

Trade Union Development Cooperation Network

General Meeting Report

12-14 December 2011, Florence

Monday 12 December 2011 – Chair of the meeting: Wellington Chibebe

1. **Welcome of participants**

Wellington Chibebe, DGS ITUC, opens the meeting and welcomes the participants.

2. **Approval Report of the previous meeting**

The [report of the 7th General Meeting](#) is approved.

3. **General overview on the TUDCN activities June-December 2011**

Jan Dereymaeker (TUDCN) gives an overview of the [activities of TUDCN in the past period June to December 2012](#). The report is endorsed.

Maurice Bossuat (CFDT), member of the TUDCN Facilitation and Steering Group (FSG) reports on the evaluation of the work to the TUDCN by the FSG, stresses the need of consideration by the political leadership for the issues of development cooperation. He challenges the participants to become also more active on the political level. Interesting outcomes of the work in TUDCN are very helpful in this process.

Kjeld Jakobsen (TUCA) mentions that the traditional trade union cooperation is going through a crisis, whereas the new model of South-South cooperation is only in early stage of development. A political debate on the models of development is urgent. Good indicators would be helpful. Multilateral agreements on regional level are very important. New policies are necessary.

Wellington Chibebe (ITUC) reminds the participants that the Congress of Vancouver decided to give political support to development cooperation and share the FSG concerns. Reactivation of political interest remains necessary.

4. **Trade Union Development Effectiveness Profile (TUDEP) : presentation and ways forward**

The TUDEP tool is presented by Paola Simonetti (TUDCN), and is now available in its final form. The *Trade Union Principles and Guidelines on Development Effectiveness*, approved by the ITUC General Council in February 2011, are its point of reference. It is meant to be used by Trade Unions that are involved in Development Cooperation to help them to bring the guidelines into practice.

The tool allows comparing the working modalities and to dialogue between cooperation partners. It's a way to improve collaboration between parties, and to self-assessment. It is learning oriented, towards supporting the organisations' capacity.

Stijn Sintubin (ACV-CSC), Maresa Le Roux (CGSLB) and Frederique Lellouche (CFDT) used the tool in meetings with their respective Trade Union partners. They give their comments on the tool.

Paola (ITUC) explains that a short manual has been elaborated, to support and accompany people who use the TUDEP tool. A workshop or seminar with both partners is the best. The outcomes should lead to a new strategy. It is a flexible tool that can be adapted according the needs and the situation. Next year, TUDEP will be integrated in the seminars on capacity development. The results will be brought together, to improve the system.

Stijn Sintubin (ACV-CSC) indicates that the tool can also be used to clarify one's own vision. Doing this exercise with colleagues is interesting because it will show different points of view and stimulate debate.

5. EU Policies

a. EU Structured Dialogue

Paola Simonetti (ITUC) explains the recent evolutions concerning the Structured Dialogue. The details are presented in [the presentation on the SD follow up](#).

The "Structured Dialogue Toolbox" is a long list of financial modalities, including framework agreements and cascading grants.

Mamadou Faye (CNTS Senegal) indicates to the meeting that he is a member of the Structured Dialogue, as an ambassador from the South, and that the work of the Structured Dialogue has produced results.

b. EESC Exploratory Opinion on CSOs Role in Development - Jose Maria Zufiaur, EESC member

Mr. Jose Maria Zufiaur explains that the EESC as stipulated in the Treaties, must be consulted by the EU on all legislative and important political matters. The European Union wants to publish a policy paper on the role of the CSOs, in October next year. The Committee was asked for an exploratory opinion on the issues related.

There is no black on white definition of CSOs in Europe. It is a priority of the European Commission to improve the partnership with CSOs, to study how to reach a consensus on policies.

Kjeld (TUCA) also expresses his concern on the role of private sector in development. Companies want to make benefits, profit. His fear is that small and poor countries will not benefit in this model. The role of the TU movement has to be strengthened.

Guiseppe Iuliano (CISL) explains that an opinion document from the EESC is approved also by the employers. It has a strong impact: 80% of the opinions are accepted by the European Commission and integrated in the EC documents.

Jan (ITUC) concludes in four points:

- *Actor-based approach*. As each actor in Civil Society has its own characteristics, solutions proposed need to be tailor-made, with attention for the added value of every actor.
- *Democratic ownership*. People must be able to participate in the dialogue with donors and governments. The right of initiative of Civil Society has to be safeguarded.
- *Role of international networks*. The European Commission must give space to membership-based networks.
- *The use of the toolbox*: the Call for Proposals system is not appropriate for the needs of trade unions; it also favours strong organisations, and the outcomes are totally unpredictable.

Mr. Jose Maria Zufiaur (EESC) indicates that other types of partnerships should be studied. Aid by companies such as Microsoft can lead to a situation where governments withdraw their aid, where

development is taken over by big companies. He supports democratic ownership and the autonomy of the civil society.

Participants at the meeting indicate that there is a shift in paradigm in development cooperation, a move from aid to development. Trade Unions became a development agent. Decent work is necessary for growth and development.

Mr. Jose Maria Zufiaur (EESC) speaks of sustainable development agreements. There should be consistency in the foreign policy of the European Union. The Tax level proposed now for the Financial Transactions Tax is too low: 0,05%. Some partners of CSO see Trade Unions as enemies of CSO, competitors.

6. News from ITUC regions, national affiliates and GUFs on development policies and initiatives

Mustapha Tlili (ITUC, Amman office) gives an overview on the situation in the Arab region, the Middle East. He insists on the necessary capacity to manage situations of urgency. The support by the Trade Unions in 2011 was good, but it has to continue in 2012. Governments must be convinced to respect the rights of the people. Mechanisms of quick intervention should be developed and special funds to support the developments in the region should be provided. Normal procedures are not adapted to the state of urgency in the region. In five countries the regimes are switching towards democracies, but the aid procedures remain the same as before, complex, unpredictable and time consuming. It is important that Trade Unions are recognised as representative, as a guarantee for democracy and progress.

Jan (ITUC) supports the need for attention to the situations of urgencies.

The meeting decided to look in detail into the instruments of cooperation on European level, and to use the Middle East / North Africa region as a test.

Tuesday 13 December 2011 – Chair of the meeting: Gemma Arpaia

7. News from ITUC regions, national affiliates and GUFs on development policies and initiatives - continuation

Kjeld Jakobsen (TUCA) informs about IDEAM, then Institute of Development, and the progress of the TUCA DevCoo Network and the outcomes of its meeting in August.

Christine Ascott (ITF) raises the issue of climate change. Many delegates do not see climate change as a trade union issue, thus the need for awareness. Transport is an important factor in the climate change. Education materials, about the impact of climate change on jobs; about sustainable transport and quality public services; about the importance of access to good quality public transport and good quality jobs in public transport; about the impact of climate change policies on employment in transport are finalised. COP17: it is difficult to see how market solutions would solve climate change problems.

Luciano Robles (CASC) informs about a seminar in the Dominican Republic, in cooperation with Haiti, to analyse the funding of the World Bank in the countries of the region. The project of Italian trade unions is operated from Dominican Republic. It is an example of things that can be done without huge financial resources. Human resources and synergies can have a lot of impact.

8. Presentation of the outcome document of the 4th High Level Forum on Aid Effectiveness – Busan Partnership for Effective Development Cooperation

The objective of the morning is to come to a trade union position in response to the [Busan Partnership for Effective Development Cooperation](#) (BOD).

Jan (ITUC) informs the meeting about of the BOD through a [presentation](#).

This presentation is followed by an evaluation debate with Paolo Venier (Ministry of Foreign Affairs, Italy); Iacopo Viciani (ActionAid); Kjeld Jacobsen (TUCA); Henrik Als (LO-FTF) and Hubert de Milly (OECD).

Paolo Venier states that Busan was only the beginning and that the real job starts now. The next six months are crucial. The presentation made by Jan (ITUC) was a very good analysis of the BOD.

We are in a new geopolitical scenario. We face economic problems in Europe, and we experience a shift from traditional economies to new emerging economies. This is the new situation although Europe remains the biggest donor in the world.

There is a shift from aid to development effectiveness. What does it mean really, “Going beyond aid”? We come from a dualism between donors and partner countries, to something more complex and difficult. New actors are present, new actors that are at the same time receivers and donors, and that want to be at the table.

Hubert de Milly (OECD) gives a presentation by means of [Powerpoint](#). Busan is not about a convention that has to be signed, it is about adhering on a voluntary basis. Through a system of monitoring, 77 countries have agreed to measure what is being done. The differences among the donors themselves or amongst the receiving countries themselves are certainly as important as the differences between donors and receiving countries. The force of ‘naming and shaming’ is working well at the level of countries.

He compared the shift in paradigm with a shift from talking about medicine to talking about health. It will remain difficult to realise this shift as long as there are only doctors at the table, because health is not only a question of medicine, but also of environment etc.

After these presentations, there were questions about the lack of reference to the European Social model, about the place of the ILO, and about how the document could be enforced. It was noted that Social Dialogue should be recognised as a tool in democracy.

Paolo Venier (MoFA, Italy) agrees that many aspects have still to be shaped. It is important to note that the civil society is a recognised actor. He emphasises that the voluntary character is the only method to reach a consensus with many actors and to work on the long term.

Hubert de Milly (OECD) also underlines the importance of the voluntary character of the process. He is of the opinion that China, Brazil or India would not have been part of the process if it was not on a voluntary basis. Article 16 is for him the most important one: about different commitments, but shared principles.

The private sector was treated very gently. Why? BIAC never came to a meeting. The private sector was only present in Busan through foundations. Hubert de Milly does not think that the CSO will receive a guaranteed place at the table, as the partner countries do not support this.

In the discussion on the Private Sector, Kjeld (TUCA) expresses the view that the contribution of private sector in development is exaggerated. Their role is making profit. They are not really interested in development. The poorest countries will never receive investments from the private sector. They will be left to aid from the states.

Henrik Als (LO-FTF) referred to the speech of Queen Rania Al Abdullah, who was the only one that made reference to inequality. He wants to mention four things about the private sector:

- According to article 28, the private sector is now more relevant. The rights-based approach seems to be relegated to a secondary place.
- In article 32, business associations and Trade Unions are mentioned. It is however totally new that the private sector is also included in the design of the development aid.
- The private sector is not a social partner, it is business.
- Business outcomes and development outcomes are now at the same level, which is new. We wanted something different. Companies can be engines for growth, but the question for development impact is about redistribution.

Jan (ITUC) concluded that China was present in the room at Busan, but as a ghost. The World Bank and its financial institutions were trying to get the private sector engaged. "Busan should be for the private sector what Accra was for the CSOs." But the discussion was about the "doing business indicators" of the World Bank, not about inclusive and sustainable development.

Now the challenge is how to influence the implementation in the countries.

Henrik (LO-FTF) regretted that ILO was not better represented.

Maurice (CFDT) underlines that Busan has given a place to Trade Unions, maybe symbolic. What will be our place in development cooperation? Will it increase?

Christine (ITF) stresses the role of the World Bank. The funds of the International Finance Corporation (IFC – World Bank) are steadily increasing, other funds however are decreasing. Funds of the IFC are for companies. The model of the economic development is pushed as an agenda for cooperation.

Mamadou Faye (CNTS) indicates that the private sector remains unavoidable in development, but the rights of the workers must be respected. Busan is a new step forward to more efficiency.

Stijn (ACV-CSC) would like to know what effect Busan have of aid in our own country, from our government, in Europe. Will there be more fragmentation, or more concentration? What about instrumentalisation of the Trade Unions by their government in this process?

Luciano (CASC) indicates that Trade Unions are a part of the private sector, but not in favour of the capitalist world. The best way to get out of the crisis is through dialogue. Space for dialogue has to be organised and created. This is a fair request of the Trade Unions, to have a dialogue with business, employers, government. They all have different interests, but that is no problem if we have our interests clearly defined.

Marisol Pardo (CCOO) asks to focus on rights, not on aid. We should be careful with the concept of effectiveness. The BOD is a declaration of intention, as we had a lot of them in the past, without implementation. The crisis has hit Europe very hard, and this will influence the way we think about aid and cooperation. With a Financial Transaction Tax we could have more possibilities in cooperation. Now our governments are lacking resources. Enterprises in the social economy can play an important role. They are organisations that are not oriented towards profit.

Kjeld (TUCA): If private business is interested in small countries, it will only be because there is a possibility of making profits. It will not be focused on development. Smaller countries have fewer possibilities to receive aid.

According to Jean Lacharité (CSN Quebec), the fact that the private sector is entering into the system of development cooperation is alarming. The private sector will try to exclude trade unions. And it will try to impose its requirements to the government in exchange for its funds. We are operating in the context of a crisis in the economy. We are faced with decisions taken by the G20. We have received a space in Busan, but the decisions are taken on another level. Our strategy has to take this into account. We don't want to be confronted with rules against our concept on development cooperation. We have to be careful with the definition of private sector.

The interest of the private sector to be at the table is not real. It is the interest of certain governments, like Sweden, the Netherlands and also the USA. It is an ideological issue. Fighting fragmentation and more concentration are requests from governments, because they do not have the capacity to discuss and dialogue with all partners. For the trade unions this is no problem, they have methods and structures to group and structure themselves.

Jan (ITUC) concludes that we have to consider that more and more the agenda goes beyond aid and development cooperation. The agenda becomes political, the debate is now also on G20, OECD-DAC, UNCDF etc. The discussion goes to the individual countries now. Here we can learn from the experience of the ILO on monitoring, its normative framework, and the 'name and shame' method. It is crucial to implement an effective system of monitoring.

9. Working groups on the trade union reaction to the Busan outcome document

After lunch, the participants split into working groups. Following reactions were voiced by the group rapporteurs:

General development processes:

- There is an increasing interaction of the processes that should start from the trade unionists' own agenda: decent work, social security, climate change etc.
- There is a need for more discussion on the development model that we propose in our work and external work (difference between development cooperation and our development model).
- There is a need for involvement of the political leadership of the organizations in the discussion and the integration of development cooperation in the work of the unions.
- There is a need of mapping the various processes in order to improve internal understanding and dissemination between the experts and leaders in the unions responsible for the different themes.
- We need to ensure that the opinions, proposals and opinions of the TUDCN are included also in the position papers in the other processes (G20, World Bank, WTO, etc.).

HLF4 in Busan process:

- Agreement with analysis of TUDCN.
- Given the importance of South-South cooperation, how we see South-South cooperation and how we can develop mechanisms to enable South-South and triangular cooperation and exchange.
- Both in the AAA and the BOD the interaction between multilateral and national dimension is increasingly important. Now it is crucial for the unions to bring their development cooperation activity from national level into a multilateral framework. Therefore need to develop a framework in which various and multiple actions can be submitted in a consistent manner.

- The ITUC/TUDCN should remain engaged internationally in the process of development effectiveness. But also at national level, the trade unions must be activated and integrated in the processes. Concerning the post-Busan process, the priorities for now are:
 - The integration of Decent Work indicators in the set of indicators for the BOD process.
 - The TUDCN should have its own seat in the "Global Partnership"!
 - Where possible, link with ILO Conventions and other agreements or declarations (OECD guidelines, etc.) framing of private sector discussions.
 - Active participation of ITUC in the building block 'Private Sector', Rights Based Approach, etc.

What should be the place of trade unions in the development processes:

- The best model is of course the ILO model.
- But the model of cooperation with CSOs, like in BetterAid, is also possible, provided that it starts from the own identity and that a differentiation with respect to the trade unions is possible. We stand by the CSOs, but we have our own place and role in society (social partners, membership-based, ...)
- Minimum requirement is the same place as the employers' organizations.

10. Presentations of the other current development agendas - Chair of the meeting: Thierry Aerts

First, Hubert de Milly (OECD) presented the [new development strategy of OECD-DAC](#).

Then Matt Simonds (TUAC) presented the current work of the UN Development Cooperation Forum (UNDCF). The next meeting of UNDCF will take place in June/July 2012. In the run up to that meeting a series of High-Level Symposia was organised. The last one took place in October in Luxembourg. ITUC was represented there by Mamadou Diallo. The next symposium will take place in May (feeding into the Rio+20 process) to discuss the catalytic role of aid for sustainable development.

Jan (ITUC) presented briefly the G20 development agenda, which was developed during the Korean presidency and formulated in the *Seoul Consensus*. It touches not only on the issues of development, but most of all on economic and trade agendas. In Jan's opinion it presents rather traditional development cooperation approach, much less progressive than Busan.

There is a need to formulate positions on these processes.

Wednesday 14 December 2011 - Chair of the meeting: Gemma Arpaia

11. Finalization of the trade union reaction to the Busan outcome document

The participants have been presented with the draft text of the [TU statement in response to the Busan Partnership for Effective Development Cooperation](#), drafted the previous evening by a small drafting committee. It has been agreed that the text will be finalised over email and published soon after the GM.

12. Survey on Trade Union support mechanisms

Huib Huyse (HIVA Institute) has presented, over skype, the draft results of his study on the TU support modalities, commissioned by TUDCN. The presentation, as well as the study, will be distributed later on.

After the presentation, a number of comments were collected:

- The study can serve as the grounds for further advocacy work with OECD.
- It should be clear that the study is about the support for TU development cooperation activities, not TU support modalities.
- Among multilateral organization financing TU development cooperation the study mentions only EU, although there are more.
- The issue of South-South cooperation should be further researched.
- The reasons and recommendations for the cooperation with CSOs should be presented.
- Governments should employ people who understand trade union development issues.
- The volume of the TU development cooperation should be estimated.
- The diversity in trade union models should be recognized and worked upon.

The report will be circulated in a draft version. There was an idea of proposing a seminar with OECD on the TU support system. ILO could be invited for cooperation here as well. There was also a remark that the publication of the study should be done in a diplomatic way, as an open criticism towards donors might not be beneficial for the trade unions. The outcomes of the study will be analyzed by the network and it will be decided together what should be published and what not. The geographic and thematic scope of the study could be further discussed to cover e.g. Spain and human rights work and a wider approach to development.

13. Action Plan TUDCN 2012 (Danish and Cypriot Presidencies)

The [TUDCN plan for 2012](#) was presented and endorsed by the participants with no changes.

14. Evaluation notes

The groups reported thought a pooling exercise the points that they would take home from the meeting and the points that they would like to see improved.

Positive is

- the opportunity that offers TUDCN to exchange information and discuss with the broad variety of actors in development within the trade union movement.
- The information session on Busan. The speakers were excellent and the information very relevant of our work. The work on the statement was a good way of making the synthesis of the terms of our engagement with the Development Effectiveness agenda.
- Both the TUDEP as well as the study on support systems for trade union development cooperation were seen as concrete and valuable instruments for our trade union work on development cooperation.

Could be improved:

- Participation: better representation from the regions on the one hand and larger participation from GUF. Also a number of important “traditional” participants were absent.
- We should ensure better embedding of development cooperation in the mainstream policy agenda and ensure the necessary buy-in at political level.
- Documents (including the agenda) could be send earlier for better preparation, and avoiding to extend oral inputs into the meeting itself.
- The working groups’ method could be improved.
- We should avoid the use of too many acronyms; they are not always helpful for translation and new participants may find it difficult to understand.
- Need for more exchange on the concrete development practice amongst the participants (sharing on programming and partners).
- We should be able to tackle also new challenges for development cooperation such as climate change.

Brussels, January 2012

Jan Dereymaeker (editing), Vik Meeuws (note-taking), Kasia Szeniawska (note-taking and editing), Paola Simonetti (review), Joke Van Mele (admin).