regard to broader human resources development goals, which all Members were committed to achieving.
- 861.** The Employer Vice-Chairperson recalled that a paragraph on benchmarking was already included in the proposed Recommendation. He agreed there was a need to measure progress, but he did support the inclusion of only two broad targets.
- 862.** The Worker Vice-Chairperson expressed strong support for the amendment for all the reasons given by the Government member of South Africa. It was important to emphasize not only the outcomes, but also how to evaluate their achievement. She proposed a subamendment to replace the words “job creation” by the words “creation of decent jobs”.
- 863.** The Government member of Kenya reiterated the position of the African group on this issue and supported the subamendment proposed by the Worker Vice-Chairperson. The Government members of Canada, Finland, France, Mexico, New Zealand, Papua New Guinea, Poland, Portugal, Saudi Arabia, Switzerland, Trinidad and Tobago, United Kingdom and United States supported the amendment as subamended.
- 864.** The Employer Vice-Chairperson acknowledged the strong support of the Committee members to make explicit reference to only two broad goals. Noting that the use of the words “such as” in the paragraph ensured that it was not an exhaustive list of goals, he supported the amendment as subamended.
- 865.** The amendment was adopted as subamended.

D.175

- 866.** As the amendment addressed a linguistic issue, it was referred to the Drafting Committee.
- 867.** New Paragraph 16 was adopted.

Paragraph 19

D.171

- 868.** The Government member of Brazil, speaking also on behalf of the Government members of Argentina, Paraguay and Uruguay, proposed an amendment to broaden the clause by including other socio-economic categories beyond those of age and gender for information collection.
- 869.** The Employer Vice-Chairperson and Worker Vice-Chairperson supported the amendment, agreeing that the current text was too narrow in focus.
- 870.** The Government member of Greece proposed a subamendment, supported by the Government member of Poland, in which the word “categories” was replaced with the words “target groups”. The Employer Vice-Chairperson opposed the subamendment, as did the Government member of Finland.
- 871.** The Worker Vice-Chairperson proposed a subamendment to delete the word “target” but retain the word “groups”. The Employer Vice-Chairperson and the Government members of Australia, Canada and Greece supported the subamendment.
- 872.** The amendment was adopted as subamended.

D.162

- 873.** The Employer Vice-Chairperson introduced an amendment to more accurately reflect the responsibilities placed on enterprises in the process of data collection.
- 874.** The Worker Vice-Chairperson argued that the amendment set a negative tone to the instrument and, while there were often administrative difficulties in responding to data collection requests, this was adequately reflected by the word “impact”. She also noted that benefits of such data collection accrued not only to governments and workers, but to enterprises as well.
- 875.** The Government members of Canada, France, Germany, Kenya, Switzerland and the United States opposed the amendment.
- 876.** The amendment was withdrawn.

D.176

- 877.** The Government member of Trinidad and Tobago, speaking also on behalf of the Government members of Barbados, Guyana and Jamaica, introduced an amendment to delete the word “skills” from clause 19(c) to reflect the definition of competencies in clause 3(b).
- 878.** The Employer Vice-Chairperson and Worker Vice-Chairperson supported the amendment,
- 879.** The amendment was adopted.

D.168

- 880.** This amendment was not considered.

881. Paragraph 19 was adopted as amended.

Paragraph 21

D.170 and D.189

882. Amendment D.170 was withdrawn by the Government member of Argentina.

883. Amendment D.189 was withdrawn by the Worker Vice-Chairperson.

D.164

884. In light of previous discussions, the Employer Vice-Chairperson withdrew the amendment.

D.180

885. The Government member of Trinidad and Tobago, speaking also on behalf of the Government members of Barbados, Guyana and Jamaica, introduced the amendment by explaining that, consistent with Paragraph 3, the term “competencies” encompassed skills, knowledge and know-how. For this reason, he wished to delete the word “skills,” after the words “demand for”.

886. Given this explanation, the Employer and Worker Vice-Chairpersons supported the amendment.

887. Amendment D.180 was adopted.

D.185

888. The Worker Vice-Chairperson introduced the amendment, proposing a subamendment to replace the words “strategies to overcome different” with the words “identifying and overcoming”, as none of the categories listed mentioned research to identify and overcome barriers. Citing a number of examples of barriers, she stressed the need to understand barriers in order to take full advantage of human resources development opportunities.

889. The Employer Vice-Chairperson stressed that the issue of access to training was highlighted several times in other parts of the proposed Recommendation. He cautioned that if the Committee agreed to include this in the subamendment, other topics would need to be considered.

890. The Government members of Belgium, Canada, Germany, Ireland, Jamaica (on behalf of CARICOM), Morocco, Papua New Guinea, Poland, Sweden, Thailand, United Kingdom and the United States supported the amendment as subamended, stressing the importance of research on this topic.

891. The Employer Vice-Chairperson acknowledged the wide support for the amendment as subamended and agreed to support it.

892. The amendment was adopted as subamended.

D.181

893. The Government member of Trinidad and Tobago, speaking also on behalf of the Government members of Barbados, Guyana and Jamaica, explained that identifying and

overcoming gender bias referred to a broader range of attributes than just skills. He felt that it would be better covered by the word “competencies”. He proposed the amendment to improve the flow of the sentence: after the words “bias in” replace the words “skills assessment” with “the assessment of competencies”.

894. The Employer and Worker Vice-Chairpersons both supported the amendment and the amendment was adopted.

D.169

895. The Government member of Argentina, speaking also on behalf of the Government members of Brazil, Paraguay and Uruguay, introduced the amendment and then proposed subamending it with a new clause after 21(f) to read: “preparation, publication and dissemination of reports and documentation on policies, surveys and available data to promote the social partners’ access to information”. She explained it was important to stress that the results from surveys and studies should be disseminated.

896. The Employer Vice-Chairperson pointed out that it was normal practice to disseminate publicly funded government research and therefore saw no need for the amendment.

897. The Worker Vice-Chairperson stated that she could support the amendment, noting the importance of dissemination. She added that broad dissemination facilitated the contributions of the social partners.

898. The Government member of Australia shared the Employers’ group’s view that research was normally disseminated. Nevertheless, he supported the amendment but proposed a subamendment to delete the words after “data” to add focus.

899. The Government member of Canada supported the amendment as subamended by the Government member of Australia and noted that even though dissemination was standard practice in many countries it was an important issue for other countries. The Government members of Côte d’Ivoire, France, Morocco, Portugal and the United Kingdom concurred. Several noted that often research was undertaken but not disseminated.

900. The Employer Vice-Chairperson responded that although he felt dissemination was standard practice, he could accept the subamendment by Australia.

901. The Worker Vice-Chairperson agreed to the amendment as subamended.

902. As a result, the amendment was adopted as subamended.

903. Paragraph 21 was adopted as amended.

Paragraph 22

D.182

904. The Government member of Trinidad and Tobago, speaking also on behalf of the Government members of Barbados, Guyana and Jamaica, explained that programme management involved a series of activities: planning, implementation and evaluation. Evaluation completed the process of planning and implementation and provided data for future planning.

905. The Employer Vice-Chairperson fully endorsed the amendment, and it was supported by the Worker Vice-Chairperson.

906. The amendment was adopted.

907. Paragraph 22 was adopted as amended.

Paragraph 23

D.165

908. The Employer Vice-Chairperson explained that the amendment was to add a new paragraph before Paragraph 23 dealing with the issue of inward and outward migration. He explained, however, that in consultation with the African group, he wished to subamend D.165 to incorporate D.193. The text would then read as follows:

Members should develop mechanisms that mitigate the adverse impact on developing countries of the loss of skilled people through migration, including strategies to strengthen the human resources development systems in the countries of origin, recognizing that creating enabling conditions for economic growth, investment and human development will have a positive effect on both inward and outward migration of skilled labour.

He explained that this amendment tried to balance the negative and positive effects of migration. He stressed that nurturing economic growth and the conditions necessary for appropriate growth would help to retain workers in their home countries.

909. The Government member of South Africa explained that the African group had submitted amendment D.193 to address the well-recognized problem of brain drain in developing countries. Much focus was put on the idea that people with skills should be able to move freely. But the loss of skilled labour, in which developing countries had invested very scarce resources, was an immense loss to those countries. The purpose of introducing the text was to promote the development of mechanisms that would mitigate the negative impact of brain drain for developing countries.

910. The Worker Vice-Chairperson questioned the use of the words “both inward and outward migration”. In response, the Employer Vice-Chairperson proposed another subamendment to replace the words “both inward and outward migration of” with the word “retaining”.

911. The Worker Vice-Chairperson found that wording much clearer and then proposed another subamendment to replace the word “investment” with the words “creation of decent jobs”. The Employer Vice-Chairperson could accept that addition if the word “investment” was retained.

912. The Worker Vice-Chairperson and the Government member of South Africa agreed to that wording.

913. In response to queries about the introductory sentence to the new paragraph, the Employer Vice-Chairperson proposed a subamendment to insert it as a new clause 21(a). The Worker Vice-Chairperson and the Government member of Canada supported this subamendment.

914. The amendment was adopted as subamended.

D.193

915. This amendment was not considered since the substance had been incorporated into the previous amendment.

D.167

916. The Government member of Brazil, speaking also on behalf of the Government members of Argentina, Paraguay and Uruguay, introduced an amendment to insert the words “solidarity and collective bargaining” after the word “entrepreneurship” in clause 23(c), noting that solidarity was especially important in the promotion of entrepreneurship because many persons formed cooperative organizations for income generation that are based on the principles of solidarity. Collective bargaining was an important value that should be included in employment promotion efforts.

917. While recognizing the importance of issues introduced, the Employer Vice-Chairperson opposed the amendment as it detracted from the main theme of the clause.

918. The Worker Vice-Chairperson also opposed the amendment, noting that the topics introduced were covered elsewhere in the proposed instrument.

919. The amendment was withdrawn.

D.192

920. The Government member of the United Republic of Tanzania, speaking on behalf of the African group, introduced an amendment to insert a reference to include access to international trade as an important factor in promoting entrepreneurship. He then proposed a subamendment to replace the word “including” with the word “facilitating”. He noted that the development of entrepreneurship greatly depended upon access to markets, a significant issue confronting African countries.

921. The Employer Vice-Chairperson, while recognizing the significance of access to international markets, opposed the amendment because it detracted from the main theme of the proposed instrument. The Worker Vice-Chairperson also opposed the amendment, noting that issues related to international trade were included in earlier points and that it was not the principal theme of the clause.

922. The amendment was withdrawn.

D.183

923. The Government member of Trinidad and Tobago, speaking also on behalf of the Government members of Barbados, Guyana and Jamaica, introduced an amendment to delete reference to the word “skills” to keep the wording in line with the definitions in Paragraph 3.

924. The Employer Vice-Chairperson opposed the amendment. While he concurred with the Government member that in many instances the word “skills” had been deleted when used in conjunction with the word “competencies”, in this instance he supported its retention because the word “skills” was more appropriate when referring to systems of recognition.

925. The Worker Vice-Chairperson supported the amendment, referring the Committee to the proposed Recommendation’s definition of competencies, which included skills.

-
- 926.** The Government members of Lebanon, Papua New Guinea and Thailand opposed the amendment.
- 927.** The Government members of Australia, Brazil, Canada, Finland, France, Nigeria, Poland, Switzerland and the United Kingdom supported the amendment.
- 928.** The Employer Vice-Chairperson drew the Committee’s attention to previous references to the recognition of competencies in the proposed instrument that retained the word “skills” when referring to recognition systems.
- 929.** In light of the explanation given, the Government member of Papua New Guinea confirmed his support to retain the word “skills”.
- 930.** On behalf of CARICOM, the Government member of Trinidad and Tobago supported the broader interpretation of the word “skills” as an elaboration of the word “competencies”, and withdrew the amendment.

D.186

- 931.** The Worker Vice-Chairperson introduced the amendment by explaining that the intention was to ensure the development and recognition of skills within the broader context of transferability across countries. However, as reference to “international” was already included elsewhere in the text, she withdrew the amendment.

D.166

- 932.** The Government member of Argentina, speaking also on behalf of the Government members of Brazil, Paraguay and Uruguay, introduced an amendment to replace the words “less advanced” with the word “developing”. She explained that according to the definition used in many international organizations, the term “less advanced countries” covered fewer countries than the term “developing countries”.
- 933.** The Employer Vice-Chairperson could accept either term. He recalled the lengthy discussion the Committee had last year on this point and did not wish to reopen the discussion.
- 934.** The Worker Vice-Chairperson also acknowledged the lengthy discussion last year. She noted that the text referred elsewhere to “developing countries” and supported the amendment.
- 935.** The Government members of India, Indonesia, South Africa (on behalf of the African group) and Trinidad and Tobago (on behalf of CARICOM) supported the amendment.
- 936.** The Employer Vice-Chairperson accepted the term “developing countries” and the amendment was adopted.

D.184

- 937.** The Worker Vice-Chairperson introduced an amendment to insert a new clause after clause 23(f): “explore and apply innovative approaches to provide additional resources for human resources development, in particular mobilizing higher investment in education and training in developing countries through debt relief;”. She emphasized the special significance and importance of the amendment to the Workers’ group. She noted that the main problem facing developing countries was a lack of resources. In many countries,

limited resources were used to service debt, which restricted their ability to invest in education, training and human resources development. She quoted from the ILO publication *Learning and training for work in the knowledge society* (paragraph 16, p. 105) to further describe the situation.

- 938.** Recalling the lengthy discussion on the issue last year, the Employer Vice-Chairperson expressed his group's wish not to reopen the discussion. He stated that the instrument concerned education and training and the issue of debt relief was beyond its scope. He also noted that when there was debt relief, it was up to each national government to decide how it wanted to use the resources freed from debt repayments. For these reasons he could not support the amendment.
- 939.** The Government member of France did not support the amendment, as she believed that the issue of debt relief was beyond the remit of the Committee. The Government members of Canada and Thailand concurred.
- 940.** The Government member of Liberia, speaking on behalf of the African group, emphasized the importance of debt relief and supported the amendment.
- 941.** The Worker Vice-Chairperson explained further that in the context of human resources development, the issue of resources was critical. Developing countries were hampered by a huge debt that restricted their ability to invest in people, therefore debt relief needed to be linked to human resources development.
- 942.** The Government member of Venezuela supported the amendment, noting that the burden of debt was serious and affected human resources development. The Government member of Argentina also supported the amendment, stating that the matter was of vital importance for her country. The Government member of Jamaica pointed out that the resources freed up from debt relief were usually used to invest in priorities areas such as health and education.
- 943.** The Government member of Australia recalled that after the long discussion last year, the Committee had decided that instead of making a specific reference to "debt relief", it would adopt clause 23(f) concerning technical and financial assistance for less advanced countries. He felt that debt relief was beyond the scope of the instrument and did not support the amendment. The Government members of Austria, Ireland, Mexico, Netherlands, New Zealand, Switzerland and the United States concurred.
- 944.** The Government member of Saudi Arabia stated that although his country was a donor country and the issue of a debt relief mechanism was beyond the scope of the Committee, he supported the amendment, as did the Government member of Brazil.
- 945.** The Government member of South Africa proposed a subamendment to insert, after the words "human resources development", the words "in developing countries, including through debt relief for highly indebted poor countries on a case-by-case basis".
- 946.** The Government member of Greece reminded the Committee of the long discussion that had taken place last year and how "technical and financial assistance" was a good formulation. He felt that the issue of debt relief was not appropriate for inclusion in the proposed Recommendation and opposed both the amendment and the subamendment.
- 947.** The Government member of Kenya stated that the issue was how to fund education and training in developing countries. Although debt relief might be beyond the scope of the Committee, she felt that if the problem of debt relief appeared in international instruments,

more attention would be given to finding a solution to the problem. She supported the amendment. The Government member of Namibia expressed his support for the amendment.

- 948.** The Worker Vice-Chairperson drew attention to the first line of section IX, “International and technical cooperation in human resources development and training should”, noting that it did not state, “members should”, but rather “international and technical cooperation should”. She expressed support for the subamendment as proposed by South Africa.
- 949.** The Employer Vice-Chairperson responded that the subamendment removed the reference to mobilizing higher investment in education and training, and that as a result, the clause was even less relevant and he could not support it.
- 950.** The Government member of the United Republic of Tanzania explained that highly indebted poor countries (HIPC) struggled for debt relief and had a choice of how to use funds after relief was obtained. This gave the ILO an opportunity to encourage new expenditures for human resources development.
- 951.** The Government member of Canada proposed a further subamendment to delete the remainder of the proposed text after the words “in developing countries”. She stated that although financial assistance for human resources development was covered in clause 21(f), she could support the proposed clause with the removal of the reference to debt relief.
- 952.** The Worker Vice-Chairperson stated that following informal consultations between members of the Committee, a new formulation had been found to take into account the concerns of developing country governments over their debt burden, as well as of the reluctance of some IMEC Government members to include the words “debt relief” in the text. She proposed a new subamendment: “Taking into account the specific problems of the indebted developing countries, explore and apply innovative approaches to provide additional resources for human resources development”.
- 953.** The Employer Vice-Chairperson supported the new subamendment, as it made clear that the issue was the situation of countries and not debt relief.
- 954.** The Government member of Canada also supported the subamendment, as it addressed the concerns of many Government members of IMEC regarding the amendment.
- 955.** The Government member of South Africa, on behalf of the African group, accepted the new subamendment, as did the Government members of India, Papua New Guinea, Thailand and Trinidad and Tobago, on behalf of CARICOM.
- 956.** The amendment was adopted as subamended.
- 957.** Section IX and Paragraph 23 were adopted as amended.
- 958.** The Chairperson sought the views of members of the Committee on whether or not the proposed Recommendation should replace Recommendation No. 150.
- 959.** The Employer Vice-Chairperson, while aware that some final drafting issues remained, felt the new instrument would be far better than Recommendation No. 150 and therefore should replace it.

-
- 960.** The Worker Vice-Chairperson agreed, noting that the new instrument was more innovative, comprehensive and up to date.
- 961.** The Government members of India, France (on behalf of the IMEC countries), Papua New Guinea and Thailand all expressed the wish for the new instrument to replace Recommendation No. 150.
- 962.** The Chairperson noted it was the consensus of the Committee members to have the new text replace Recommendation No. 150, and that it would be conveyed to the Drafting Committee.

D.45 and D.72

- 963.** The Chairperson recalled that the Committee had agreed at its first sitting to defer discussion on amendments concerning the title of the instrument until it completed work on its contents. The Government member of New Zealand, speaking also on behalf of the Government members of the Czech Republic, France, Malta, Norway, Portugal and Spain, presented amendment D.45, proposing a new title, “Recommendation on Lifelong Learning”, explaining that the proposed Recommendation promoted outcomes and strategic results, and lifelong learning was one of these. The term “lifelong learning” encompassed the concepts of education and training, and was broader than the term “human resources development”. The preamble of the text included lifelong learning concepts, and while the term might have different meanings, it was widely accepted. However, taking into account the amendment submitted by the Government members of the African group, she could also accept to include in the title the words “education and training”. She proposed a subamendment to change the title to “Recommendation on Education, Training and Lifelong Learning”.
- 964.** The Government member of Côte d’Ivoire confirmed that the African group supported the amendment as subamended, and withdrew amendment D.72.
- 965.** The Employer Vice-Chairperson stated that the Employers’ group could accept the amendment as subamended.
- 966.** The Worker Vice-Chairperson stressed that the term “human resources development” had a special meaning for the Workers’ group as it covered more than “education, training and lifelong learning”. She therefore proposed the title “Human Resources Development, Training and Lifelong Learning”.
- 967.** The Government member of Saudi Arabia proposed another subamendment: “Human Resources Development”.
- 968.** The Government member of Australia proposed as a subamendment the title “Human Resources Development – Education, training and lifelong learning”.
- 969.** The Government member of Switzerland seconded the subamendment of the Government member of Saudi Arabia, noting that a brief title was needed to take into account the difficulties in translating the terms into French, and that human resources development was a comprehensive term.
- 970.** The Worker Vice-Chairperson observed that there were some difficulties in the Workers’ group to accepting the words “human resources development” alone, as this had the possibility of implying that workers were factors of production and she therefore supported the subamendment made by the Government member of Australia.

-
- 971.** The Employer Vice-Chairperson proposed that there should be a colon between the words “human resources development” and the remaining text. This proposal was acceptable to the Government member of Australia and to the Worker Vice-Chairperson.
- 972.** Amendment D.45 was adopted as subamended.
- 973.** The title “Human Resources Development: Education, training and lifelong learning” was adopted for the proposed Recommendation.
- 974.** The Chairperson indicated that most instruments had both a long and a short title. He noted that the Recommendation concerning Vocational Guidance and Vocational Training in the Development of Human Resources (No. 150), 1975 also had a short title referenced in its Preamble: “Human Resources Development Recommendation, 1975”.
- 975.** The Employer Vice-Chairperson and Worker Vice-Chairperson both supported “Human Resources Development” as the short title for the new instrument, as did many Government members.
- 976.** The short title of the proposed Recommendation, “Human Resources Development Recommendation, 2004” was adopted.

Adoption of the report and the proposed Recommendation

- 977.** At its 15th sitting, the Committee met to adopt the draft report of its proceedings as well as the proposed Recommendation.
- 978.** The Employer Vice-Chairperson, the Worker Vice-Chairperson and the Government members of Argentina, Barbados, Japan, Morocco, Saudi Arabia, South Africa, Switzerland and Thailand submitted minor changes to the draft report relating to their interventions. Subject to these changes, the report was adopted.
- 979.** The Reporter reminded Committee members that the Drafting Committee was asked to ensure that the title and text of the proposed Recommendation were in conformity. After eight-and-a-half hours, the Drafting Committee had met this objective as well as establish consistency between the English and French texts.
- 980.** The Committee proceeded to adopt the proposed Recommendation, clause by clause and in its entirety.
- 981.** The Chairperson informed the Committee that two amendments to clause 5(f) had been submitted to the Chairperson under article 67 of the Standing Orders. He advised that, after consultations with the Employer and Worker Vice-Chairpersons, he had decided not to table the amendments as there was not consensus support and, therefore, a discussion of the amendments would not be useful.
- 982.** The Employer Vice-Chairperson stated, for the record, that the Employers’ group could adopt clause 5(f) as the formal outcome of the Committee, but there were several problems in the wording. He explained that, since collective bargaining was a voluntary process, social partners, themselves, should decide on the agenda and the level of negotiation. He noted that the Employers’ group wanted to make this clear in clause 5(f), but this was not accepted. The current wording of the clause suggested that governments should strengthen

collective bargaining at all levels – from international to enterprise. For this reason, the Employers’ group found clause 5(f) unacceptable.

- 983.** The Worker Vice-Chairperson stated that she did not want to reopen the debate, but reminded the Committee of the extensive consultations with the Employers’ group and Government members from all regions, undertaken to reach consensus. She explained that the outcome of these consultations was reflected in the proposal of the Government members of France and the United Kingdom, which had not been tabled for discussion. She added that the proposed text addressed the Employers’ concerns by clearly defining the government’s role in, and status of, bargaining. She reiterated her support for the proposed text and requested that it be tabled.
- 984.** The Employer Vice-Chairperson responded that, if it was recognized that the voluntary character of collective bargaining included the social partners’ determination of the level, then this was the wording that should appear in clause 5(f). He pointed out that the text proposed by the Government members of France and the United Kingdom did not address this concern.
- 985.** The Government member of France, speaking also on behalf of the Government member of the United Kingdom and several other IMEC members, explained that their proposal was submitted with the intention of meeting the concerns of the Government members, the Employers’ group and the Workers’ groups. It made it very clear that the role of governments was to support collective bargaining. To ensure flexibility in negotiations in individual countries, the proposal also included a statement to refer to the industrial relations system applicable in each country.
- 986.** The Government member of Finland, commenting on the contributions of the Employer and Worker Vice-Chairpersons, suggested that the concerns might be resolved by adding “on a voluntary basis” in the clause.
- 987.** The Employer Vice-Chairperson reminded the Committee members that they were not considering amendments, as none had been tabled for discussion.
- 988.** The Worker Vice-Chairperson stated that the phrase “support bipartite collective bargaining” clearly meant that governments did not interfere, but provided support and guidance.
- 989.** The Chairperson, in response to the Employer Vice-Chairperson, stated the he was not proposing to open a discussion of amendments, but was giving Government members the opportunity to speak to clause 5(f).
- 990.** The Government member of South Africa explained that during earlier discussions of the Committee, the African group had expressed concern that many countries in Africa could not guarantee training as a right for all its citizens, not because they did not want to, but because they could not afford to. The Committee had emphasized that the “right to training” should be viewed as a goal. In light of this, the African group withdrew one of their amendments, knowing that they would have to address this issue with those who might interpret the right as an entitlement. She expressed concern that the matter of collective bargaining had been seen as a more important issue than that raised by the African group.
- 991.** The Government member of Portugal supported the views of the Government member of France, as did the Government member of Sweden.

-
- 992.** The Employer Vice-Chairperson stated that if the Worker Vice-Chairperson agreed that the level and substance of collective bargaining should be voluntary, then the Committee simply had to agree to include that kind of wording in the clause. The Worker Vice-Chairperson replied that the request of the Employer Vice-Chairperson would mean that one of the social partners would have the power of veto, which was unacceptable in an instrument such as this.
- 993.** The Government member of France expressed deep regret that the clause could not be adopted. She regretted that the Employers' group could not accept the text proposed by the Government members of France and the United Kingdom, particularly since the Workers' group had made great concessions to reach an acceptable text.
- 994.** The Chairperson acknowledged the concern expressed by many Government members that the Government members and the Employer and Worker Vice-Chairpersons could not move forward on this issue. He noted that, despite great efforts to find a solution, agreement could not be reached.
- 995.** The text of the proposed Recommendation was adopted.
- 996.** The Chairperson acknowledged the contributions of all members of the Committee and thanked the Employer and Worker Vice-Chairpersons. He commended the Government members for their active participation, which brought a broader perspective to the discussion and which was now reflected in the Recommendation and thanked the Secretariat and interpreters for their efforts in assisting the Committee's work.
- 997.** The Employer Vice-Chairperson thanked the Chairperson for his leadership and the entire Employers' group for the support throughout the discussions. He expressed regret that disagreement over the wording of clause 5(f) was not resolved.
- 998.** The Worker Vice-Chairperson also thanked the Chairperson for leadership in steering the Committee, the Secretariat for excellent support and guidance and the interpreters for their patience. She was pleased that the Committee had developed a progressive, dynamic and comprehensive instrument that will improve people's lives. In conclusion, she stressed her support for the adopted Recommendation and hoped that all Committee members would do the same.
- 999.** The Chairperson declared closed the work of the Committee on Human Resources of the 92nd Session of the International Labour Conference.

Geneva, 14 June 2004.

(Signed) J. Chetwin,
Chairperson.

A. Murty,
Reporter.

Proposed Recommendation concerning human resources development: Education, training and lifelong learning

The General Conference of the International Labour Organization,

Having been convened at Geneva by the Governing Body of the International Labour Office, and having met in its 92nd Session on 1 June 2004, and

Recognizing that education, training and lifelong learning contribute significantly to promoting the interests of individuals, enterprises, the economy and society as a whole, especially considering the critical challenge of attaining full employment, poverty eradication, social inclusion and sustained economic growth in the global economy, and

Calling on governments, employers and workers to renew their commitment to lifelong learning: governments by investing and creating the conditions to enhance education and training at all levels; enterprises by training their employees; and individuals by making use of the education, training and lifelong learning opportunities, and

Recognizing that education, training and lifelong learning are fundamental and should form an integral part of, and be consistent with, comprehensive economic, fiscal, social and labour market policies and programmes that are important for sustainable economic growth and employment creation and social development, and

Recognizing that many developing countries need support in the design, funding and implementation of appropriate education and training policies to attain human development, economic and employment growth, and poverty eradication, and

Recognizing that education, training and lifelong learning are contributing factors to personal development, access to culture and active citizenship, and

Recalling that the realization of decent work for workers everywhere is a primary objective of the International Labour Organization, and

Noting the rights and principles embodied in the relevant instruments of the International Labour Organization, and in particular:

- (a) the Human Resources Development Convention, 1975; the Employment Policy Convention and Recommendation, 1964; the Employment Policy (Supplementary Provisions) Recommendation, 1984; and the Paid Educational Leave Convention and Recommendation, 1974;
- (b) the ILO Declaration on Fundamental Principles and Rights at Work;
- (c) the Tripartite Declaration of Principles concerning Multinational Enterprises and Social Policy;
- (d) the conclusions concerning human resources training and development, adopted at the 88th Session (2000) of the International Labour Conference, and

Having decided upon the adoption of certain proposals with regard to human resources development and training, which is the fourth item on the agenda of the session, and

Having determined that these proposals shall take the form of a Recommendation;

adopts this ... day of June of the year two thousand and four the following Recommendation, which may be cited as the Human Resources Development Recommendation, 2004.

I. OBJECTIVE, SCOPE AND DEFINITIONS

1. Members should, based on social dialogue, formulate, apply and review national human resources development, education, training and lifelong learning policies which are consistent with economic, fiscal and social policies.

2. For the purpose of this Recommendation:

- (a) the term “lifelong learning” encompasses all learning activities undertaken throughout life for the development of competencies and qualifications;
- (b) the term “competencies” covers the knowledge, skills and know-how applied and mastered in a specific context;
- (c) the term “qualifications” means a formal expression of the vocational or professional abilities of a worker which is recognized at international, national or sectoral levels; and
- (d) the term “employability” relates to portable competencies and qualifications that enhance an individual’s capacity to make use of the education and training opportunities available in order to secure and retain decent work, to progress within the enterprise and between jobs, and to cope with changing technology and labour market conditions.

3. Members should identify human resources development, education, training and lifelong learning policies which:

- (a) facilitate lifelong learning and employability as part of a range of policy measures designed to create decent jobs, as well as to achieve sustainable economic and social development;
- (b) give equal consideration to economic and social objectives, emphasize sustainable economic development in the context of the globalizing economy and the knowledge- and skills-based society, as well as the development of competencies, promotion of decent work, job retention, social development, social inclusion and poverty reduction;
- (c) stress the importance of innovation, competitiveness, productivity and growth of the economy, the creation of decent jobs and the employability of people, considering that innovation creates new employment opportunities and also requires new approaches to education and training to meet the demand for new skills;
- (d) address the challenge of transforming activities in the informal economy into decent work fully integrated into mainstream economic life; policies and programmes should be developed with the aim of creating decent jobs and opportunities for education and training, as well as validating prior learning and skills gained to assist workers and employers to move into the formal economy;

-
- (e) promote and sustain public and private investment in the infrastructure needed for the use of information and communication technology in education and training, as well as in the training of teachers and trainers, using local, national and international collaborative networks;
 - (f) reduce inequality in the participation in education and training.

4. Members should:

- (a) recognize that education and training are a right for all and, in cooperation with the social partners, work towards ensuring access for all to lifelong learning;
- (b) recognize that the realization of lifelong learning should be based on the explicit commitment: by governments by investing and creating the conditions to enhance education and training at all levels; by enterprises in training their employees; and by individuals in developing their competencies and careers.

II. DEVELOPMENT AND IMPLEMENTATION OF EDUCATION AND TRAINING POLICIES

5. Members should:

- (a) define, with the involvement of the social partners, a national strategy for education and training, as well as establish a guiding framework for training policies at national, regional, local, and sectoral and enterprise levels;
- (b) develop supportive social and other policies, and create an economic environment and incentives, to encourage enterprises to invest in education and training, individuals to develop their competencies and careers, and to enable and motivate all to participate in education and training programmes;
- (c) facilitate the development of an education and training delivery system consistent with national conditions and practices;
- (d) assume the primary responsibility for investing in quality education and pre-employment training, recognizing that qualified teachers and trainers working under decent conditions, are of fundamental importance;
- (e) develop a national qualifications framework to facilitate lifelong learning, assist enterprises and employment agencies to match skill demand with supply, guide individuals in their choice of training and career and facilitate the recognition of prior learning and previously acquired skills, competencies and experience; this framework should be responsive to changing technology and trends in the labour market and recognize regional and local differences, without losing transparency at the national level;
- (f) strengthen social dialogue and collective bargaining on training at international, national, regional, local, and sectoral and enterprise levels as a basic principle for systems development, programme relevance, quality and cost-effectiveness;
- (g) promote equal opportunities for women and men in education, training and lifelong learning;
- (h) promote access to education, training and lifelong learning for people with nationally identified special needs, such as youth, low-skilled people, people with disabilities,

migrants, older workers, indigenous people, ethnic minority groups and the socially excluded; and for workers in small and medium-sized enterprises, in the informal economy, in the rural sector and in self-employment;

- (i) provide support to the social partners to enable them to participate in social dialogue on training;
- (j) support and assist individuals through education, training and lifelong learning, and other policies and programmes, to develop and apply entrepreneurial skills to create decent work for themselves and others.

6. (1) Members should establish, maintain and improve a coordinated education and training system within the concept of lifelong learning, taking into account the primary responsibility of government for education and pre-employment training and for training the unemployed, as well as recognizing the role of the social partners in further training, in particular the vital role of employers in providing work experience opportunities.

(2) Education and pre-employment training include compulsory basic education incorporating basic knowledge, literacy and numeracy skills and the appropriate use of information and communication technology.

7. Members should consider benchmarks in relation to comparable countries, regions and sectors when making decisions about investment in education and training.

III. EDUCATION AND PRE-EMPLOYMENT TRAINING

8. Members should:

- (a) recognize their responsibility for education and pre-employment training and, in cooperation with the social partners, improve access for all to enhance employability and to facilitate social inclusion;
- (b) develop approaches for non-formal education and training, especially for adults who were denied education and training opportunities when young;
- (c) encourage the use of new information and communication technology in learning and training, to the extent possible;
- (d) ensure provision of vocational, labour market and career information and guidance and employment counselling, supplemented by information on the rights and obligations of all concerned under labour-related laws and other forms of labour regulation;
- (e) ensure that education and pre-employment training programmes are relevant and that their quality is maintained;
- (f) ensure that vocational education and training systems are developed and strengthened to provide appropriate opportunities for the development and certification of skills relevant to the labour market.

IV. DEVELOPMENT OF COMPETENCIES

9. Members should:

-
- (a) promote, with the involvement of the social partners, the ongoing identification of trends in the competencies needed by individuals, enterprises, the economy and society as a whole;
 - (b) recognize the role of the social partners, enterprises and workers in training;
 - (c) support initiatives by the social partners in the field of training in bipartite dialogue, including collective bargaining;
 - (d) provide positive measures to stimulate investment and participation in training;
 - (e) recognize workplace learning, including formal and non-formal learning, and work experience;
 - (f) promote the expansion of workplace learning and training through:
 - (i) the utilization of high-performance work practices that improve skills;
 - (ii) the organization of on- and off-the-job training with public and private training providers, and making greater use of information and communication technology; and
 - (iii) the use of new forms of learning together with appropriate social policies and measures to facilitate participation in training;
 - (g) urge private and public employers to adopt best practices in human resources development;
 - (h) develop equal opportunity strategies, measures and programmes to promote and implement training for women, as well as for specific groups and economic sectors, and for people with special needs, with the objective of reducing inequalities;
 - (i) promote equal opportunities for, and access to, career guidance and skill upgrading for all workers, as well as support for retraining employees whose jobs are at risk;
 - (j) call upon multinational enterprises to provide training for all levels of their employees in home and host countries, to meet the needs of the enterprises and contribute to the development of the country;
 - (k) promote the development of equitable training policies and opportunities for all public sector employees, recognizing the role of the social partners in this sector;
 - (l) promote supportive policies to enable individuals to balance their work, family and lifelong learning interests.

V. TRAINING FOR DECENT WORK AND SOCIAL INCLUSION

10. Members should recognize:

- (a) the primary responsibility of government for the training of the unemployed, those seeking to enter or re-enter the labour market and people with special needs, to develop and enhance their employability to secure decent work, in the private and public sectors, through such measures as incentives and assistance;

-
- (b) the role of the social partners to support, through human resources development policies and other measures, the integration of the unemployed and people with special needs in jobs;
 - (c) the role of local authorities and communities and other interested parties in implementing programmes for people with special needs.

VI. FRAMEWORK FOR RECOGNITION AND CERTIFICATION OF SKILLS

11. (1) Measures should be adopted, in consultation with the social partners and using a national qualifications framework, to promote the development, implementation and financing of a transparent mechanism for the assessment, certification and recognition of skills, including prior learning and previous experience, irrespective of the countries where they were acquired and whether acquired formally or informally.

(2) Such an assessment methodology should be objective, non-discriminatory and linked to standards.

(3) The national framework should include a credible system of certification which will ensure that skills are portable and recognized across sectors, industries, enterprises and educational institutions.

12. Special provisions should be designed to ensure recognition and certification of skills and qualifications for migrant workers.

VII. TRAINING PROVIDERS

13. Members should, in cooperation with the social partners, promote diversity of training provision to meet the different needs of individuals and enterprises and to ensure high-quality standards, recognition and portability of competencies and qualifications within a national quality assurance framework.

14. Members should:

- (a) develop a framework for the certification of qualifications of training providers;
- (b) identify the roles of government and the social partners in promoting the expansion and diversification of training;
- (c) include quality assurance in the public system and promote its development within the private training market and evaluate the outcomes of education and training;
- (d) develop quality standards for trainers and create the opportunities for trainers to meet such standards.

VIII. CAREER GUIDANCE AND TRAINING SUPPORT SERVICES

15. Members should:

- (a) assure and facilitate, throughout an individual's life, participation in, and access to, vocational and career information and guidance, job placement services and job search techniques and training support services;

-
- (b) promote and facilitate the use of information and communication technology, as well as traditional best practices in career information and guidance and training support services;
 - (c) identify, in consultation with the social partners, roles and responsibilities of employment services, training providers and other relevant service providers with respect to vocational and career information and guidance;
 - (d) provide information and guidance on entrepreneurship, promote entrepreneurial skills, and raise awareness among educators and trainers of the important role of enterprises, among others, in creating growth and decent jobs.

IX. RESEARCH IN HUMAN RESOURCES DEVELOPMENT, EDUCATION, TRAINING AND LIFELONG LEARNING

16. Members should evaluate the impact of their education, training and lifelong learning policies on the progress made towards achieving broader human development goals such as the creation of decent jobs and poverty eradication.

17. Members should develop their national capacity, as well as facilitate and assist in developing that of the social partners, to analyse trends in labour markets and human resources development and training.

18. Members should:

- (a) collect information, disaggregated by gender, age, and other specific socio-economic characteristics, on educational levels, qualifications, training activities, and employment and incomes, especially when organizing regular surveys of the population, so that trends can be established and comparative analysis undertaken to guide policy development;
- (b) establish databases and quantitative and qualitative indicators, disaggregated by gender, age and other characteristics, on the national training system and gather data on training in the private sector, taking into account the impact of data collection on enterprises;
- (c) collect information on competencies and emerging trends in the labour market from a variety of sources, including longitudinal studies, and not confined to traditional occupational classifications.

19. Members should, in consultation with the social partners, and taking into account the impact of data collection on enterprises, support and facilitate research on human resources development and training, which could include:

- (a) learning and training methodologies, including the use of information and communication technology in training;
- (b) skills recognition and qualifications frameworks;
- (c) policies, strategies and frameworks for human resources development and training;
- (d) investment in training, as well as the effectiveness and impact of training;
- (e) identifying, measuring and forecasting the trends in supply and demand for competencies and qualifications in the labour market;

-
- (f) identifying and overcoming barriers to accessing training and education;
 - (g) identifying and overcoming gender bias in the assessment of competencies;
 - (h) preparing, publishing and disseminating reports and documentation on policies, surveys and available data.

20. Members should use the information obtained through research to guide planning, implementation and evaluation of programmes.

X. INTERNATIONAL AND TECHNICAL COOPERATION

21. International and technical cooperation in human resources development, education, training and lifelong learning should:

- (a) develop mechanisms that mitigate the adverse impact on developing countries of the loss of skilled people through migration, including strategies to strengthen the human resources development systems in the countries of origin, recognizing that creating enabling conditions for economic growth, investment, creation of decent jobs and human development will have a positive effect on retaining skilled labour;
- (b) promote greater opportunities for women and men to obtain decent work;
- (c) promote national capacity building to reform and develop training policies and programmes, including developing the capacity for social dialogue and partnership building in training;
- (d) promote the development of entrepreneurship and decent employment and share experiences on international best practices;
- (e) strengthen the capacity of the social partners to contribute to dynamic lifelong learning policies, in particular in relation to the new dimensions of regional economic integration, migration and the emerging multicultural society;
- (f) promote recognition and portability of skills, competencies and qualifications nationally and internationally;
- (g) increase technical and financial assistance for developing countries and promote, at the level of the international financial institutions and funding agencies, coherent policies and programmes which place education, training and lifelong learning at the centre of development policies;
- (h) taking into account the specific problems of the indebted developing countries, explore and apply innovative approaches to provide additional resources for human resources development;
- (i) promote cooperation between and among governments, the social partners, the private sector and international organizations on all other issues and strategies encompassed in this instrument.

XI. FINAL PROVISION

22. The present Recommendation revises and replaces the Human Resources Development Recommendation, 1975.

CONTENTS

	<i>Page</i>
<i>Fourth item on the agenda: Human resources development and training – Revision of the Human Resources Development Recommendation, 1975 (No. 150) (standard setting, second discussion)</i>	
Report of the Committee on Human Resources.....	1
Proposed Recommendation concerning human resources development: Education, training and lifelong learning	91