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**TUDCN ADVOCACY STRATEGY 2013-2014**

Assessing the challenges for a new development model

**The purpose of this document is to be the starting point for comprehensive approach to the trade union advocacy strategy on Development Policies.**

**In this document we will look at the different aspects of the development cooperation architecture, the instruments, the players and the terms of engagement for the Trade Unions and how to organise.**

* **We will look at the WHAT of the policies, the objectives and definitions: this mainly involves the UN system and is the focus of the UN+2015 debate and the sustainable development goals. It also looks at the architecture of development.**
* **The post Busan Global Partnership for Effective Development Cooperation is looking, following the Paris Declaration and the Accra Agenda for Action at the HOW development cooperation is implemented.**
* **Special attention will be given to the EU development policies; the EU being the biggest player on the development scene in terms of resources and one of the most influential partners in the international policy debates.**
* **A particular focus is given also on the OECD/DAC as the meeting place of the development cooperation agencies. Through its evaluation and sharing practices on ODA, the DAC has a strong influence, from the practitioner’s point of view, on the development debates.**
* **Finally we propose a number of areas of engagement for the Trade Union movement, at global, but also at regional and national level. The strength of our network is to be able to make synergy work at all levels and to engage together in advocacy and policy setting. We also look into alliances with Civil Society Organisations and our special relation and interaction with the International Labour Organisation.**

## OUR ADVOCACY MISSION ON DEVELOPMENT POLICIES

## *Promoting the decent work agenda remains the main objective of our trade union input into the development policy debate, because the Decent Work agenda is a cornerstone for sustainable development and recovery strategies.*

* It is rights based and not an assistential policy
* It is focussing on jobs creation and favouring full productive and freely chosen employment in a green economy perspective
* It favours security at social level, including social protection floors that should lift people out of poverty and give them a rights based instrument to improve their livelihood and of their families
* It is based on a broad social dialogue approach, implying the key actors in economic and labour market areas, to negotiate, pilot and mitigate risks on questions of economic, labour market and social policies but also on good governance, fiscal policies and development, and other relevant areas.

The decent work agenda responds to the basic demands in the development policy area:

* Rights based approaches because they are the only way of ensuring democratic ownership
* Inclusive economic growth and risk mitigation
* Supporting effective institutions that actively involve the citizenship concerned
* Democratic ownership through stakeholders dialogues
* Resilience and redistribution policies that combat inequalities and promote fair development chances including use of country systems

At international and regional level, it is imperative that social partners are recognised as actors in their own right. Where private sector or business has now open doors in all development quarters, the trade union movement is relegated as “a civil society organisation” amongst others, reducing its brief and mandate as a social partner as key constituent of the ILO and as the major representative and member based social movement in the vast majority of countries of the world. Where politics, including development policies have failed to bring change about, throughout history, including the recent Arab Spring, the trade union movement very often was at the forefront of the movements of change. Our seat at the table is not a mere symbol of tolerance and openness, it is also an element to bring into the debate at the right time, one of the essential elements of change and democratic representation of the work force as a driving factor of development.

OUR KEY ASKS are based on the key elements of the DWA and the recognition of the unions as actors in development in their own right.

1. Development strategies should be **based on and accountable for respecting the universally agreed Human Rights (including labour rights, women’s rights, environmental rights etc…).**

Development paradigms should not be mere assistential and should not supplant these internationally agreed rights frameworks. This implies as a prerequisite the *recognition of freedom of association (FoA – ILO C87 & C98)) of independent and free trade unions, alike FoA, of assembly and freedom of speech, as well as an enabling environment for civil society organisations* as part and parcel of the democratic ownership and accountability requirements in development. A (H)RBA implies an approach that is accountable on behalf of all stakeholders that allows for check and balances and for assessment of commitments on an independent and enforceable way.

1. Economic development strategies should be based on creating **Green jobs, full employment and freely chosen employment** as an alternative to profit maximization and jobless and high-carbon economic growth. This also includes fair fiscal policies and regulation of financial markets; use of country systems and development-fair procurement rules; the building of effective institutions; industrial policies to support transition to the green economy and development-fair trade relations.
2. **Social protection floors and redistribution policies** that allow for rights based development opportunities for all, as embedded in the ILO Convention 102 (and recommendation 202).
3. **Recognition** by all development partners of the role **of trade unions as development actors and as social partners in their own right**. This is the prerequisite for a meaningful and **effective social dialogue**, in line with the ILO principles and conventions. Social dialogue, bringing around the table the key players of economic and social development, should be recognised as a core instrument for democratic ownership and for the multi-stakeholder dialogue on countries’ development objectives and strategies. Similarly, the GPEDC and other international development frameworks should include trade unions as social partners and actors in their own right.
4. All this should amend the international development frameworks, architecture and its governance and support the overall demands of the development community for an **accountable, standards based system that has an effective and independent supervisory mechanism and is based on a truly multi-stakeholder approach**, away from the outlived intergovernmental frameworks that failed to bring justice in development.

## EXPECTED OUTCOMES in the post Busan/pre 2015 era. (2013-2014)

* Consolidated and approved trade union position papers on the post +2015 framework and development goals, and on the regional (EU …) policies.
* Trade unions are actively involved in the preparation, decision making and follow up structures of the 2015 process.
* The post 2015 framework recognises and integrates the trade union positions on decent work, social protection and the enabling environment for sustainable development
* The relevant development cooperation organisations and policy frameworks at national, regional and international level recognise trade unions as social partners and development partners in their own right and promoting social and labour market policy dialogue as core developmental instruments.

Areas of involvement

# AT INTERNATIONAL LEVEL

* A key achievement and challenge of the Busan/Global Partnership, besides the involvement of many new development partners, countries (China, Brazil, India, …) and other actors (private sector, foundations, CSO, …), has been the understanding that **development results are at the crossroads of international and domestic policies and practices.**
* This calls upon us also to **better ensure effective interaction between our global and regional advocacy efforts and the efforts we can and should deploy at national level**, both in the donor countries but especially also in the “partner” developing countries.
* The main challenge here is to bring in, very often with short timelines, delegates and voices from the developing countries. An improved and proactive network setup in the regions can contribute to this challenge (see also below: at **regional and national level**).
* **Documentation and information system**: the TUDCN has developed a fairly extensive reference database that includes the main background documents to development debates. An important challenge however remains the **intelligence on national positions**, both for creating alliances and recognising obstacles to our demands.
* Cross cutting approaches and synergies have to be development with knowledgeable actors in the TU family on development related areas (eg. institutional inputs on Trade and development, IFI policies, G20 etc and/or sectorial concerns on education, public and private services, health …). **Task Teams and ad hoc consultations should be put into place** so as to be able to react proactively to the agenda’s, especially concerning the growing private sector involvement in development.
1. **THE UN +2015 AND SUSTAINABLE DEVELOPMENT GOALS**

The UN has launched a broad debate on the future development framework: the +2015 debate. The purpose is to review the objectives of the development policies and in particular to review the Millennium Development Goals, that expire in 2015 and to promote a new development framework that should fix the sustainable development goals of the next generation.

The Trade Union movement has been involved in the Rio+20 debates as well as in the work of the High Level Panel of Eminent Persons that will present its report to the UN SG for further discussion by the UN GA as from September 2013. The Trade Unions and Workers as one of the major groups in the UN system will bring forward its priorities and mobilise its members following the negotiation calendar and challenges. The TU movement is currently discussion with the ILO to find grounds for its further strategy and will set up a task team to steer coordinate further initiatives

 *Creation of a TU Task Team and define the mobilisation and advocacy campaign around the new development framework by 2015*

1. **THE BUSAN GLOBAL PARTNERSHIP FOR EFFECTIVE DEVELOPMENT COOPERATION**
	1. **The CSO Partnership for Development Effectiveness platform:**
	2. Coordinates all CSO positions and strategies towards the GPEDC.
	3. Is our only access to the GPEDC at the moment (refusal of a TU seat)
	4. 8 seats for TU participation in General Council (7 regions + 1 global)
	5. By default seat in the Coordinating Committee
	6. **3 CSO led working groups**
2. CSO Environment (ITUC member)
3. CSO Development Effectiveness (ITUC member)
4. Human Rights Based Approaches (ITUC member and lead)

*REPRESENTATION by TU experts from each REGIONS and/or GUF*

* *In GC and especially for the 3 working groups.*
* *Support group for HRBA work as key area of work (also for UN2015 debates)*
	1. **The Global Partnership for Effective Development Cooperation**
1. Is the follow up structure from Busan
2. Has a ministerial meetings dynamic (every 12 to 18 months)
3. Has a “multi-stakeholder” Steering Committee, ***without trade unions,*** including donor and “partner” governments, emerging economies =new donors, foundations, private sector, CSO, …
4. Sets the strategic objectives and ways forward in-between ministerial sessions.
5. Has unclear working structures with building blocks, work strands, …

*Representation of TU in our own right need to be ensured through lobbying key players at national level (donor governments and partner governments, OECD DAC etc.. ). An* ***online interest group*** *will be formed for those interested in the overall process and wanting to take action at national level.*

A number of working structures of the GPEDC could be of interest to the trade union.

* 1. **GPDE “Building Blocks”**
1. **Platform for effective institutions:** is probably the most successful exercise in the attempt to make the GPEDC relevant for development strategies in country. It is led by Ghana and the USAID. It does tackle issues that are relevant for good governance, public management and institutional settings. In this respect the issue of economic and social governance and of social dialogue are key issues for us to bring to the table. Some of the subareas of work are highly technical and would need specialised TU input (PSI …).

*A* ***shadow task team*** *within the TUDCN could monitor the work of that group and ensure representation, especially for trade unions, from “partner” countries.*

1. **Private/Public Cooperation**: a “private sector” building block was set up based on a unilateral approach by business and donor governments. The setup of the group and its internal ruling, conflicts with all prerequisites of the multi-stakeholder approach under the GPEDC. The group is clearly focused on northern private sector interests and the development relevance of their agenda is unclear.

*Based on the PS research, a task team within the TUDCN could come up with an alternative approach that is more inclusive and more focused on development result GPEDC.*

1. **Results Based Management**. This is a very closed shop around a strong donor driven agenda. Non-governmental partners are side-lined to date in the work of this group. DFID (UK)coordinates; German government and Uganda are co-leading.
2. **South-South and Trilateral Cooperation**: was recognised as a potential interesting policy issue and served to accommodate new players (China, Brazil, …). However the group is not coherent, and interests are divided. We cooperated in the CSO effort to map CSO experiences on SSC. However on the longer run, it is not clear what the commitment to this group is by governmental partners neither is it clear if, besides the timely and strategic interest on the theme in Busan, there is a real policy matter at stake.

*Kjeld (TUCA) was monitoring this area of work in cooperation with the secretariat. A more in-depth analysis is needed inside the TUDCN and with other partners*

* 1. **The Multi-stakeholder Task Team on CSO development effectiveness**
1. Is the “unofficial” building bloc on CSO related matters
2. We have been granted membership based on our previous experience and our inputs on content (TU principles and TUDEP; FoA, …)
3. It is a good/direct/only meeting place with governmental reps in charge of national CSO policies, especially in donor countries.

*Secretariat to follow up as member of the TT; online interest group could be created within the TUDCN to monitor CSO policies at national level and their interaction at European and international level. Where appropriate, questions could be raised in the OECD DAC.*

1. **THE OECD/DAC AND ITS SUBSIDIARIES**

The OECD/DAC mainly functions as a meeting place and strategic consultation amongst the donor countries (OECD+) recently new “donors” have been admitted and there is the will to open up in a more structured way to “partner” countries and to other stakeholders (TUAC and BIAC as well as some foundations and CSOs are “invited”). This would make it, at least in composition, a duplication of the GPEDC)

In the light of the work that has been achieved, we can now consolidate our relationship with the OECD/DAC, the DAC representatives (Agencies) and the OECD/Development Cooperation Centre.

*To that end and to create a permanent dialogue between the OECD Development “leg” and the Trade Union Development Cooperation Network through* ***an annual OECD/DAC/DCD – TUDCN/TUAC Forum*** *with the aim to discuss issues of mutual interest and to strengthen potential cooperation around issues of common interest.*

* 1. **The Senior level and Ministerial DAC meetings:**
	2. Are decision-making meetings with heads of agencies or ministers. They set the main lines of follow up and prepare for influencing other development policy meetings (DAC was instrumental to the MDG’s at the end of the 90ies).
	3. Since 20112 we are “invited” as TUAC, using our OECD status, together with BIAC on an ad-hoc basis (hopefully permanently) but are not (yet) members in our own right.
	4. The main interest lays in the subsidiaries and the monitoring (peer reviews) and research that is carried out and sometimes functions as standard setting for the national policies.

*An* ***online interest group*** *will be formed for those interested in the overall process and wanting to take action at national level. Representation of TU in our own right need to be secured on the longer term, through lobbying key players at national level.*

* 1. **Working groups:**
1. The DAC has a number of working groups, from technical to more political that are of interest to us. Some of the work that is done is very much related to similar work done at the OECD level (work on taxation and evasion of capital; statistics; ….). Not all is of interest and not all can be monitored, let alone followed up.
2. **GOVNET:** is looking at governance issues in development. This is the place where accountability and transparency are discussed; democratic ownership has come high on the agenda as well as other related questions.

*The support group on HRBA (see above CPDE) could also usefully follow up this working group, given that the subjects and the players are largely the same.*

1. **GENDERNET:** this was in the past the place to be to discuss gender policy in the development strategies. In the past national organisations followed up GENDERNET.

*If there is an interest,* ***one of the members could represent us there****, and we could create an* ***interest/support group*** *with people working on the gender issues in development amongst the TUDCN members.*

1. **The Development Cooperation Directorate** supports the DAC and is an OECD institution that is implementing Research and works with specialised groups, on a broad variety of subjects related to development : aid for trade; private sector; taxation; fighting corruption; evaluation and methodologies; empowerment and poverty reduction; capacity development; etc…In general the work of the DCD is more progressive and open minded than the DAC policy settings, but less of the “real world” when it comes to implementation.

The liaison office and secretariat will keep you posted on initiatives, studies and research trough the Newsletter and call for participation by interested members in conferences, consultations or other initiatives form the DCD-DAC on an ad-hoc basis.

1. **THE UN AND THE DEVELOPMENT COOPERATION FORUM**

The UN has a variety of development cooperation bodies and instances. We have lost an important source of intelligence, know-how and influence after the closure of the representation office in NY. We are looking at how we can, in cooperation with the Paris liaison office, cope with the need to have a more direct presence and interaction with the UN based development cooperation policy setting. The most important priority here is of course the discussion on the post 2015 development framework and the sustainable development goals after the Rio+ process.

* 1. **The biennial high-level Development Cooperation Forum (DCF)**
* Is one of the principal new functions of a strengthened Economic and Social Council (ECOSOC).  It was [mandated](http://www.un.org/en/ecosoc/newfunct/mandate.shtml) by the 2005 World Summit. ECOSOC convened the [first biennial DCF](http://www.un.org/en/ecosoc/newfunct/2008dcf.shtml) in July 2008 to review trends and progress in international development cooperation and promote greater coherence among the development activities of different development partners.
* Is in many ways a duplication of the GPEDC. The latter being OECD/DAC “grounded”/”founded” (as a more “effective” and workable alternative to the “ineffective” UN structures) the UNDCF claims rightly so, a more legitimate UN embedding that the “donor-led” OECD DAC initiatives.
* Most of the issues discussed here are therefore very much the same as in the GPEDC and/or the DAC. The UNDCF has an interesting “networking” function, but in the current system no influence on standard setting or policy decision making in practical terms.
* Regularly “thematic” high level symposia are organised to which we are invited as trade unions.
* We could also take up a place in the Advisory Board as one of the entry points for the broader UN development cooperation settings.

*We have to evaluate the future of the UNDCF with regard to the new UN related post 2015 development framework, as well as the further development of the GPEDC in this respect. Participation can be useful for bringing our messages to an interested forum and support networking although not crucial for policy setting at this point. We can keep a finger on the pulse through the liaison officer.*

* On a broader perspective we should re-evaluate our position with the UNDP. This is a major in-country operator and we have not yet developed workable relations beyond the occasional participation in the yearly meeting of the “Advisory Board”.
* Generally speaking, we do experience in the debates around 2015 that we have lost momentum and intelligence with the UN System in general since 2010.

*The discussion on Post 2015 also reminds us of the importance of improving our intelligence gathering and networking presence towards the UN system in general.*

1. **EU ADVOCACY**

The EU has a double importance for the development cooperation strategy:

* Because of its own foreign policy and external relations, including its coordination function with the EU member states
* Because of its own development cooperation policy and its representation in international fora (OEDC/DAC, Busan, G20…)

An active cooperation on EU matters is put in place with the ETUC in the different areas of concern.

Our main involvement came through the Structural Dialogue on Development the EU Commission organised two years ago in order to establish a dialogue with Civil Society and the evaluate its relationships and cooperation in the field of support for civil society in the south (Development Cooperation Instrument and programme on Non State Actors). Also on other policies discussions took place, such as the European Instrument for Democracy and Human Rights; -the Investing in People programme and other ad hoc initiatives.

Today the following areas could have a special interest for further engagement:

1. The Policy Forum on Development
2. Democracy and Human Rights
3. Investing in People, with emphasis on Social Dialogue and Social Protection in development
4. Development Education
5. Policy coordination issues
	* Aid for Trade
	* UN +2015 (sustainable development)
	* Global Partnership (Busan)
	1. **Policy Forum on Development (PFD)**[[1]](#footnote-1)
* MANDATE: The overarching goal of the Policy Forum on Development (PFD) is
	+ to offer CSOs and LAs from the EU and partner countries, as well as European institutions, a multi-stakeholder space for dialogue on development issues at EU Headquarters level….
	+ The PFD will primarily focus on European development policies, as well as global development agendas, building on the momentum gained by current debates and discussions on the global architecture for international aid.
* STRUCTURE: The PFD is composed of the main civil society actors at European and global level and include an ample representation of the South. The trade unions are recognised as one of the main sectors and have an integrated representation through the TUDCN/ITUC:
	+ Africa: 2 seats (in cooperation with ITUC Africa)
	+ AL/C: 2 seats (in cooperation with TUCA)
	+ A-P 1 seat (in cooperation with ITUC A-P)
	+ ENR: 1 seat (in cooperation with PERC)
	+ EU: 2 seats (in cooperation with ETUC/ITUC)
	+ Global: 1 seat (TUDCN/ITUC).
* The PFD will meet twice a year
* A working group (15 selected persons) will facilitate the organisation of the meetings.
* 1 co-chair representing civil society organisations and local authorities.

The next PFD meeting will take place in Brussels on June 17-18.

For more background see annex on Composition and working methods of the PFD.[[2]](#footnote-2)

*The GM should discuss the engagement in the PFD and the representation by the various continents and groups. Synergies should/could be envisaged with the CPDE General Council Meetings as well as the TUDCN General Meetings in order to facilitate participation and lightening the agenda’s.*

* 1. **Democracy and Human Rights**

We have been following this working area from a distance although the commission has repeatedly expressed interest in associating the trade union movement to this working area and various member organisations do have programmes under the EIDHR.

*We seek opinion and proposals from the General Meeting on the TUDCN involvement in this area*

* 1. **Investing in People, with emphasis on Social Dialogue and Social Protection in development**

The commission took the initiative, following insistent lobbying by ITUC, ETUC and ILO to promote social dialogue in development as well as social protection. Both are central issues to our development agenda and the Decent Work Agenda in general. However the dialogue with the commission is ad-hoc and unpredictable as are the possible ways in which the commission proposes to implement the actions around these working areas.

*We propose to set up, in cooperation with the employers’ organisations (Business Europa and IOE) and in collaboration with the ILO-Brussels Office, a STRUCTURED DIALOGUE formula so as to engage on a permanent basis and to be able to build on agreed progress and implementation strategies. The joint EU Working group TUDCN/ETUC could give follow up and set up eventually an ad-hoc task team with the interested partners.*

* 1. **Development Education**

Following the successful seminar on DE in Vienna, there could be an interest from TUDCN members to give follow up to this area and see how we can get better involved in the work that is done at EU level by the organisations having DE programmes.

*We propose to create an on-line task team that can give follow up to the European initiatives concerning development Education (DEAR: Development Education and Awareness Raising)[[3]](#footnote-3).*

* 1. **Policy coordination issues**

These issues are given follow up in cooperation with the ETUC in the EU WG and in other relevant WG or initiatives that are organised in cooperation.

*EU WG is recomposed and members will be involved in online consultations and advocacy initiatives towards the EU institutions.*

# Summary table of proposed WG and commitments for international advocacy

|  |
| --- |
| ***TUDCN advocacy working groups*** |
| ***Private/Public cooperation***  | *WG/Shadow Task Team* | *Online/permanent* | *Interested organisations GUFs* |
| ***UN post-2015*** | *TU Task Team with ILO/ACTRAV* | *Online/permanent* | *Interested organisations and selected participants* |
| ***Effective Institutions*** | *Task Team + seminar (tbd)* | *Online/permanent* | *Interested organisations from the continents* |
| ***National Donor policies*** | *OECD/DAC + EU MS + TT on CSO Effectiveness*  | *Online interest group* | *Interested organisations from donor countries* |

|  |
| --- |
| ***Global and institutional representation*** |
|  |  |  |  |
| ***CSO Platform for Development Effectiveness (CPDE)+GPEDC*** | *Global Council* | *1 or 2 meetings a year; b2b with EU PFD* | *Regions/GUF + ITUC/TUDCN/TUAC* |
| *WG on Development Effectiveness* | *Online interest group + 1 lead* | *Interested organisation* |
| *WG on Enabling Environment* | *Online interest group + 1 lead* | *Interested organisation* |
| *HRBA* | *Online interest group + 1 lead* | *Secretariat in representation* |
| *South-South Cooperation* | *Online interest group + 1 lead* | *TUCA in lead* |
| *Effective Institutions* | *Online interest group + 1 lead* | *Preference Africa* |
| ***OECD DAC*** | *ANNUAL FORUM OECD/DAC/DCD – TUDCN/TUAC* |  |
| *Senior and high level meetings* | *TUAC/ITUC in lead* |  |
| *GOVNET (HRBA and Democr Own)* | *TUAC/ITUC in lead* | *+ interested organisations* |
| *GENDERNET* | *1 lead organisations* | *+online interest group* |
| ***UN*** | *UNDCF* | *Ad hoc leads* |  |
| *UNDP*  |  |  |
| *Others UN ECOSOC/ GA /* | *Liaison Officer* | *To be discussed* |
| ***EU*** | *EU working group* | *Interested organisations* | *In cooperation with ETUC* |
| *PFD* | *1 or 2 meetings a year; b2b with CPDE GC* | *TU Delegation regions/GUF + ITUC/TUDCN* |
| *DEAR* | *Online interest group + 1 lead* |  |
| *Policy Coordination* | *ETUC/ITUC/TUDCN* |  |

# AT REGIONAL LEVEL AND TOWARDS THE NATIONAL LEVEL

**Regional networks**

The real development impact is felt at local level. National policy setting is a key strategic element in our efforts to influence decisions in favour of a more social and sustainable development model. The interaction between the national (sub)regional and international level is crucial for the effectiveness of our advocacy at all the levels.

The consolidation of the networking in the regions is therefore a key challenge for the achievement of our advocacy objectives. It is also an important step in the internationalisation of the trade union movement and its policies and should allow us to bring the voice of the developing country unions to the regional and international fora.

Reinforcing regional cooperation and involvement of local unions in development cooperation policy decisions, is also a new and potentially important objective for TU development cooperation per se. The support for unions to engage in policy dialogue and the potential of the use of social dialogue to discuss labour market and socio-economic strategies for development should also attract SSO and other partners, beyond the borders of the current programme, to support the efforts to strengthen regional cooperation. The current incentives to regional cooperation from the TUDCN could than effectively be used as a catalyst for more important programmes and more significant impact through broader partner cooperation.

The evolutions have been quite different from continent to continent, and rightly so, given the very different realities, also when it comes to development cooperation, be it official or trade union based.

The following reflections and proposals are to kick start the debate and should give us a common understanding about the way forward as a global network. Concrete suggestions and plans will of course have to be elaborated by the regions and the affiliates and implemented in dialogue with the TUDCN on the one hand and potentially other bi- or multilateral support organisations on the other hand.

**AMERICA LATINA**

Since 3 years, a regional network has been developed in the Americas (Red Sindical de Cooperacion al Desarrollo de las Americas -RSCDA[[4]](#footnote-4)) based on a number of needs and objectives:

* Information and training in programme management
* Information and positioning on regional dimensions of international development policies
* Thematic seminars (South South)
* Coordination of national affiliates and the annual meeting with the SSO’s
* Support and backup for the Development Institute of the Americas

This has resulted in a network that has been approved and “officialised” by the 2nd TUCA congress in its resolution 11 on development cooperation.

For 2013-2014 the following elements can be taken into a regional action plan

* Clarification of different objectives and outcomes
	+ Resolution 11 of the 2nd TUCA Congress
	+ Programme management (PME, Logical Frameworks, … )
	+ Coordination with SSO’s at regional and national level
	+ Regional dimension of international, multilateral and bilateral development policies
	+ Backing up and support of the Development Institute of the Americas

*These objectives, whilst relevant for all organisations, do not necessarily involve the same responsibles within each organisation.*

* Outline an action plan for the region: network meetings and regional seminar; sub-regional initiatives when appropriate and possible;
* Establish the online communication and networking tools
* Improve governance by setting up a coordination group to prepare and follow up the work in between meetings of the Red.
* Regional and sub-regional representation in development debates with governments and CSOs
* International representation in cooperation with the TUDCN (CPDE / PFD / delegations)
* Participation in online and other working groups within the TUDCN and the RSCDA

**AFRICA:**

One regional consultation initiative took place in 2012 in the framework of the CPDE consultations.

For 2013-2014, alike the Americas, Africa has the potential to develop a strong presence on development policy work at regional, subregional and national level.

It is foreseen to submit the formal setup of the regional network to the ITUC Africa General Council in the fall 2013. In the meanwhile priorities could be

* To clarify objectives and outcomes:
	+ There is an spoken need for support in programme/project management
	+ Advocacy on development by unions can potentially have a strong impact on African governments and decisions makers
	+ A more forceful engagement with the African Union and other institutions has not been effective so far.
	+ The balance has to been found between the regional and subregional level, given the importance of subregional decision making and developmental impacts.
	+ The past experience of having the network meeting back to back with the SSO meeting for Africa was positive. Further effectiveness of this integration should be striven for so as to deepen between the SSO and the affiliates
* An action plan including thematic seminar, regional and sub-regional initiatives should be drawn up and
* Given the potential of the African continent in terms of sub regional specificities and the great number of potentially interested affiliates, special efforts will have to be made to support the organisation of the network on the continent.
* A working group could therefore, with the support of the TUDCN, start off the planning exercise and organise some initial events as well as ensure African representation towards regional and global institutions and platforms.

**ASIA-PACIFIC**

The A-P region has specific challenges because of its diversity in development realities that brings together donor countries (Australia, Japan, Korea,…) as well as emerging economies (China, India, Indonesia, ….), developing countries (Bangladesh, Vietnam, Cambodia, Thailand, Pakistan, Nepal, …) and so-called fragile states (Timor-Leste, Afghanistan, Papua New Guinea, …).

No consultation has taken place yet in the region.

The obvious objective is to plan and organise the regional consultation in the coming months and to take the discussion further on the basis of the outcomes of the consultation as well through the political dialogue within the region.

**EUROPE**

(see also chapter on EU cooperation).

Further efforts will be made to address the specific challenges for the organisations neither in the PERC region many of whom have no tradition in international and development cooperation nor in the politics around it. Development Education could be an effective trigger for creating the level playing field for further engagement and bring initiatives to life.

Together with the ETUC we should however also be aware of the importance of influencing national voices in the decisions making within the EU and create effective alliances to support social and sustainable development strategies in the EU development policy as a whole.

# AT SECTOR AND EXPERT LEVEL

Many of the development debates, when approaching realities tend to become very technical or are by essence targeting specific sectors in development.

Most of the GUFs have their own advocacy strategies, in most of the cases directed towards specialised agencies or departments dealing with the sector based policies (education, transport, public services, extractive industries, etc. …). Many of these have direct and very relevant impact on the development patterns of developing countries.

These sector discussions tend also to pop up in the general policy debates or, in a number of recent cases, even steer the overall debates based on the sector experience (e.g. health; education …). With the generalisation of the “private sector in development debate”, it will be more than ever necessary that we have a close consultation and cooperation so as to allow experience and evidence based policy proposals to be represented, including by the directly affected trade unionists from the developing countries.

The TUDCN has been able to get access to many of those debates and should support GUFs, when there is an interest and willingness to engage, by gathering intelligence, facilitating consultations and supporting representation and participation.

In many other discussions, specialised knowledge and savoir faire is required, be it economical, legal, statistical or otherwise. We should therefore be able to call upon the existing expertise within the members of the TUDCN, confederations, SSOs and GUFs but we should also look into greater cooperation with existing trade union related think tanks or networks such as the African Labour Research Network and others at regional or international level.

# IN COOPERATION WITH THE ILO

We should build upon the synergies that can be developed with the ILO on many on these development policies’, given our matching advocacy objectives and the complementarity in the roles we can play within the international community.

\*\*\*\*\*\*\*

1. Relevant documents on the origins and preliminary discussion can be found here: <https://webgate.ec.europa.eu/fpfis/mwikis/aidco/index.php/Policy_forum_on_development> [↑](#footnote-ref-1)
2. http://www.ituc-csi.org/IMG/pdf/final\_draft-pfd\_chart-en.pdf [↑](#footnote-ref-2)
3. <https://webgate.ec.europa.eu/fpfis/mwikis/aidco/index.php/DEAR> [↑](#footnote-ref-3)
4. Working name… [↑](#footnote-ref-4)