

RECORD TYPE: PRESIDENTIAL (NOTES MAIL)

CREATOR: Anne H. Lewis (CN=Anne H. Lewis/OU=OPD/O=EOP [OPD])

CREATION DATE/TIME:22-MAY-1997 11:27:21.00

SUBJECT: Re: Sweatshop Factsheet for Euros

TO: Lael Brainard (CN=Lael Brainard/OU=CEA/O=EOP @ EOP [CEA])

READ:UNKNOWN

TEXT:

Here are my participants for the working group.

Group 1:

David Lane

Jeffrey Hunker

DOL crowd: hold off on these invites until DOL decides who they want in the lead (that's what I've been waiting for) which should happen tomorrow.

Group 2: International

Paul Brown, Cof S to Undersecretary for Enforcement

Gare Smith, DAS, State

David Lane, AS for Policy, COMmerce, (he probably won't attend)

Jeffrey Hunker, DAS, commerce

Richard Ragan -- NSC (he apparently works for Eric Schwartz and called me on about a congressional inquiry. He asked whether we have a working group and expressed interest in being included.)

Andrew Samet

My idea is that we have a two tiered meeting. Tier one would relate narrowly to implementing the Apparel Industry Partnership agreement and what help the white house should give. Tier two would be focused on the international side: decisions on the conference, other upcoming opportunities/deleiverables etc.

Let me know if you think this makes sense.

RECORD TYPE: PRESIDENTIAL (NOTES MAIL)

CREATOR: Russell W. Horwitz (CN=Russell W. Horwitz/OU=OPD/O=EOP [OPD])

CREATION DATE/TIME:23-MAY-1997 16:55:13.00

SUBJECT: Lael: Would you change/add anything here?

TO: Lael Brainard (CN=Lael Brainard/OU=CEA/O=EOP @ EOP [CEA])

READ:UNKNOWN

TEXT:

Sweatshops. The first meeting of an NEC led interagency process to coordinate administration-wide efforts to fight sweatshops internationally and domestically will take place next week. We will continue to work with the Apparel Industry Partnership which has begun working to implement the framework announced at the White House last month, and will assist in the recruitment of additional members of the Partnership.

RECORD TYPE: PRESIDENTIAL (NOTES MAIL)

CREATOR: Lael Brainard (CN=Lael Brainard/OU=CEA/O=EOP [CEA])

CREATION DATE/TIME:27-MAY-1997 12:49:45.00

SUBJECT: Re: Sweatshop Factsheet for Euros

TO: JOSHLYN_G (JOSHLYN_G @ A1 @ CD @ LNGTWY [UNKNOWN]) (OPD)
READ:UNKNOWN

TEXT:

Could you call around and set up two 45-minute meetings back to back in the same room.

The first meeting is on the Implementation of the Apparel Industry Partnership (domestic). The second meeting is on Internationalizing Sweatshop Eradication Efforts. Participants from either are welcome to sit in on the other meeting if they choose, but not necessary. Anne Lewis will chair the first and she and I will co-chair the second.

List from first is Group 1 below. Call Anne Lewis at home to get final DOL names.

List from second is Group 2 but replacing Eric Schwartz (NSC) for Richard Ragan (Eric can bring Richard if he wants plus:

Rita Hayes, USTR

Jon Rosebaum, USTR

John Simpson, Customs.

My schedule is fairly open next Monday between 10 and 12 and from 3 on.

Standard Drill: Could you call around and get a sense of the time & room & then draft a memo to send out notifying everyone of the meeting. I will clear it before sending it out.

Thanks, Gay.

----- Forwarded by Lael Brainard/CEA/EOP on 05/27/97

12:42 PM -----

Anne H. Lewis

05/22/97 11:22:06 AM

Record Type: Record

To: Lael Brainard/CEA/EOP

cc:

Subject: Re: Sweatshop Factsheet for Euros

Here are my participants for the working group.

Group 1:

David Lane

Jeffrey Hunker

DOL crowd: hold off on these invites until DOL decides who they want in the lead (that's what I've been waiting for) which should happen tomorrow.

Group 2: International

Paul Brown, Cof S to Undersecretary for Enforcement

Gare Smith, DAS, State

David Lane, AS for Policy, COMmerce, (he probably won't attend)

Jeffrey Hunker, DAS, commerce

Richard Ragan -- NSC (he apparently works for Eric Schwartz and called me on about a congressional inquiry. He asked whether we have a working group and expressed interest in being included.)

Andrew Samet

My idea is that we have a two tiered meeting. Tier one would relate narrowly to implementing the Apparel INdustry Partnership agreement and what help the white house should give. Tier two would be focused on the international side: decisions on the conference, other upcoming opportunities/deleiverables etc.

Let me know if you think this makes sense.

RECORD TYPE: PRESIDENTIAL (NOTES MAIL)

CREATOR: Gay L. Joshlyn (CN=Gay L. Joshlyn/OU=OPD/O=EOP [OPD])

CREATION DATE/TIME: 2-JUN-1997 13:43:05.00

SUBJECT: Confirmation list for tomorrow's meetings

TO: Anne H. Lewis (CN=Anne H. Lewis/OU=OPD/O=EOP @ EOP [OPD])

READ:UNKNOWN

TO: Lael Brainard (CN=Lael Brainard/OU=CEA/O=EOP @ EOP [CEA])

READ:UNKNOWN

TEXT:

Participant List

Implementation of the Apparel Industry Partnership Meeting

2:30 pm, June 3, 1997 Room 231

Jeffrey Hunker, DOC

David Lane, DOC

Marvin Krislov, DOL

Jennifer O'Connor, DOL (for Seth Harris)

Andrew Samet, DOL

Suzanne Seiden, DOL

Elaine Papazian, DOS (w/ Gare Smith)

Gare Smith, DOS

Paul Browne, TRS

Jon Rosenbaum, USTR

Participant List

Internationalizing Sweatshop Eradication Efforts Meeting

3:15 pm, June 3, 1997 Room 231

Jeffrey Hunker, DOC

David Lane, DOC

Andrew Samet, DOL

Elaine Papazian, DOS (w/ Gare Smith)

Gare Smith, DOS

Eric Schwartz, NSC (may send a substitute)

Paul Browne, TRS

Jon Rosenbaum, USTR

Rita Hayes (USTR) and her entire shop are in Geneva until June 12th. John Simpson (TRS) is also on travel and the rest of his office is involved with China MFN meetings tomorrow.

Everyone from the first meeting is aware that they are invited to stay for the second.

RECORD TYPE: PRESIDENTIAL (NOTES MAIL)

CREATOR: Gay L. Joshlyn (CN=Gay L. Joshlyn/OU=OPD/O=EOP [OPD])

CREATION DATE/TIME:16-JUN-1997 10:57:59.00

SUBJECT: Re: Sweatshops

TO: Lael Brainard (CN=Lael Brainard/OU=CEA/O=EOP @ EOP [CEA])

READ:UNKNOWN

TEXT:

These are the lists from the last meeting:

Implementation of the Apparel Industry Partnership Meeting
2:30 pm, June 3, 1997 Room 231

Jeffrey Hunker, DOC
David Lane, DOC
Marvin Krislov, DOL
Jennifer O'Connor, DOL (for Seth Harris)
Andrew Samet, DOL
Suzanne Seiden, DOL
Elaine Papazian, DOS (w/ Gare Smith)
Gare Smith, DOS
Paul Browne, TRS
Jon Rosenbaum, USTR

Internationalizing Sweatshop Eradication Efforts Meeting
3:15 pm, June 3, 1997 Room 231

Jeffrey Hunker, DOC
David Lane, DOC
Andrew Samet, DOL
Elaine Papazian, DOS (w/ Gare Smith)
Gare Smith, DOS
Eric Schwartz, NSC (may send a substitute)
Paul Browne, TRS
Jon Rosenbaum, USTR

Everyone from the first meeting is aware that they are invited to stay for the second.

RECORD TYPE: PRESIDENTIAL (NOTES MAIL)

CREATOR: Lael Brainard (CN=Lael Brainard/OU=CEA/O=EOP [CEA])

CREATION DATE/TIME:17-JUN-1997 09:59:39.00

SUBJECT: Re: Sweatshops

TO: Anne H. Lewis (CN=Anne H. Lewis/OU=OPD/O=EOP @ EOP [OPD])

READ:UNKNOWN

TEXT:

This is the invitee list from the last meeting. Could you please let Gay know if you have any adds or deletes before she starts calling around? It looks ok to me. Thanks.

----- Forwarded by Lael Brainard/CEA/EOP on 06/17/97
09:58 AM -----

Gay L. Joshlyn
06/16/97 10:57:44 AM

Record Type: Record

To: Lael Brainard/CEA/EOP

cc:

Subject: Re: Sweatshops

These are the lists from the last meeting:

Implementation of the Apparel Industry Partnership Meeting
2:30 pm, June 3, 1997 Room 231

Jeffrey Hunker, DOC
David Lane, DOC
Marvin Krislov, DOL
Jennifer O Connor, DOL (for Seth Harris)
Andrew Samet, DOL
Suzanne Seiden, DOL
Elaine Papazian, DOS (w/ Gare Smith)
Gare Smith, DOS
Paul Browne, TRS
Jon Rosenbaum, USTR

Internationalizing Sweatshop Eradication Efforts Meeting
3:15 pm, June 3, 1997 Room 231

Jeffrey Hunker, DOC

David Lane, DOC
Andrew Samet, DOL
Elaine Papazian, DOS (w/ Gare Smith)
Gare Smith, DOS
Eric Schwartz, NSC (may send a substitute)
Paul Browne, TRS
Jon Rosenbaum, USTR

Everyone from the first meeting is aware that they are invited to stay for the second.

RECORD TYPE: PRESIDENTIAL (NOTES MAIL)

CREATOR: Lael Brainard (CN=Lael Brainard/OU=CEA/O=EOP [CEA])

CREATION DATE/TIME: 8-NOV-1997 15:31:34.00

SUBJECT: Weekly Update

TO: Jonathan A. Kaplan (CN=Jonathan A. Kaplan/OU=OPD/O=EOP @ EOP [OPD])
READ:UNKNOWN

TO: Gene B. Sperling (CN=Gene B. Sperling/OU=OPD/O=EOP @ EOP [OPD])
READ:UNKNOWN

CC: Melissa Green (CN=Melissa Green/OU=OPD/O=EOP @ EOP [OPD])
READ:UNKNOWN

TEXT:

The main issues I am working on at the moment are:

1. APEC, November 20-5: We should talk about this soon. I have given Melissa/Peter the President's schedule for Vancouver and a policy memo detailing where we are on each of the main policy issues. Berger and Tarullo will hold a small group meeting on Monday, which I flagged for Peter/Melissa, and there will be a trip meeting (probably chaired by Glyn Davies at NSC) next week, which I flagged for Jake. The President has five meetings on the edges of the APEC Leaders Meeting (short bilaterals with Hashimoto, Goh, Soeharto and Chretien and a one hour meeting with the ASEAN leaders as a group). In addition, he has 1 1/2 days of APEC leaders meeting. The President has opted for a schedule which does not include a speech or press conference; the only public remarks will be a brief departure statement and brief remarks at the pool spray for one of the bilaterals. The main policy issues will include commitments to reduce tariffs in sectors such as environmental technology and chemicals, discussion of financial market turbulence in Asia, admission of new members and an emergency/disaster planning initiative. Climate change may or may not feature prominently, depending on how we decide to handle it; we should know more following Wirth's meetings in Tokyo this week.
2. Zedillo visit, November 14: The set of events will include a private one-on-one in the residence on Thursday evening, followed by a short small group meeting and an expanded Cabinet meeting on Friday morning and a signing ceremony on a hemispheric firearms convention at the Organization of American States. So far, there is no plan for a press conference. The main message topics will be narcotics cooperation and joint hemispheric leadership in controlling trade in guns (gangs/crime). We are pushing very hard for a strong climate change statement along the lines we secured in Argentina, but the prospects are bleak. On the economic front, we may get a lukewarm endorsement of the electronic commerce initiative and we are hoping for no news on trade irritants (trucks, Mexican sugar imports). I will pass along the briefing papers when they are drafted, which should be midweek. Let me know what else you

need.

3. Labor & trade: As you know, the Central American Labor Ministerial was a disappointment because a few of the governments dug in over codes of conduct and external monitoring. The best Alexis could get on the Apparel Industry Partnership was a sentence in the joint communique acknowledging the AIP made a presentation to the ministers. The next significant international meeting that could address these issues is the G-8 Employability Ministerial in February. Anne Lewis and I met with our Treasury/Labor reps before the first preparatory meeting and gave them instructions to get core labor standards/trade & labor onto the agenda (where it previously had been notably absent). Apparently, the Japanese were incredibly resistant, but we succeeded in getting a placeholder. There is an opportunity to hold a U.S.-EU Labor Ministers meeting on voluntary labelling initiatives around the same time as the G-8 Employability Ministerial and try to forge a connection between the two. The UK's main objective for the Employability meeting is to get the Continentals on board with the Anglo flexible labor markets model. We can invest more or less time in these initiatives, depending on how you want to handle them. There could be strong links to the child labor report release, which we could highlight when we are ready to go forward with this.

RECORD TYPE: PRESIDENTIAL (NOTES MAIL)

CREATOR: Lael Brainard (CN=Lael Brainard/OU=CEA/O=EOP [CEA])

CREATION DATE/TIME: 4-DEC-1997 16:29:35.00

SUBJECT: Revisions as per Your Suggestions

TO: novick_robert (novick_robert @ ustr.gov @ INET @ LNGTWY [UNKNOWN])

READ:UNKNOWN

TEXT:

Your suggestions were helpful. Apparently, Customs has already gone a long way towards addressing USTR concerns. The initiative would be limited to detention/seizure of particular shipments from a particular manufacturer only after Customs had gathered demonstrable proof of bad behavior. Thus, in contrast to earlier proposals, the burden of proof would be on Customs and would have to be established before the detention/seizure took place.

The description of the initiative was modified to make explicit these features. In addition, we have now included language describing the possible risks and Customs' efforts to minimize them. There is a lot of enthusiasm over here for your additional initiative proposal, so it is now referenced in the Customs section and described more fully in the list of future initiatives. Could you take a quick look and call with any additional modifications/concerns.

Thank you as always.

2. \$3 Million for Stepped up Customs Enforcement of Ban on the Importation of Goods Made with Forced or Bonded Child Labor.

With clear authority emanating from the FY98 Treasury Department appropriation, the Customs Service will launch an enforcement initiative with the following elements:

Designation of child labor as a major enforcement priority, with new staff and offices working to document and pursue a high profile case, for instance by targeting a shipment from an individual carpet manufacturer in South Asia after gathering demonstrable evidence of the involvement of exploitative child labor;

Establishment of a Treasury Advisory Committee to improve coordination and establish a regular dialogue with NGOs, other federal agencies and industry; and

Creation of a child labor & jump team 8 capable of conducting investigations, initially targeted at the rug industry in South Asia.

It is important to note that the WTO does not currently authorize any ban on imports made with exploitative child labor. Further, we must be careful that this initiative is not viewed by our trade partners as providing license for them to restrict or harass imports of U.S. goods produced using techniques they do not approve. This is particularly

important to our agricultural sector, where we have been arguing that the manner in which goods are made (e.g. with hormones or genetic engineering) should not be used as a basis for restrictions. The Customs initiative is carefully designed to minimize the potential for a challenge in the World Trade Organization (WTO) or retaliatory actions, by limiting Customs enforcement to cases of individual shipments or importers where Customs has gathered demonstrable proof of the exploitation of children.

In addition, as a complementary initiative, we may want to consider seeking an amendment to the WTO to explicitly authorize a ban on imports made through exploitative child labor. This is described further below as one of the possible initiatives for a broader action plan on child labor.

PREVIEW OF BROADER CHILD LABOR ACTION PLAN

In addition to the budget package above, we want to develop a broader action plan to fight child labor. Such a plan would:

- Provide a larger context for the budget initiative, thus leveraging more change as a result of U.S. investment;

- Maximize the impact of the bully pulpit which can be an effective tool in raising public awareness and establishing international and domestic norms; and

- Establish you as a leader in fighting this important problem.

Although we cannot predict the outcome of such a process, items worthy of consideration for inclusion in the larger plan might include:

- Presidential challenge to private organizations, such as the Girl Scouts or the Boy Scouts, to adopt a "No Sweat" policy for procurement of their uniforms.

- Department of Labor child labor enforcement strategy designed to promote greater compliance with current law by encouraging -- through enforcement actions and partnerships -- growers, food processors, wholesalers, and grocery store chains to value compliance by their suppliers.

- Department of Labor grant to support the voluntary adoption of codes of conduct and external monitoring in the garment industry through the Apparel Industry Partnership and its successor, the Fair Labor Association.

- Joint Customs and Department of Labor conference with U.S. rug importers and NGOs to urge their support of voluntary efforts to eliminate child labor in the rug industry in South Asia, specifically including broader support of the voluntary Rugmark label.

- Presidential support for an ILO Convention on Intolerable Child Labor which will be debated in June, including outreach to employers.

- Plan to consult farm labor advocates and agribusiness community on possibilities for harmonizing U.S. farm labor law and non-farm labor law and U.S. and international law.

Joint U.S.-E.U. conference with business, government and labor organizations to disseminate best practices on voluntary labelling, monitoring and codes of conduct efforts.

Seek an amendment to the WTO to authorize a ban on imports made with exploitative child labor. This would complement the Customs enforcement initiative and, if successful, would shield broader Customs efforts from a WTO challenge.

These and other proposals will be considered through an NEC interagency process, including in shaping fast track legislation, and presented in a subsequent decision memo.

RECORD TYPE: PRESIDENTIAL (NOTES MAIL)

CREATOR: Lael Brainard (CN=Lael Brainard/OU=CEA/O=EOP [CEA])

CREATION DATE/TIME: 8-DEC-1997 13:55:30.00

SUBJECT: Human Rights Conference & Apparel Industry Partnership

TO: Anne H. Lewis (CN=Anne H. Lewis/OU=OPD/O=EOP @ EOP [OPD])

READ:UNKNOWN

TO: Gene B. Sperling (CN=Gene B. Sperling/OU=OPD/O=EOP @ EOP [OPD])

READ:UNKNOWN

CC: Peter A. Weissman (CN=Peter A. Weissman/OU=OPD/O=EOP @ EOP [OPD])

READ:UNKNOWN

TEXT:

Unable to convert ARMS_EXT:[MESSAGE.D44]MAIL405015142.316

To ASCII,

The following is a HEX dump of the file:

RECORD TYPE: PRESIDENTIAL (NOTES MAIL)

CREATOR: Jonathan A. Kaplan (CN=Jonathan A. Kaplan/OU=OPD/O=EOP [OPD])

CREATION DATE/TIME: 2-FEB-1998 10:13:28.00

SUBJECT: Ideas on executive actions by 2pm

TO: Lael Brainard (CN=Lael Brainard/OU=CEA/O=EOP @ EOP [CEA])
READ:UNKNOWN

TO: Anne H. Lewis (CN=Anne H. Lewis/OU=OPD/O=EOP @ EOP [OPD])
READ:UNKNOWN

TO: Jake Siewert (CN=Jake Siewert/OU=OPD/O=EOP @ EOP [OPD])
READ:UNKNOWN

TO: Robert M. Shireman (CN=Robert M. Shireman/OU=OPD/O=EOP @ EOP [OPD])
READ:UNKNOWN

TO: Peter R. Orszag (CN=Peter R. Orszag/OU=OPD/O=EOP @ EOP [OPD])
READ:UNKNOWN

TO: Emil E. Parker (CN=Emil E. Parker/OU=OPD/O=EOP @ EOP [OPD])
READ:UNKNOWN

TO: KYLE_R (KYLE_R @ A1 @ CD @ LNGTWY [UNKNOWN]) (OPD)
READ:UNKNOWN

TO: Dorothy Robyn (CN=Dorothy Robyn/OU=OPD/O=EOP @ EOP [OPD])
READ:UNKNOWN

TO: Jeanne Lambrew (CN=Jeanne Lambrew/OU=OPD/O=EOP @ EOP [OPD])
READ:UNKNOWN

TO: Jonathan Orszag (CN=Jonathan Orszag/OU=OPD/O=EOP @ EOP [OPD])
READ:UNKNOWN

TO: Charles R. Marr (CN=Charles R. Marr/OU=OPD/O=EOP @ EOP [OPD])
READ:UNKNOWN

TO: Thomas A. Kalil (CN=Thomas A. Kalil/OU=OPD/O=EOP @ EOP [OPD])
READ:UNKNOWN

CC: Russell W. Horwitz (CN=Russell W. Horwitz/OU=OPD/O=EOP @ EOP [OPD])
READ:UNKNOWN

Jonathan A. Kaplan (CN=Jonathan A. Kaplan/OU=OPD/O=EOP [OPD])
READ:UNKNOWN

TEXT:
We need to compile for Gene for a meeting this afternoon a memo containing ideas for executive actions that the President could take on policy

matters over the next several months. These could include presidential memoranda, executive orders, challenges (to the public and private sectors), and other original ideas. Some examples could be the President authoring a book on education policy, issuing an executive order to agencies on contributing old computers to schools, etc.

Please follow the example below:

Child Labor Challenge. The President could challenge children's clothing manufacturers to ensure that none of their goods sold in the United States are produced with child labor. The President and/or Vice President could propose this "children shouldn't wear clothes made by children" initiative with Secretary Herman to the Apparel Industry Partnership at their next meeting in late February. We could also make this a part of the rollout of the various child labor initiatives in the President's FY99 budget proposal.

Please email your ideas to Jon Orszag and me as soon as possible with a deadline of 2pm today.

RECORD TYPE: PRESIDENTIAL (NOTES MAIL)

CREATOR: Brian A. Barreto (CN=Brian A. Barreto/OU=OPD/O=EOP [OPD])

CREATION DATE/TIME: 2-APR-1998 14:20:25.00

SUBJECT:

TO: Malcolm R. Lee (CN=Malcolm R. Lee/OU=OPD/O=EOP @ EOP [OPD])

READ:UNKNOWN

TO: Sherman G. Boone (CN=Sherman G. Boone/OU=OPD/O=EOP @ EOP [OPD])

READ:UNKNOWN

TO: Lael Brainard (CN=Lael Brainard/OU=CEA/O=EOP @ EOP [CEA])

READ:UNKNOWN

TEXT:

Attached are the pieces you submitted for the weekly report last week. Please update and send them back to me. If they do not need to be updated please let me know which ones don't need to be changed.

Weekly International Economic Principals Meeting: Following the meeting of hemispheric trade ministers in Costa Rica, there is now widespread support for a strong and comprehensive launch of negotiations toward the Free Trade Area of the Americas (FTAA) at the Santiago Summit of the Americas, including the creation of a consultative group on labor and the environment. Anticipating that there will be considerable press interest in fast track at that juncture, international economic principals agreed the best approach is to acknowledge that fast track authority is important but that we are finding ways to move forward with our market opening agenda as evidenced by the success of the FTAA launch. In anticipation of a mark-up of the tobacco bill this week, principals agreed that our main emphasis in the international arena should be on developing a strong set of health-oriented advertising, labeling and marketing standards through the World Health Organization and ensuring that there is sufficient funding to enable developing countries to implement these standards. On the issue of the upcoming World Trade Organization 50th anniversary, principals agreed that a speech in Geneva by you would provide an important opportunity to demonstrate continued U.S. leadership of and commitment to the multilateral trading system. We will hold a message-oriented meeting to discuss the content of a possible speech.

Japan Economic Policy: In the run-up to the end of Japan's fiscal year, the ruling LDP party announced a proposal for 16 trillion yen (\$123 billion or 3.1 percent of GDP) in fiscal stimulus and hinted at additional tax cuts later this year. Although this is an encouraging development, it is difficult to assess at this juncture whether it will have a significant impact on the economy, since such top-line numbers customarily include a large number (half or more) of repackaged existing commitments. The initial reaction of the markets suggested considerable skepticism.

China Visit: We have begun consulting with outside experts on potential visits and events for the China trip later this year. One possibility is to highlight the launch of an internet wiring and technical assistance initiative aimed at high schools and universities connecting Chinese students to the world of ideas; an alternative focus would be on wiring hospitals and rural health clinics. Through the Apparel Industry Partnership, we have already begun to hear considerable concern by labor about American companies doing business in China, due to prohibitions on unionization and collective bargaining. For that reason, we will need to be careful in highlighting U.S. business ventures in China.

Asia Financial Markets: The IMF is in intensive consultations with Indonesia on the outlines of a revised reform package, which are likely to include some added flexibility on food and fuel subsidies, a corporate debt workout including exchange rate guarantees on some portion of interest repayments and tightened monetary and interest rate targets. The State Department announced a package of \$74 million in humanitarian assistance for Indonesia, including approximately \$50 million in food assistance; and secured World Bank support for a donors conference to coordinate such assistance for Indonesia. In addition, we are keeping a close eye on Malaysia, which is undertaking a home-grown reform package to address its currency and corporate debt problems, drawing on IMF advice but stopping short of requesting IMF financial support and the attendant policy conditionality.

RECORD TYPE: PRESIDENTIAL (NOTES MAIL)

CREATOR: Lael Brainard (CN=Lael Brainard/OU=CEA/O=EOP [CEA])

CREATION DATE/TIME:14-JUL-1998 17:01:03.00

SUBJECT: Sweatshops and China on Evans & Novak

TO: Sarah Rosen (CN=Sarah Rosen/OU=OPD/O=EOP @ EOP [OPD])

READ:UNKNOWN

TEXT:

Getting the word out! Congratulations.

----- Forwarded by Lael Brainard/CEA/EOP on 07/14/98

05:00 PM -----

Jake Siewert

07/14/98 03:36:56 PM

Record Type: Record

To: Sarah Rosen/OPD/EOP, Lael Brainard/CEA/EOP

cc:

Subject: Sweatshops and China on Evans & Novak

HUNT: Madam Secretary, a leading issue on your agenda has been anti-sweatshops, both domestically and abroad. One of the worst abusers is

China, which has not only slave labor, but prison labor, too. And yet during the president's recent nine-day trip to China, the issue hardly came up at all.

Is that a big disappointment to you?

HERMAN: It was not a big disappointment to me, because there were

many issues that the president raised that I think will ultimately be of benefit to the American people.

And one of the most important things that came out of the visit, was that the president did call for an exchange of visits between myself and the labor minister of China. And he has certainly expressed the point of view that he wants me to engage directly with the labor minister of China. I am planning to visit China.

We are in active discussions right now with the labor

ministry there as to
when we might exchange those visits. And certainly I
intend to put on the
table a series of issues that are of concern to us.

HUNT: All right. Give us an idea -- give us a benchmark
-- where a year
from now should China be on this issue, if we want to
claim they are making
progress?

HERMAN: Well, I don't know that I would lay out a
benchmark at this
point in time, Al. I think just starting the dialogue; I
think having the meeting;
I think beginning the discussion itself will be a very
important first step.

And I think the fact that the president had called for
this meeting for an
exchange of visits to talk about our common labor issues
and concerns, it's
historic and very significant.

NOVAK: Madam Secretary, the staff of the House Work
Force Committee
says that another abuser of sweat shops is the famous
garment worker's
union, Unite (ph). Their evidence indicates that the
workers who belong to
that union in New York are abused and that some \$99
million, which have
come from companies that have paid to the union who have
moved
overseas, and not been passed on to the workers. Why
hasn't the Labor
Department investigated this situation?

HERMAN: Well, I am not aware of those particular
statistics that you are
quoting, Bob. What I am aware of is the fact that Unite
has been very
involved in working with the Department of Labor on the
apparel industry
partnership, on doing what it can to eradicate
sweatshop-like conditions,
and other areas (ph) in the industry itself. And I
believe that that's the kind of
positive engagement that we have had with Unite, and I
would expect to see
that continue in the future.

NOVAK: Well, Unite has given a lot of money and
contributions to the

Democratic candidates. They give almost nothing to
Republicans, and the
special counsel of the House Work Force Committee,
Joseph DiGenova,
says that the Labor Department is a lap dog for
organized labor because of
those contributions. What's your response to that?

HERMAN: Well, I don't believe the Department of Labor is
a lap dog for
organized labor. We continue to do the job of enforcing
the labor laws of
this country. And that certainly includes labor unions.
And I think that we've
done an effective job. I don't think we are lap dogs for
any union in this
country.

RECORD TYPE: PRESIDENTIAL (NOTES MAIL)

CREATOR: Sarah Rosen (CN=Sarah Rosen/OU=OPD/O=EOP [OPD])

CREATION DATE/TIME:25-AUG-1998 13:07:05.00

SUBJECT: Apparel Industry Partnership

TO: Matthew.rhode (Matthew.rhode @ ustr.gov @ inet [UNKNOWN])

READ:UNKNOWN

TO: dwoskin_dorothy (dwoskin_dorothy @ ustr.gov @ INET @ VAXGTWY [UNKNOWN])

READ:UNKNOWN

TO: esserman_sue (esserman_sue @ ustr.gov @ INET @ VAXGTWY [UNKNOWN])

READ:UNKNOWN

CC: Lael Brainard (CN=Lael Brainard/OU=CEA/O=EOP @ EOP [CEA])

READ:UNKNOWN

TEXT:

Hi. We haven't met, but I thought email might be more effective than phone tag, especially when I am not sure who at USTR would be best able to answer this question. I work at the NEC on (among other things) child labor and international labor standards. Andrew Samet suggested that I talk to you about an issue that has arisen in the context of the AIP (Apparel Industry Partnership).

The AIP is a group of apparel industry manufacturers and retailers, NGOs, and unions that came together to create a mechanism to monitor the factories (mostly overseas) of companies for compliance with a model workplace code. The President announced the formation of the AIP almost a year and a half ago and has been very interested in its progress. The NGOs and companies are near agreement on the formation of a Fair Trade Association, the organization which will oversee the companies' monitoring programs and certify their compliance with the workplace code. The unions will probably not participate further.

To make it attractive for companies to join, the FTA needs to keep costs down. They hope to attract foundation money but are also looking to see if they qualify for any federal grant programs (AID, state, DoL) and have asked us to consider a budget initiative to create a grant program to support these sorts of organizations.

Samet asked if federal funding for such an organization would create a WTO problem? Would it matter if only some of the activities of the organization were given federal funds?

If you have questions, please call me at 456-5386. Although the final documents for the FTA are a work in progress, I could get you drafts if that would help you to make an assessment.

We are meeting on Friday with Gene, Kitty, and other WH and DOL officials

to discuss next steps for the AIP. I would be grateful if it were possible to get your preliminary reaction to the funding issue by Thursday COB, so I can brief Gene before the meeting. I will call your offices tomorrow to check in if I haven't gotten a confirmation that you have received the message.

Many thanks.

RECORD TYPE: PRESIDENTIAL (NOTES READ RECEIPT)

CREATOR: Lael Brainard (CN=Lael Brainard/OU=CEA/O=EOP [CEA])

CREATION DATE/TIME:26-AUG-1998 14:03:06.00

SUBJECT: RECEIVED: Apparel Industry Partnership

TO: Sarah Rosen (CN=Sarah Rosen/OU=OPD/O=EOP [OPD])

READ:UNKNOWN

TEXT:

RETURN RECEIPT

Your Document:

Apparel Industry Partnership

was successfully received by:

CN=Lael Brainard/OU=CEA/O=EOP

at:

08/26/98 02:02:57 PM

RECORD TYPE: PRESIDENTIAL (NOTES MAIL)

CREATOR: Annette E. Rooney (CN=Annette E. Rooney/OU=OMB/O=EOP [OMB])

CREATION DATE/TIME:26-JAN-1999 13:21:04.00

SUBJECT: Labor Testimony on Trade Policy

TO: bvanhan1 (bvanhan1 @ doc.gov @ inet [UNKNOWN])
READ:UNKNOWN

TO: laffairs@ustr.gov (laffairs@ustr.gov @ inet [UNKNOWN])
READ:UNKNOWN

TO: #lrm@exim.gov (#lrm@exim.gov @ inet [UNKNOWN])
READ:UNKNOWN

TO: rademachpr@ssonwpob.us-state.gov (rademachpr@ssonwpob.us-state.gov @ inet [UNKNOWN])
READ:UNKNOWN

TO: epalrm@epamail.epa.gov (epalrm@epamail.epa.gov @ inet [UNKNOWN])
READ:UNKNOWN

TO: jnorton@tda.gov (jnorton@tda.gov @ inet [UNKNOWN])
READ:UNKNOWN

TO: opic.lrm@opic.gov (opic.lrm@opic.gov @ inet [UNKNOWN])
READ:UNKNOWN

TO: agc.llr@treas.sprint.com (agc.llr@treas.sprint.com @ inet [UNKNOWN])
READ:UNKNOWN

TO: justice.lrm@usdoj.gov (justice.lrm@usdoj.gov @ inet [UNKNOWN]) (OA)
READ:UNKNOWN

TO: vancell (vancell @ usda.gov @ inet [UNKNOWN])
READ:UNKNOWN

CC: Kim_David@ustr.gov (Kim_David@ustr.gov @ inet [UNKNOWN])
READ:UNKNOWN

CC: Charles M. Brain (CN=Charles M. Brain/OU=WHO/O=EOP@EOP [WHO])
READ:UNKNOWN

CC: ABERCROMBI_G@A1@CD@VAXGTWY@VAXGTWY (ABERCROMBI_G@A1@CD@VAXGTWY@VAXGTWY [UNKNOWN]) (NSC)
READ:UNKNOWN

CC: Tracey E. Thornton (CN=Tracey E. Thornton/OU=WHO/O=EOP@EOP [WHO])
READ:UNKNOWN

CC: Robert J. Tuccillo (CN=Robert J. Tuccillo/OU=OMB/O=EOP@EOP [OMB])
READ:UNKNOWN

CC: Carole Kitti (CN=Carole Kitti/OU=OMB/O=EOP@EOP [OMB])

READ:UNKNOWN

CC: Nouriel Roubini (CN=Nouriel Roubini/OU=CEA/O=EOP@EOP [CEA])

READ:UNKNOWN

CC: Lori Hendricks (CN=Lori Hendricks/OU=OPD/O=EOP@EOP [OPD])

READ:UNKNOWN

CC: Alphonse J. Maldon (CN=Alphonse J. Maldon/OU=WHO/O=EOP@EOP [WHO])

READ:UNKNOWN

CC: Richard M. Samans (CN=Richard M. Samans/OU=OPD/O=EOP@EOP [OPD])

READ:UNKNOWN

CC: Daniel D. Heath (CN=Daniel D. Heath/OU=OMB/O=EOP@EOP [OMB])

READ:UNKNOWN

CC: Donna M. Rivelli (CN=Donna M. Rivelli/OU=OMB/O=EOP@EOP [OMB])

READ:UNKNOWN

CC: Ronald L. Silberman (CN=Ronald L. Silberman/OU=OMB/O=EOP@EOP [OMB])

READ:UNKNOWN

Annette E. Rooney (CN=Annette E. Rooney/OU=OMB/O=EOP [OMB])

READ:UNKNOWN

TEXT:

Below is the LRM and testimony for Department of Labor. We will also fax this to your office.

LRM ID: AER12

EXECUTIVE OFFICE OF THE PRESIDENT
OFFICE OF MANAGEMENT AND BUDGET
Washington, D.C. 20503-0001

Tuesday, January 26, 1999

LEGISLATIVE REFERRAL MEMORANDUM

TO: Legislative Liaison Officer - See Distribution below

FROM: John D. Burnim (for) Assistant Director for Legislative Reference

OMB CONTACT: Annette E. Rooney

PHONE: (202)395-7300 FAX: (202)395-5691

SUBJECT: LABOR Testimony on Trade Policy

DEADLINE: NOON Wednesday, January 27, 1999

In accordance with OMB Circular A-19, OMB requests the views of your agency on the above subject before advising on its relationship to the program of the President. Please advise us if this item will affect

direct spending or receipts for purposes of the "Pay-As-You-Go" provisions of Title XIII of the Omnibus Budget Reconciliation Act of 1990.

COMMENTS: If you do not respond by the deadline we will presume that your agency has no comment.

DISTRIBUTION LIST

AGENCIES:

33-Environmental Protection Agency - John Reeder - (202) 260-5414
128-US Trade Representative - Fred Montgomery - (202) 395-3475
25-COMMERCE - Michael A. Levitt - (202) 482-3151
6-AGRICULTURECONG AFFAIRS - Vince Ancell (Testimony) - (202) 720-7095
Council of Economic Advisers - Liaison Officer - (202) 395-5084
61-JUSTICE - Dennis Burke - (202) 514-2141
76-National Economic Council - Sonyia Matthews - (202) 456-6630
83-National Security Council - Glyn T. Davies - (202) 456-9221
114-STATE - Paul Rademacher - (202) 647-4463
118-TREASURY - Richard S. Carro - (202) 622-0650
34-Export-Import Bank of the United States - David Carter - (202) 565-3203
91-Overseas Private Investment Corporation - Richard C. Horanburg - (202) 336-8417
115-US Trade and Development Agency - Julie Norton - (703) 875-6854

EOP:

Ronald L. Silberman
Carole Kitt
Donna M. Rivelli
Robert J. Tuccillo
Daniel D. Heath
Tracey E. Thornton
Richard M. Samans
ABERCROMBI_G
Alphonse J. Maldon
Charles M. Brain
Lori Hendricks
LRM ID: AER12 SUBJECT: LABOR Testimony on Trade Policy

RESPONSE TO LEGISLATIVE REFERRAL MEMORANDUM

If your response to this request for views is short (e.g., concur/no comment), we prefer that you respond by e-mail or by faxing us this response sheet. If the response is short and you prefer to call, please call the branch-wide line shown below (NOT the analyst's line) to leave a message with a legislative assistant.

You may also respond by:

(1) calling the analyst/attorney's direct line (you will be connected to voice mail if the analyst does not answer); or

(2) sending us a memo or letter

Please include the LRM number shown above, and the subject shown below.

to step back and put this discussion in the context of our current economic prosperity. We have added nearly 18 million jobs to our economy since President Clinton took office. At 4.3 percent, unemployment is the lowest it's been in almost 30 years and wages are growing at more than twice the rate of inflation. The Administration's policies of controlling spending, making targeted investments in our people, and opening markets has helped us to the longest peacetime expansion in our Nation's history.

Increased trade has been an important source of growth for our economy and export related jobs are good jobs, paying about 13 - 16 percent more than the overall U.S. average. The process of globalization clearly has provided new opportunities for U.S. workers, but has also posed challenges. We are seeing changes in ways of producing goods and doing business as profound as those brought on by the industrial revolution two centuries ago. Globalization has brought with it mobility of trade, technology and capital. That has placed a premium on people -- on human capital and the skills of workers.

At the same time the global economic turbulence brought about by the Asian financial crisis has added urgency to our international labor agenda. We have seen dislocations, instability, and adverse impact on workers, lives in countries with inadequate labor standards or social safety nets.

In order to rise to the challenge of managing globalization successfully we must keep several principles in mind. We must ensure that free trade is also fair. We must ensure that globalization provides broadly shared prosperity so that we all can reap its rewards. We must ensure that working conditions are leveled up -- not pushed down.

These principles not only make good economic policy but that they are also necessary to maintain the confidence and willingness to remain engaged in the global economy. All of this means that just as our world, our hemisphere, and our economies become more integrated, so, too must our trade, our finance and our labor policies. Our challenge is to work with you and other members of Congress to build an architecture that best accomplishes the objectives of all three policy areas.

My approach to this effort begins with certain imperatives in mind.

First, all workers must have the skills they need to compete in this global economy. By investing in our workers we are recognizing that job security starts with skills. For those workers who become dislocated, we need to provide reemployment services and training that will enable them to find new jobs faster and at better rates of pay.

Second, there is a need to build greater consensus and understanding for our view that international labor standards and global trade liberalization are not mutually-exclusive, but are mutually-reinforcing goals.

Third, international labor standards can improve long-term global economic growth by contributing to the development of the middle class, and assuring more broadly-based prosperity.

Fourth, worker rights are important human rights, and an important barometer of democratization, and it is neither right nor pragmatic to believe that global economic policy can be isolated from such concerns.

Fifth, we can be more successful if we build partnerships with other governments, and also partnerships with employer, worker and non-governmental groups to advance our international labor concerns.

* * *

Now let me provide some background on our current initiatives in the international labor area.

I will cover three primary elements in our international policy. First, placing our concerns on the global agenda. Second, building international agreements to advance our concerns. Third, supporting the ILO as the indispensable institution to advance action on international labor standards.

BUILDING THE AGENDA: A CONSENSUS ON CORE LABOR STANDARDS

First, the Administration has sought to place global labor standards squarely on the world's agenda through various international fora, and we have sought to build a level of consensus on international labor standards and globalization where surprisingly little seemed to exist. And now where an even more surprising degree of consensus has been established.

For example, the Administration launched working groups in the ILO and the OECD in 1994 to look at the issue of the labor dimension of trade liberalization. By 1996, both organizations had developed a consensus on the concept of &core labor standards8 -- or a set of standards that ought not be seen as dependent upon a country's level of economic development. Indeed, the implementation of such standards is now understood to actually enhance economic performance.

The list of such standards were agreed to include:

- freedom of association
- collective bargaining
- non-discrimination
- prohibition on forced labor
- prohibition on abusive child labor

This list now reflects not only the view of the OECD, but also the ILO's over 170 member countries, and employer and worker organizations. And although today the notion of &core8 or &fundamental8 standards is widely-recognized and referred to -- it only emerged as an accepted principle recently.

This set of standards was agreed upon to be differentiated from other types of &outcome8 standards, such as levels of wages and benefits and other social protections that might be expected to vary with the economic development of a country. We have made it clear that we are not in the

business of trying to set wage rates -- we are in the business of trying to make sure that workers have a fair chance to bargain for what their productivity suggests they might earn.

President Clinton has elevated the importance of international labor standards on the global economic agenda through meetings of the G-8 and other regional efforts, as well as placing the issue before the economic institutions of the international system.

Last year, President Clinton addressed both the World Trade Organization and the IMF/World Bank meetings. In both of those speeches, he referred to the role of the ILO in the global economy, and the need for those institutions to work more closely with the ILO.

After all, the mandate of the ILO goes to the heart of the central mission of all international economic institutions--including the WTO, the IMF and the World Bank. Clearly, trade, investment and development are not objectives in and of themselves--they are objectives because we believe them to be the key to improving people's lives.

Indeed, just last week in his State of the Union Address, President Clinton summed up our challenge this way. &When you come right down to it,8 he said, &now that the world economy is becoming more and more integrated, we have to do in the world what we have spent the better part of this century doing here at home. We have to put a human face on the global economy.8

I believe that recent criticisms of globalization, of freer trade, of open financial markets, makes it more important than ever that we support a greater working relationship between the ILO and the WTO, IMF and World Bank. And this is not a one-way relationship where the ILO has all the talking to do. But rather the ILO also must continue -- as it has often done -- to find the best possible ways to support the mandates of the WTO, the IMF and World Bank. We need to maximize the role of all of these institutions in the interests of a successful global economy. We are pleased that consistent with the request of the Administration, last October the first high level dialogue between ILO and IMF/World Bank officials was held in Washington. Further such exchanges and cooperation are expected, and supported by the Administration. We have also encouraged a similar dialogue between the ILO and WTO.

REACHING AGREEMENTS ON LABOR STANDARDS

That leads to the second policy initiative--shaping international agreements to reflect our agenda.

Last June included a very important step forward. After nearly two years of effort, the ILO, with the support of global worker and employer groups, negotiated and adopted a new Declaration on Fundamental Rights and Principles at Work, and a follow-up mechanism to measure compliance. In so doing, the ILO has affirmed that membership connotes certain obligations, which include adhering to the core rights of freedom of association and the right of collective bargaining, non-discrimination in employment, and the abolition of forced labor and abusive child labor.

The first follow-up reports measuring country compliance under the new declaration are expected to be completed in 2000.

The new declaration is the most important development in expressing the ILO's mandate since the historic Declaration of Philadelphia in 1944, which sought to provide the foundation to reconcile concerns for social justice with the economic recovery strategies for the post-war period. The ILO declaration of 1998 provides the same path forward as we attempt to place labor standards priorities in the context of the global economy of the 21st century. What we need to do is invest the effort to assure that the new follow-up mechanism counts in the world -- that it has teeth.

North American Agreement on Labor Cooperation

We have also moved forward in new ways to develop labor agreements at the regional level. You are well aware of the North American Agreement on Labor Cooperation that was negotiated with NAFTA and implemented in 1994 between the United States, Mexico and Canada.

This was the first agreement we signed that integrated our trade and labor agenda, and we believe that it has been an important vehicle to assure that the concerns of workers have received sustained attention over time as part of the NAFTA relationship.

The main objective of the NAALC is to improve working standards and living conditions in the three countries, and this is largely carried out through a cooperative plan of exchanges on the broad range of labor matters. The agreement also permits an oversight mechanism on the effective enforcement of labor laws by the three countries. This process is aimed at promoting a greater public understanding of labor law implementation procedures, and enhancing transparency of enforcement.

The NAALC has contributed significantly to building a more cooperative relationship with Mexico and Canada on labor matters. It promotes international scrutiny of labor conditions, generates public debate, and provides greater understanding of labor law matters. Since 1994, some 13 submissions concerning labor law practices in Mexico have been reviewed by us and a number have been the subject of consultations at the ministerial level. They have covered issues of industrial relations, gender discrimination and health and safety matters.

And although I won't tell you that we have never had disagreements with Mexico under the agreement, I do believe that the level of cooperation with Mexico has been improving. The current Secretary of Labor of Mexico has invited me on an official visit to Mexico, when we expect to work together on women's workplace issues, and the working conditions and industrial relations situation in the maquiladora sector.

Regional Initiatives

As you also know, we have a schedule to complete the Free Trade Area of the Americas by 2005, and in that regard we have also focused our attention on the labor aspect of this process. With President Clinton in the forefront, Hemispheric leaders agreed in Chile last spring that their labor ministers needed to work to strengthen basic worker rights and modernize and improve the ability of labor ministries to deliver services

to workers and employers. The leaders directed the labor ministers to meet to move this agenda forward, and we completed a successful meeting of the hemisphere's labor ministers in October, also in Chile. We adopted a detailed plan of action, and we have better engaged the OAS, the Inter-American Development Bank and the ILO in working with us in the implementation. We are committed to produce a work plan by April, and we will meet again in a year's time in the Dominican Republic to continue our progress.

We also have active labor dimensions as part of our on-going framework relationships with the European Union under the New Transatlantic Agenda and the Transatlantic Economic Partnership, as well as in the Asia-Pacific Economic Cooperation (APEC) forum. I am scheduled to host the APEC labor ministers later in 1999.

STRENGTHENING THE ILO

A third, and related policy initiative that we are pursuing is to strengthen the capacity of the International Labor Organization. As we look at the process of globalization and the labor issues moving to the center -- we must again recognize that the ILO is the indispensable institution to our objectives.

We need the ILO. We need an ILO that works. We need an ILO dedicated to excellence. The global economy depends upon that. As I indicated previously, the work of the WTO and the IMF and World Bank depends upon it.

As President Clinton has said with regard to the labor dimension of globalization, "We should level up, not level down. Without such a strategy, we cannot build the necessary public support for the global economy. Working people will only assume the risks of a free international market if they have the confidence that this system will work for them." Our strategy very much includes the ILO.

We have worked to strengthen at least three aspects of the ILO.

Child Labor

First, we have been a leader in making the ILO a leader in the fight against abusive child labor. And support from the Congress has been central to that leadership. Last year President Clinton requested \$30 million in funding for the ILO's International Program on the Elimination of Child Labor -- or IPEC -- to put us in the forefront of that program. The Congress fully responded to that request.

As all of you know, the ILO estimates that there are some 250 million working children under 14, with tens of millions of those working in abusive conditions. And although there are no simplistic solutions to this problem, and none of us wants to see a child being driven from a bad job to a worse one, neither can we simply tolerate the type of abuse that widely exists. Bonded child labor, children in mines, children trafficked for commercial sexual exploitation, children exposed to intense heat, harmful chemicals and dangerous machinery.

Moreover, the stain of child labor on the global economy threatens to

undermine increased trade and commerce by calling into question trading rules that are silent on such abuses.

If you don't believe that child labor concerns can shake trading relationships, ask the industries and associations that we have worked with to remove children from work and to place them in schools -- with monitoring programs run by the ILO to assure commitments are kept. We have partnered with employers and other groups in Bangladesh to remove 10,000 children from the garment industry, and with Pakistan to remove 7,000 children from stitching soccer balls, and 30,000 children from knotting carpets. We are currently looking at programs with ILO monitoring to take children out of the fireworks and coffee industries in Central America, the sporting goods and brassware industries of India, and commercial agriculture in certain African countries.

Furthermore, it should come as no surprise that the issue of child labor has called into view concerns about international labor standards more generally. After all, concerns about child labor that emerged in the latter part of the 19th century led to the first international labor standards. And four of the first 10 conventions adopted by the ILO after its creation in 1919 dealt with setting minimum ages for the employment of children in industry, at night, at sea and in agriculture.

Our concern for child labor today in our global economy is in keeping with this tradition of the ILO, and we hope, as the President said in his State of the Union Address, to lead the conclusion of a new ILO convention in June that would ban the worst forms of child labor.

Codes of Conduct

A second area where we have sought to strengthen the engagement of the ILO is in the question of codes of conduct for working conditions, and building greater private sector partnerships. In the last several years there has been a great and growing interest in firms and employer associations to adopt codes of conduct covering various labor standards. These are often done with reference to ILO standards.

And, of course, the Administration has encouraged efforts such as the Apparel Industry Partnership to work out a code of conduct and elements of monitoring and implementation. The AIP group has done ground breaking work and we hope to see their efforts embraced even more broadly. We have held two joint programs with the European Union to also encourage a transatlantic partnership on the code of conduct approach advanced by the AIP.

Also at our urging, the ILO has done an extensive review of codes of conduct initiatives, and is being asked to look more carefully at what role it could play in the further development of codes of conduct. It is important to keep in mind that this type of work is, and can only, go forward in the ILO with the support of the employer and worker groups -- and in this regard the ILO could be part of important future partnerships on codes of conduct.

Implementing Labor Standards

A third area where we are trying to strengthen the ILO is in its ability to support the implementation of the new Declaration on Fundamental Rights and Principles at Work. We certainly want to be tough on accountability under the new follow-up mechanism -- and we will be.

But we also want to be able to encourage those governments prepared to come into compliance with such standards if resources were available to help them do so. That is precisely why the President has requested that the Congress support providing an additional \$25 million to the ILO to set up a new arm of the organization to back its political and moral commitment on fundamental rights with resources targeted to the task.

This funding would be built upon the IPEC model of targeted, project-specific programs with measurable results. The funding could, for example, support the development and implementation of industrial relations institutions that would assist governments to move away from authoritarian or non-democratic ways of resolving labor disputes, to one based upon the rule of law. It could also provide funding to support the application of basic labor standards in a particular sector of an economy, such as programs we are currently developing to agreed standards in the garment sectors of Haiti and Cambodia.

In addition, this new arm could assist the ILO to work with the IMF and World Bank to better integrate fundamental labor rights into their programs. Such an arm might also help the ILO respond to the related needs underscored by the Asian financial crisis, for help on social safety net strategies for impacted countries. While many recognize the need to mitigate the impacts on the millions of workers displaced, the inadequacy of social safety net programs, including unemployment insurance, pensions, and employment strategies, makes clear a need to enhance the ability of the ILO to respond quickly with the highest quality policy assistance in these areas.

The President has also proposed that the Department of Labor be provided \$10 million to expand our capacity to respond to the some 50 countries who have sought our assistance to improve working conditions and labor programs in the last two years.

If we can achieve these objectives with the ILO, then I think we will be much closer to the need, as President Clinton said, to &put a human face on the global economy. 8

WORKER ADJUSTMENT

Even as we focus on our international labor agenda, we need to be mindful of the first imperative I raised this morning: we must ensure that our workers who face change from the global economy are given the tools to manage that change and that no one be left behind. We must assure that workers who are dislocated from their jobs due to trade -- and for that matter for any reason -- get the tools they need to find and prepare themselves for new jobs.

The President's budget to be announced next week will emphasize our commitment to this principle through a five year increase in funds to

serve dislocated workers -- with a goal that these services become universally available. This investment will be coupled with an initiative to improve rapid response to worker dislocations and improve information which will link laid off workers with services available in their communities.

But we have always had a special commitment to workers dislocated by trade. Beginning with the passage of the Trade Expansion Act of 1962 all the way to the 1993 enactment of the NAFTA Transitional Adjustment Assistance (NAFTA-TAA) Program this commitment has been reaffirmed. And I am hopeful that we will continue -- on a bipartisan basis -- to support our system of assistance to trade-impacted workers.

A little over a year ago, the President expressed his commitment to improving and expanding the programs which assist workers who lose their jobs as a result of trade. He proposed both administrative measures and legislative reforms that would expand the coverage of workers who are adversely affected by trade and increase the emphasis on the retraining of workers in a manner that would enhance their ability to compete in the global economy.

As we began to consider ways to enhance and improve the programs, it became apparent that the most meaningful reform would be the creation of a single trade adjustment assistance program which would serve all workers whose jobs are lost as a result of increased trade, regardless of which countries that trade may be with. This includes covering workers who lose their jobs because of shift in production) whether it be to Canada or Mexico, or elsewhere in the world.

In designing this consolidated trade adjustment program, we adopted the best features of TAA and NAFTA-TAA. We not only provided for increased resources for training, but also included provisions to make our assistance more timely, encourage prompt readjustment and to make sure that workers access training that is most suited to their individual needs.

Our approach is consistent with the provisions of the recently-enacted Workforce Investment Act. The bill anticipates the delivery of services through the One-Stop career centers which are being established in all States and many communities. And, consistent with the Government Performance and Results Act (GPRA), the bill would also enhance program accountability by requiring that TAA and other dislocated worker programs have common performance outcome measures.

I would like to recognize the efforts of Congressmen Robert Matsui and David Bonior for introducing trade adjustment assistance reform legislation in the last Congress and for collaborating closely with both the Administration and organized labor in design of the consolidated program. And I am especially grateful that Senator Moynihan, who has a long record of championing quality worker adjustment assistance for trade-impacted workers, last week introduced S. 220, the Trade Adjustment Assistance Improvements Act of 1999, which provides for these same important enhancements and expanded program coverage. The President's FY 2000 Budget will propose the funding for this reform legislation and I look forward to working with this committee to ensure its early enactment.

Thank you.

RECORD TYPE: PRESIDENTIAL (NOTES MAIL)

CREATOR: Ann Chih Lin <annlin@umich.edu> (Ann Chih Lin <annlin@umich.edu> [UNKNOWN])

CREATION DATE/TIME: 19-MAY-1999 16:28:57.00

SUBJECT: IPE timeline and other info

TO: Sharon Lee Price <slprice@umich.edu> (Sharon Lee Price <slprice@umich.edu> [UNKNOWN])
READ: UNKNOWN

TO: Sheldon Danziger <sheldond@umich.edu> (Sheldon Danziger <sheldond@umich.edu> [UNKNOWN])
READ: UNKNOWN

TO: Mark Vincent Ouellette <ouellett@umich.edu> (Mark Vincent Ouellette <ouellett@umich.edu> [UNKNOWN])
READ: UNKNOWN

TO: Scott Allard <sallard@umich.edu> (Scott Allard <sallard@umich.edu> [UNKNOWN])
READ: UNKNOWN

TO: john robert chamberlin <johnch@umich.edu> (john robert chamberlin <johnch@umich.edu> [UNKNOWN])
READ: UNKNOWN

CC: Rebecca M. Blank (CN=Rebecca M. Blank/OU=CEA/O=EOP [CEA])
READ: UNKNOWN

TEXT:

Hi everyone. I heard that the IPE evaluation came through with a lot of machine language, so I'm sending it again in the hopes that it will look better this time. In addition, I'm attaching the timeline for preparing the IPE, and a packet of the materials I distributed to the students. Let me know if you have questions and/or want to discuss these. ann

Ann Chih Lin 466 Lorch Hall 734-764-7507 annlin@umich.edu

School of Public Policy and Dept. of Political Science
University of Michigan Ann Arbor, MI 48109

"I would like you to listen with an open mind, but not
so open that your brains fall out."
Sara Maitland

- IPEeval.doc - IPEtimeline.doc - IPEpacket.doc===== ATTACHMENT 1

=====
ATT CREATION TIME/DATE: 0 00:00:00.00

TEXT:

> bcahc e8p)HHHd|||L*X\|Z\|||h|||SPP 638: Integrated Policy Exercise -- Ja
n 1999

Topic: The Apparel Industry Partnership

Evaluation

Contact information:

Ann Chih Lin, Assistant Professor
School of Public Policy, University of Michigan

466 Lorch Hall, Ann Arbor, MI 48109-1220
Ph: 734-764-7507
E-mail: annlin@umich.edu

Executive Summary

The 1999 Integrated Policy Exercise was held at UM-SPP from Monday, January 4 to Saturday, January 9. The topic was international labor standards, with a specific focus on a currently pending policy issue, the White House-sponsored Apparel Industry Partnership (AIP) and its draft monitoring proposal. 70 students, including all the first-year MPP's, enrolled.

Over the course of the exercise, students, working in teams, wrote a strategy memo advocating a particular stance on the IPE for the organization they represented; negotiated a number of policy coalitions, each with a different focus; created press releases to both explain their positions and advance particular negotiating stances; and prepared both written and oral testimony for a mock Congressional hearing. Two teams of students were assigned to represent the chair and the ranking member of the congressional committee, and negotiated the witness list, orchestrated the hearings, and questioned the witnesses.

In general, the coalitions that testified at the hearing approved of the AIP's monitoring proposal, with some significant changes that strengthened monitoring and allowed the document to be revised and updated over time. Two outside experts invited to evaluate the hearing stated that they were impressed by the speed with which the students had learned the contours of the debate, by their ability to make the case for their positions, and by the creativity of the modified AIP. They were, however, surprised at the extent of the pro-free trade sentiment on the part of the student teams, which they felt diverged somewhat from the environment in Washington. They also commented that students were generally less able to manage questions about tradeoffs arising from their positions, than questions about the advantages and the rationale for their policy stance.

Faculty response to the exercise was very positive: in particular, faculty noticed the energy and dedication the exercise called forth from the students. Student response was mixed and heavily dependent upon the team the students worked in. On a scale of 1-5, with 5 being "strongly agree," the average score on the question, "The IPE was a valuable learning experience" was a 3.5. H

however, this was bimodally distributed, with 4 groups rating it 4 or above and 3 groups rating it 3 or below. Generally, the groups which were left out of the eventual coalitions were the most frustrated with the exercise. Students were generally more positive about their teams than about the exercise; the average rating for the question, "Working with the members of my team was a valuable exercise," was a 4, and some of the groups who had given the exercise a low rating gave their teams a very high rating.

The exercise could be improved in several ways. The most important is to increase the integration of skills and knowledge from the different parts of the MPP curriculum. Opportunities to engage in data analysis or in using data to build arguments need to be made more evident in the structure of the exercise. Second, the negotiation workshops should be restructured and a group process workshop added. Third, assigning student teams to different roles -- some who were members of Congress and some who were witnesses at the hearing -- created procedural confusion. This should be restructured or discontinued. Fourth, the "scoring" of the exercise could be reconsidered: currently, most of the awards go to those teams that agree to join a coalition, as opposed to teams that avoid making unrealistic compromises. However, the successes of this year -- engagement with a multi-faceted policy issue and with practitioners; realistic negotiations; exposure to organizations with real interests, constraints, and a practical stake in the outcome of negotiations; and the emphasis on student interaction and teamwork -- should be preserved and built upon.

In addition, moving from 70 students to 140 will require some logistical rethinking. One possibility is to run parallel exercises: running two or even three simulations on the same topic, with the same role assignments, at the same time. This has the advantage of providing the opportunity for student teams to reflect upon why outcomes across different simulations varied, and to compare negotiating strategies across teams that represented the same organization. Other alternatives, which are to run two or three simulations on different topics, or to expand the number of teams (and thus policy actors) in the simulation, are logistically complex and would require a much greater investment of resources.

This evaluation is organized as follows. Section I, "Background," explains the issues behind and the structure of the exercise. Section II, "Evaluation," examines how well the exercise satisfied the pedagogical reasons for its adoption, with some additional commentary drawn from student evaluations and from informal conversations with faculty and students about the exercise. Section III, "Curriculum Suggestions," lists and explains a number of curricular issues that should be built into next year's exercise. Finally, Section IV, "Logistics," discusses the ways in which the exercise can be expanded to accommodate both the first- and second-year MPP students, as currently planned for the January 2000 IPE.

Section I: Background

The Integrated Policy

Exercise (IPE) is a new part of the curriculum at the U-M School of Public Policy, designed to help students integrate skills from different courses and to work together across classes and concentrations. This intensive, one-week policy simulation that gives student teams the chance to do a time-pressured policy s

tudy from the point of view of a particular policy actor, to present results and policy recommendations in public, and to form coalitions around policy positions.

A first run of the IPE was held in January 1998 under the direction of Doug Ross. 12 students enrolled; the topic was charter schools. This year, the IPE was mandatory for all first year students and optional for others. In all, 70 students enrolled. The topic was international labor standards, with a specific focus on a currently pending policy proposal, the White House-sponsored Apparel Industry Partnership (AIP).

Policy Focus

The AIP is an (actual) task force of government, business, labor, and non-governmental organizations (NGO's), first convened by the White House in 1996 to discuss the issue of labor standards for apparel companies who contract out their production to overseas manufacturers. In 1997, the AIP issued a consensus document creating a model "code of conduct" for companies. In November 1998, the AIP issued a second document proposing that an organization, the Fair Labor Association, be established to monitor company compliance with the code of conduct and to approve "sweat-free" labels for clothing made by companies that passed muster. But two important participants in the AIP -- UNITE, the garment workers' union, and a leading NGO representing church groups -- pulled out of the task force to express their displeasure with the November agreement. As our exercise was being finalized, businesses, NGO's, and government representatives were actually jockeying for position, looking for compromises, fighting for control of the boards of directors of the major advocacy groups involved in this issue, releasing new policy proposals, and the like. The IPE did not re-run an event that had already happened; it was right in the middle of events.

The IPE Process

Students were assigned to one of 12 teams representing organizations with interests in the AIP. The students' job was to decide what their group's position would be on the November 1998 monitoring agreement, to find coalition partners, and to testify in front of a mock Congressional hearing. Their negotiations took place in a specific context: we invented a factory fire in China that had a bipartisan group of hard-liners in Congress calling for an import ban on all apparel made in China.

Students received their team assignments on Monday afternoon and were given 24 hours to write a strategy memo that detailed the organization's goals, recommended a position on the AIP, and proposed a strategy to accomplish those goals.

Teams had access to a general briefing book on international labor standards and the AIP, as well as a listing of web resources on their particular organization. Nine of the twelve teams had a contact at the organization they represented who was available for a scheduled phone consultation and/or who sent internal materials for the students to use; the other three had faculty contacts who served the same purpose.

After turning in their strategy memo on Tuesday afternoon, students participated in a 4-hr workshop on negotiation skills led by Julia Wondolleck and Steve Yaffee of the UM-SNRE. At the close of the workshop, th

ey were given an "update" including news of the factory fire, a spreading public boycott movement in the U.S., and the Senate Foreign Relations Committee's decision to call a hearing on apparel manufacturing and labor standards in China.

Student teams were told that they had to join a coalition to testify at the hearing, and that their coalition had to be invited to testify by the chair or ranking member. This set up two sets of negotiations: one with other teams to build coalitions, and one with the members of Congress for permission to testify.

Teams negotiated Wednesday and Thursday and put out press releases on Thursday announcing their coalitions. On Friday, the teams representing members of Congress negotiated with the coalitions and issued an invitation list to the hearings. The teams prepared their oral and written testimony on Friday and Saturday and testified Saturday afternoon, in front of a panel that included the two members of Congress represented by students, Prof. Alan Deardorff, and two outside experts: Anthony Freeman, Director of the Washington Branch Office of the International Labor Organization, and Bama Athreya, Program Officer at the International Labor Rights Fund. The IPE concluded with an awards banquet Saturday evening.

Evaluation of the students' performance occurred at several different points. The strategy memos were evaluated and commented upon by a team of three faculty members; the press releases, by a team of two. Each written testimony was assigned to one faculty member for evaluation; the oral testimony was evaluated by the non-student members of the hearing panel. In addition, students voted on peer awards for "most impressive team" and "most impressive individuals."

Section II: Evaluation

Faculty response to the exercise was very positive: in particular, faculty noticed the energy and dedication the exercise called forth from the students. Student response was mixed and heavily dependent upon the team the students worked in. On a scale of 1-5, with 5 being "strongly agree," the average score on the question, "The IPE was a valuable learning experience" was a 3.5. This was bimodally distributed, with 4 groups rating it 4 or above and 3 groups rating it 3 or below. In general, the groups which were left out of the eventual coalitions, and the groups representing the senators, were the most frustrated with the exercise.

The difference in responses to the IPE speaks to the different criteria that faculty and students used to evaluate the exercise. The pedagogical objectives the faculty had for the exercise were largely, although not entirely, achieved. The students, while appreciating much of the exercise, were frustrated both by the rules and by the scoring. These frustrations weighed most heavily on the groups that lost out in the policy negotiations, and the senators, who did not participate in the policy negotiations but were heavily involved in the rules negotiations.

Faculty Objectives

In the curriculum revision process that created the IPE, and in consultation during the fall planning process for the IPE, faculty formed a set of pedagogical objectives for the exercise. These were:

- (1) to give students experience in applying their knowledge to current policy issues and to put them in contact with practitioners working on those issues;

The sustained and in-depth study of international labor standards was clearly a strength of the exercise. In the open-ended comments on their evaluation, about 20% of the students responding mentioned

ned this as the most positive aspect of the exercise. Students said that they learned a great deal about an issue with which they were unfamiliar, that they were forced to understand the multiplicity of different perspectives on the issue, and that they were intellectually challenged by the sustained attention they were able to give it. Students were also overwhelmingly positive about their practitioner contacts, who included the head of the Calvert (Investment) Group's Social Research Division, a senior manager for corporate affairs at Wal-Mart, the legislative director at UNITE, the director of the International Child Labor Study Office at the DOL, and program officers responsible for labor standards issues at the various NGO's.

The focus on international labor standards was supported outside of the exercise as well. Faculty integrated the subject, in different ways, into all but one (Calculus) of the core classes in the Fall term, and also into Program Evaluation and Benefit-Cost. The international student newsletter focused one of its special issues on the topic. We were particularly fortunate that our diplomat-in-residence, Dan Turnquist, was an expert on these issues and had worked on them personally for most of his career; he was an important resource for the students.

(2) to integrate the skills that students learn from their different courses;

The integration of skills across the curriculum was not as successful as the other parts of the exercise. Students gave a closed-ended question, "I used knowledge and skills from several different courses in the IPE," an average rating of 3.2. In addition, about 10% of the students specifically commented on this as something that they missed about the IPE.

The choice to focus the exercise on a late-breaking, current policy problem meant that it was hard to find a dataset, a set of impact measures, or other kinds of quantitative evidence for students to analyze on the AIP in particular. Much of the scholarly work in this area, which Bob Stern and Alan Deardorff helped me find, uses economic models to simulate the effect of different proposals. However, most of these models were too advanced for our first-year, first-term students to manipulate on their own.

The compromise was to give the students some scholarly articles to read that used data to evaluate the effect of trade sanctions and trade restrictions on the American economy, as well as critiques of the methodology and evidence in those specific articles. However, because students were not specifically required to analyze these (as opposed to all the rest of the material they were given as resources), they didn't. Nor, for the most part, did they use the materials they were given as part of the briefing books: scholarly articles, commentaries and opinion pieces, journalism. When they did use resources, they tended to cite the pieces that they agreed with for support, rather than seriously evaluate and make use of the arguments that those pieces advanced. The end result was that an exercise where economic analysis and argument ought to be central ended up evoking reasonably shallow economic reasoning.

The possibilities of a management focus on this issue were also missed, although the fact that public management was not offered in the fall made this omission more understandable. Students did not think much about the ease or difficulty of managing some of their policy proposals. However, the exercise did clearly show students the importance of managing their own collaboration. About 20% of the students mentioned issues of group dynamics -- ego management, taking the negotiations personally, free rider problems, inability to make group decisions -- as aspects of the exercise that needed improvement.

Several students also suggested, after taking public management, that a group process workshop be built into the IPE.

(3) to give the students experience at negotiating, working in teams, and public presentation;

Students clearly consid

ered negotiation the heart of the exercise. Over 50% of the students thought that the most positive aspect of the exercise was the experience with negotiation and the knowledge they gained about its complexity. The most creative aspects of the exercise were the result of negotiation: in particular, one team, whose real-world influence and resources are minimal, managed to make itself a central player by positioning itself as an honest, impartial broker. This aspect of the exercise was also the most visible to faculty, almost all of whom commented to me about the energy, the seriousness, and the involvement of the students.

Students also had many suggestions about how to improve the negotiation component of the exercise. While 10% of the students were very positive about the negotiation workshop, 20% wanted the workshop to be shortened, more hands-on, more directly related to the exercise, less about competition and more about consensus-building, or simply eliminated. 15% also wanted a time limit on negotiations, so that teams couldn't wiggle out of a previously negotiated agreement, and so they could pay attention to producing testimony rather than holding their coalitions together.

Students generally liked their teams, which had 5-6 people each. On the closed-ended question, "Working with the members of my team was a valuable exercise," the average rating (out of 5) was a 4, and some of the groups who had given the exercise a low rating gave their teams a very high rating. Students, however, also commented that the teams should be smaller (10%) and that they wanted some help with group dynamics (20%).

Because the evaluat

ion occurred before the public presentation, none of the students mentioned this on the evaluation. One student commented, however, that the fact that groups might not be invited to testify meant that groups put in a lot of work preparing, with no payoff if they were not invited. The faculty/expert panelists at the hearing were impressed with the quality of the presentations and with several of the presenters, in particular. The students, I gathered, were surprised at how hard the questions from the invited panelists (Deardorff, Freeman, and Athreya) were, especially because they hadn't realized how central the invitees would be to the event. Announcing and publicizing the "performance" aspect of the closing event would probably be beneficial in the future.

(4) to give studen

ts a sense of the multi-faceted nature of policymaking and of the constraints upon policymakers;

26% of the students considered the knowledge they gained about real-world constraints on policymaking to be the most valuable aspect of the exercise. Students particularly valued the help of their practitioner contacts in this area, although teams did a great job in figuring out their organization's position and goals even when they did not (because of the practitioner's constraints) have early access to their practitioner.

Additional, though perhaps

negative, evidence of the success of the IPE at teaching about the multi-faceted nature of policymaking is that 34% of the students thought the exercise needed more focus and structure. Much of this reflects confusion over the rules for being invited to testify, an issue I address later. But part of this sentiment comes from the fact that there were multiple issues and multiple motives on

the table, as there are for the actual organizations involved. Students tended to simplify their task by marginalizing some issues as side issues or allowing some groups to specialize in them. When they could not, as with the issue of trade with China, they tended to get frustrated at the way this "extraneous" issue was diverting attention from the "real" problem of the AIP. (I was often asked what the hearing was "really" about.)

One set of student comments is particularly interesting. About 20% of the students, including both "winners" and "losers" (but weighted towards "losers") in the coalition building, felt that groups were compromising too easily and not staying true to their real-world positions. Some felt that this was a problem that could be rectified by more information; others, that it was an issue of principles. Students also commented after the exercise that the scoring rewarded all groups that built coalitions regardless of the compromises they made, over groups that brokered them or that tried to stay in character. It is hard to figure out how much this is a complaint about the structure of the exercise, and how much this is a complaint about the world.

(5) to improve the communication between 1st and 2nd year students and between the domestic and international tracks.

Because this year's exercise was mandatory only for first years, it could not build many bridges across the classes. But 15% of the students specifically mentioned that they most valued the chance to meet and get to know their classmates. Comments about peers on the nomination ballots for peer awards were very positive, and students clearly noticed the contributions of people who were not their teammates, as well as of those who were.

In the process of assigning students to groups, we (Yolanda Li zardi-Marino and I) took some care to mix domestic and international track students; to mix people who had done well in the first term with people who had done less well; to avoid concentrating the students of color; to put ESL-students with at least one other student who could speak their native language; and to make use of students' past experiences. The snowstorm, which caused some reshuffling of groups so as to make sure each group had at least a few members, created one major problem: a group with only one native English speaker. Apart from that, however, the mixing was time-consuming but quite successful.

Students raised additional comments about the IPE, which will be dealt with in the next section. Two of their issues, however, merit some attention here because of the pedagogical choices they involve. One is the question of rules, and the other the question of scoring.

Rules: Of the 34% of students who felt the exercise needed more focus and structure, many mentioned the problems with the witness list invitations in particular. Briefly, two student teams were assigned to represent the chair and the ranking member of the Senate Foreign Relations Committee. These two committees were given the power to decide which coalitions to invite, how much time to allot to each coalition to testify and take questions, and how the hearing should be organized.

This control over structure was intended to give the members of Congress some power to bargain with, and to force the possible witnesses to take the political interests of the senators at the hearing into account. But as it turned out, the members of Congress felt they had too little to bargain with, while the other teams thought the members had too much power. The constant negotiation over rules meant that the senators spent almost no time thinking about their member's policy position and way too much t

ime arguing over the allocation of minutes. They were also frustrated about the unpredictable ways in which the hearing diverged from the official rules of the Senate, and about the times when faculty (Rick Hall, who advised the teams, and I) would intervene or not. Meanwhile, the teams were put into the position of preparing testimony that they could not give, after they were disinvited. Some teams were thus unable to demonstrate the excellent work that they had done in preparation.

The question here is whether conflicts over rules and procedure are an important part of the IPE, or whether they are an element of realism that can be usefully abstracted away. It is possible to have "better," i.e. more structured, conflict over rules. But it is also possible to confine the exercise to policy conflicts by setting up clearer "rules of the game" in advance.

Scoring: Certificates were given for "Best Position Paper," "Best Press Release," "Best Coalition," "Best Oral Statement," "Best Written Testimony," and "Best Response to Questions." Special awards were also given to the senators, who were not members of the coalitions, did not testify, and thus could not compete for those awards. Peer awards for teams and for individuals were also distributed.

These awards create incentives to compromise and join senatorially-approved coalitions, because teams which did not join coalitions could not testify.

Those teams were thus ineligible for 4 out of the 6 awards. They remove incentives for staying in character, because there are no awards for verisimilitude.

And they skew the distribution of peer awards, because teams were quite bitter about other teams which held out from joining or who raided existing coalitions.

One solution is to remove the requirement to join a coalition. However, without a strong incentive to join coalitions, there is no incentive to join any.

Many of the members of the faculty were insistent that in the real world, a group loses if it's not part of the solution. But other faculty felt that groups should be rewarded for having the "right" analysis or the "right" argument, even if they couldn't convince anyone else that they did. This year, the emphasis clearly was on joining coalitions, and students felt that this made the negotiations real and valuable. But the students who were left out of coalitions were also left out of a significant part of the exercise: in particular, the chance to testify.

Another solution is to add a set of awards for verisimilitude.

However, this would require judges who actually know something about the groups the students represent. This year, we spread the grading out among multiple faculty, so as to allow the papers to get back as quickly as possible and to involve as many faculty as possible in the exercise. But faculty graded papers on logic and argument, not on faithful representation, because for the most part they didn't know much about the issues or the groups in question. Grading on verisimilitude would require (1) the faculty coordinator to do all the grading; (2) individual faculty to learn something about at least some of the groups; (3) practitioners to grade. The last is most attractive, but unrealistic if we want to distribute awards before the exercise ends. Also, while I found practitioners very willing to talk to students for an hour; reading a student paper might be a very different story. Very few of the practitioners I recruited had any prior relationship with SPP or with SPP faculty; there is probably a limit as to how much we can ask them to do under those circumstances.

In summary, the

pedagogical objectives of the exercise were largely achieved, although a good deal of room remains for improvement. In particular, one focus of next year's

exercise should be the integration of skills across the curriculum in the exercise. A restructuring of the negotiation workshop and an addition of a group process component are also important. Issues relating to rules and to scoring need to be resolved. However, the successes of this year -- engagement with a multi-faceted policy issue and with practitioners; realistic negotiations; exposure to organizations with real interests, constraints, and a practical stake in the outcome of negotiations; and the emphasis on student interaction and teamwork -- should be preserved and built upon.

Section III: Curriculum Suggestions

I have one problem that seems insoluble, and a set of suggestions that will hopefully solve some other problems.

(1) Timing. There is probably no realistic

alternative to holding the exercise the first week of Winter Term. Our students take so many courses outside the school that holding the IPE in the middle of the term will cause them to fall behind in their other classes. (I should note here, though, that 10% of the students suggested holding the IPE in the middle of the semester, as Harvard does.) They use Spring Break for job hunting.

Ending classes a week early in either term would mean that students would deal with finals and the exercise at the same time; and UM's compressed schedule makes the end of the term a disaster for faculty, all of whom are also teaching non-SPP courses. Holding the IPE the first week of Fall Term means that we have first-years in the exercise who have not taken SPP courses at all.

Having said

this, there are multiple problems with the current timing. The massive snowstorm this year could easily reoccur, and indeed a snowstorm anywhere in the country makes it hard for our students to get back on time. Next year, there is the Y2K problem to further derange transportation. The American Economics Association and the American Historical Association always hold their annual meetings in the first/second week of January, which means we lose both faculty and possible guest speakers. After classes start in the first week, the university cannot provide us with space, computers, or meeting rooms to accommodate this many small groups working together. And finally, many practitioners simply have not come back from their holidays, or are too busy coming back from their holidays to help us. This is especially true for members of Congress: the week we hold the IPE is the week Congress goes into session.

Now for some problems we can solve:

(2) Build a specific data analysis problem into the exercise, and/or specific policy questions that students must answer in their testimony. Students should have to turn this in before the actual testimony day, so that they will actually devote time to preparing it.

(3) Start working with the faculty who will teach the negotiation component early, so as to build 2-3 small workshops (1 1/2 hrs) on negotiation into the week. Although the negotiation workshop itself did not get very high ratings, my sense is that this is a format issue rather than a personnel issue. Because they are already familiar with our exercise, I recommend working with Julia Wondolleck and Steve Yaffee again, and bringing them into the planning and structuring of the exercise. Working with them early will also allow them to schedule our workshops into their first week of Winter Term; the fact that they weren't able to do that this year meant that the four-hour Tuesday block was the only time they could give us. One, preferably both, of these workshops should deal with the specific issues and groups in th

e IPE.

A time limit (perhaps 2 days) on negotiations tramples on realism but will probably make things easier for the students.

(4) Add a group process workshop

to the first day of the IPE. We can incorporate the workshop into the IPE opening session, replacing the presentations we had on the subject matter this year. Students could come to the session, get their materials and group assignments, and then immediately move into the group process workshop.

(5) Acquaint

students with the specific topic of the IPE before they come back to campus. This is especially important if (3) is to happen. About 10% of the students suggested, in fact, that they would like to have had information about the groups and the topic earlier. We avoided doing this this year, so as not to "ruin" the holidays for the students. But imitating Scrooge, at least on a trial basis next year, is probably a good idea.

I would suggest giving students the set-

up, the groups, and the briefing book (text and web-based) at the end of the term. They probably should not get their actual group assignments, however, until they return. (This allows us to use fall grades to distribute students among groups.) Some thought should go into the extensiveness of the briefing book. This year we gave students a lot of material, only half of which was available on the web. (Much of the material that is not on the web could be scanned in, if that is deemed advisable.) They took that material with the understanding that it was their "research archive" for the exercise. I think this worked pretty well: it kept students from trolling the web for more information and forced them to get down to work instead. But we may also want to give them some ways of structuring the use of the material we give them, rewarding for thoroughness and use of sources, etc.

(6) Eliminate the arguments over rules by setting

up a clear, though unrealistic, structure for the final presentation. Political actors, such as members of Congress, can take roles as bargainers but not as decision-makers. The panel before which the students present should be composed of outside experts and faculty but not students. I favor this alternative because our students don't have training in the consequences of selecting one set of rules over another, and teaching them this in the course of the IPE seems too difficult. Alternatively, we could build a focus on rules and rule selection into one of the negotiation workshops.

(7) Retain the coalition requirement

for testifying but allow all coalitions to testify, and require each group to join a coalition. To make the problem more difficult, we might also forbid each group from joining more than one coalition. I favor this alternative because the student's experience with negotiation was such a central and valuable aspect of this year's IPE. Allowing students to take principled, individual stances will, in my opinion, skew the exercise too much towards academic debate, at the expense of listening to each other and hammering out agreements.

(8) The i

deal situation would be to have each group testify individually, even though it is part of a coalition. The coalition might nominate one person to give a short presentation about the coalition's aims, and then each group would have to make reference to the coalition in its testimony. This allows more people to get involved in the final presentations and forces groups to take responsibility for their coalition choices. A strict time limit on group testimony and on question time will keep the hearing from growing completely out of proportion.

H

however, if we run several parallel simulations, having each of the groups testify will be impossible. (See Section IV) In that case, we might have to go back to this year's model, where one representative testified for each coalition, but each coalition member deputed a representative to answer questions.

(9) De

termine the organizations/policy actors in the exercise early, before the specific topic is chosen. The specific topic/problem that forms the set-up for the IPE is dependent on the data available and events in the real world. But the actors on an issue don't change that much from topic to topic. If these are determined early, the coordinator will have more lead time to find practitioners who will participate.

I also recommend finding some way to honor those practitioners who do participate. Name them as SPP "Fellows" for the year, invite them to meet with our students on campus, offer a small honorarium, write letters and give certificates. We might also consider requiring students to write their practitioner a thank-you letter. All of this could make it easier to get practitioners involved more extensively, and give them a stake in hiring our students in the future.

(10) Talk with faculty about ways to integrate the IPE topic into classes in the fall and winter; and keep the IPE topic salient for the students throughout the year. The course integration issue was very difficult.

Faculty plan their courses at different times, and tend to use examples that they are familiar with and have used in past years. I was not familiar enough with the different courses to make suggestions that the faculty could easily use. While everyone made a valiant effort to use examples relating to international labor standards, it was often a stretch, and the examples used often had little to do with the AIP itself. I think faculty need to brainstorm about the best way to accomplish this integration, if it is a good idea to continue trying to do this.

Whether or not we continue to make the effort to make the IPE topic present in the curriculum each year, it is probably important not to let the topic disappear after the exercise. This happened this year, despite all the activity around apparel labeling on campus, because I didn't have the time to follow up on it. One easy way to keep the discussion going would be to schedule a few speakers, preferably famous and/or controversial ones, throughout the year, and to release that schedule early. Another might be to keep updating a webpage with breaking news and resources on the topic, through the fall and winter terms.

Section IV: Logistics

Increasing the IPE from 12 students to 70 this year was a major challenge. Increasing the number again from 70 to 140 will be another. With teams of 4 students each, 140 students yields 35 teams. I see three ways to do this: run two or three different exercises, with a different topic for each exercise; run one exercise, with 25-30 organizations/policy actors represented; or run two or three exercises on the same topic with the same groups, in parallel. I prefer this last option.

Parallel Exercises

In this structure, the coordinator would first choose a specific topic and 12 relevant policy actors, and then divide the students into three large groups. Each group would be further subdivided into the 12 policy actors, so that each of the groups could run the exercise separately. To use this year as an example, there would be three teams (A, B, and C) representing UNITE, three representing the DOL, three representing Wal-Mart, and so on. UNITE "A" would be in a simulation w

ith DOL "A" and Wal-Mart "A"; UNITE "B" would be in a simulation with DOL "B" and Wal-Mart "B"; and UNITE "C" would be in a simulation with DOL "C" and Wal-Mart "C". The "A", "B", and "C" simulations would all start from the same problem and set-up; presumably, however, the dynamics of each simulation would be different.

This option has both logistical and pedagogical benefits. Logistically, it minimizes the complexity of the issue and the time and resources needed to prepare the exercise. The students only need to learn about 12 groups; the same practitioner can talk to all the teams representing his/her organization; the faculty coordinator can design one simulation; the whole school focuses on the same topic each year. Pedagogically, debriefing sessions can be built into the negotiation at some key points, so that students can compare the dynamics of the different simulations and analyze why the results were similar, or different. One drawback, however, is that the faculty coordinator will have to design the debriefing sessions without a prior model to work from, and place it in an already over-crowded schedule. Another is that running sessions in parallel means three different final presentations on the same topic, which is a heavy burden on the judging panel and which will take a lot of time.

Multiple Exercises

The original plan for the IPE actually suggested two different topics per year, with a team of three faculty who would coordinate the exercise. Two different topics would allow us to have one with an international and one with a domestic focus, or simply to allow students to have some choice among exercise topics. If all three faculty were assigned to coordinate the exercise, it would also allow for easier integration of the topics into the courses, and probably for exercises that better reflect the diversity of skills taught at SPP.

This plan,

however, might promote the separation that students already sense between the domestic/international tracks. If students did not sign up in equal numbers for the two exercises, the logistical problems would be significant. This plan would also require a much greater commitment of total faculty time, although the burden on each faculty coordinator would be reduced. The research required in to different groups and into a suitable exercise set-up would also increase.

On

the Gigantic Exercise

In the world, of course, it is not unusual to have dozens of groups interested in one policy problem. So an exercise with 20-30 teams of students is not at all unrealistic. An exercise like this would underline the multi-faceted nature of policymaking, make numerous coalition arrangements possible, and give students the greatest possible chance to meet and work with each other.

The investment of time on the faculty coordinator's part, however, would be very significant. Learning about 12 groups is already difficult; learning about 30, identifying a practitioner contact in each, and preparing the background materials would be a challenge. Helping the students to keep all the different groups separate will also be a challenge, and the sheer complexity of that many players allows that many more degrees of freedom for things to go wrong. Students, who like focus, might also get frustrated with the lack of focus that such an exercise would inherently involve.

Teams were assigned a faculty contact when the organization/person they were representing had not, in the real world, shown any interest in the AIP. For instance, the two teams representing the chair and the ranking member of the Senate Foreign Relations Committee were

given a faculty advisor because neither of those two senators has made the AIP a focus of their office's work. The other team which received a faculty advisor was Save the Children USA, which is the U.S. branch of an international organization that has been very active on labor standards issues. However, since the U.S. branch (as distinguished from the international office or national branches in Europe and Asia) has not been involved in labor standards advocacy, there was no one appropriate for the students to talk to in their U.S. office.

We received 53 evaluations, out of 70 participants; all percentages are based on the number responding to open-ended questions about the most and least valuable parts of the exercise, and about suggestions for improvements. Five closed-ended questions were also asked, with students reporting their answers on a 5-point scale ("5" being "strongly agree" and "1" being "strongly disagree"). Responses from these questions are reported as averages for the number of students responding to the question.

Some possible problems with this evaluation should be noted. The evaluation was included as part of a briefing packet distributed a few days before, and many students lost it or forgot to fill it out. Extra evaluations were provided in a central place, but not all of the students saw them. Evaluations were also collected and processed on Friday night, the day before the exercise concluded. This was necessary because the evaluations included the ballot for the peer awards (which was an incentive for students to fill out the evaluations). However, this meant that students were evaluating the exercise at the end of a very exhausting period of negotiations, but before the fruit of those negotiations (in the final testimony) had appeared. Two alternatives would have been to pass out evaluations at the hearing (where people might have been too distracted to fill them out), or at the banquet (which one half to two-thirds of the students attended). I should note that CRLT evaluations were distributed at the end of the winter term; these have not yet been returned.

My guess, however, is that the response rate is pretty low, and that it would be even if we had distributed the evaluations the day after the exercise in the student folders.

I have avoided mentioning the snowstorm until now, although it will come up again when I discuss timing. For those who don't remember, 2-3 ft of snow fell across the Midwest on Saturday and Sunday before the Monday IPE opening. About half of the students were missing Monday at 1pm, when the IPE began; about 1/3 were still missing Tuesday, when the first assignment was due. The last student made it in Thursday morning.

While the teams this year were

5-6 students, I think this is a little large. Slightly smaller teams would probably make the group process issues somewhat easier to handle.

1999 IPE Evaluation, p. PAGE 13.

/=^hk57HI4J!!p&q&.-...223c4"5#5D::pDDfNNVNWZZ\ddqqiru
rfyysz{0~n~}^k @21BUUk789lmnNOPuDccU]]uDPVU^UZuUcuDcac12\^ijk567IJ"#cd34KLAB!!
!! +!##r&r)A,...0223c48D::=AqDDdGIOkfNNPSVNWY[^bde|gPjnnqq*qiruByfysz}0~}<k31
YBUUsUk8mgO'K@Normala c"A@"Default Paragraph Font *@ Endnote Referenceh\$@\$TOC 1X
! @ Header !\$&@\$Footnote Referencee,@2,
Footnote Text]ceOBBook]p#"2W5
o r (+Z[!q]^ #+!@LMTimes New Roman Symbol"MArialMTimesMNew York"c5fc5fhE +\0SP

P 638: Integrated Policy Exercise -- Jan 1999 Ann Chih Lin Ann Chih LinTTT*T**
TTT*T****TTT*TT*T*****TTT*TTTT*T*****TTTTTTTT*****TTTTTTTT*****
*TTTTTT*****TTTTT*****

! "\$ % & ' () * + , - . / 0 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 ; < = > ? @ A B C D E F G H I J K L M N O P Q R S T U V W X Y Z [\] ^ _ ` feRoot Entry
Fm0ydWordDocumentCompObjXSummaryInformation(
FMicrosoft Word DocumentNB6W Wo

rd.Document.6

Oh+'0 8D

` |

x'1SPP 638: Integrated Policy Exercise -- Jan 1999ExPP

Ann Chih Linegrnn

nn Normalh

Ann Chih Linegrln Microsoft Word 6.0d@@ze@zeh

.,0

X` 'University of Michiganr E: 1SPP 638: Integrated Policy Exercise -- Jan 199

9DocumentSummaryInformation8

4===== END ATTACHMENT 1 =====

===== ATTACHMENT 2 =====

ATT CREATION TIME/DATE: 0 00:00:00.00

TEXT:

Unable to convert ARMS_EXT:[ATTACH.D3]ARMS23797025G.136 to ASCII,
The following is a HEX DUMP:

===== END ATTACHMENT 2 =====

===== ATTACHMENT 3 =====

ATT CREATION TIME/DATE: 0 00:00:00.00

TEXT:

> kljhceXLpMjnnnnnnnnppppppXCpnZ\ nnnnpnnjnnnnnnn\zhnnnnSPP 638: The 1999 Int
egrated Policy Exercise

The Apparel Industry Partnership

Introductory Speech

Poor Kathie Lee Gifford. Here she was, minding her own business, and all o
f a sudden she gets attacked in front of a Congressional committee for using ch
ildren in Honduran factories to produce her wildly popular clothing line for Wa
l-Mart. The date is April 1996. By August of 1996, the White House had pulled
together a high-powered task force, including representatives from businesses l
ike Liz Claiborne, unions like UNITE, and non-profit groups like the Internatio
nal Labor Rights Fund, to, quote, take steps to protect workers worldwide and t
o give the public the information it needs to make informed purchasing decision
s. This task force, known as the Apparel Industry Partnership (AIP), pulled to
gether a document in April 1997, with a model code of conduct and principles of

monitoring to make sure that code was enforced. They then set to work on creating an association to oversee the monitoring of companies, with the expectation that companies who joined the monitoring process could then state that they had done so in their publicity and on their products. But at this point, negotiations broke down. When the draft monitoring agreement was announced in November 1998, UNITE and one of the major NGO participants had left the Partnership.

In the meantime, the major industry trade group, the American Apparel Manufacturer's Association, had created an alternative to the AIP, known as the Responsible Apparel Production Principles, or RAPP. And that's where we pick up the story.

A couple of things to note about this story. First, while the picture I've given you is the official picture, and it's accurate, it's not complete. The White House didn't jump on this story only because of Kathie Lee and the ensuing publicity; Robert Reich, the Labor Secretary at the time, had made sweatshop labor an interest of his and was essentially talking about a task force like the AIP before Kathie Lee gave him a policy window to launch it. The groups who signed on weren't random; many had been targeted by protests against their labor practices in the past, or had instigated those protests. But note that there's no equation between protest and signing on: neither Wal-mart nor the group that initiated the protests against it, the National Labor Committee, joined the AIP. Finally, all this domestic activity took place against a growing international backdrop of activity: in particular, the International Labor Organization (ILO), a UN-sponsored group that brings together government, employer, and labor representatives from every country, was re-examining the issue of core labor standards. In May 1995, the ILO launched an effort to get its member countries to ratify a set of labor conventions including non-discrimination and equal treatment in the workplace, the freedom of association, and the elimination of child and forced labor. At the same time, advocacy groups began suggesting that the ILO's conventions, which are non-binding, be imported into the new World Trade Organization (WTO), where they would be binding. Dan Turnquist will tell you more about that in a minute.

With this backdrop, where are you? Well, you now represent 12 policy actors who are directly or tangentially affected by the AIP. It is January 1999, a parallel universe to ours, in which. Your assignment for the next two days is to figure out where your group stands on the AIP, and what strategy your group should use to get support. Then, after the negotiation workshop on Tuesday afternoon, we will fast forward to March 1999.

You will get information on what's been happening between January and March, and using that information and the strategies you've planned, you'll form coalitions, which will testify at a Congressional hearing this Saturday.

IPE Schedule

Updated: Monday, January 4, 1999

Notes on the Schedule:

1. People who get into Ann Arbor late for weather-related reasons should check in with their groups as soon as possible. Contact information for the groups will be available at 466 Lorch and on e-mail as soon as it is available.

2. The schedule has been designed to give you maximum flexibility in terms of where and when you'll meet with your groups. However, you should expect to put in a full day each day in terms of actual hours as you digest information, talk it over with your group, and prepare the written and oral assignments.

All SPP classes are cancelled the week of the IPE. John Chamberlin will write a note to the professor in charge of any non-SPP classes, explaining your absence from the first day of class: if you would like him to do this, please give ANN LIN (annlin@umich.edu) the name and course number of the class(es), the name of the professor, and the time/day it meets, by Monday evening.

As long as you can get your group to agree, you can go to any classes and work any hours that you need to work. However, you must attend three mandatory events: the opening assembly on Monday, the negotiation workshop on Tuesday, and the Senate hearing on Saturday afternoon.

If child care is an issue for you, we may be able to arrange some group childcare alternatives that week. Please let Ann Lin know as soon as possible if you would like to try to pull something together.

Monday, January 4:

1:30

3:30 pm: Opening Assembly (Askwith Auditorium, 140 Lorch)

Ann Lin will introduce the IPE scenario and structure.

Dan Turnquist will speak on the politics of international trade standards.

Students will receive group assignments and briefing materials

Monday afternoon and evening: Students will meet with their group to read about the AIP, discuss their groups priorities, and draft a 2-3 page memo on their objectives with respect to the AIP.

IPE Schedule

Up

dated: Tuesday, January 5, 1999

Tuesday, January 5:

1:00 pm: Group priorities memo due in 466 Lorch (Ann Lins office).

1:30 5:00pm: Negotiation Workshop (Askwith Auditorium, 140 Lorch)

Steven Yaffee and Julia Wollondeck of the School of Natural Resources and Environment will lead a series of negotiation exercises.

5:00 pm -- News Update: Rapidly snowballing events in the parallel world of the IPE have caused Sen. Jesse Helms to call for hearings before the Senate Foreign Relations Committee on Saturday, January 9. Groups will be issued briefing books on the events that have prompted the Foreign Relations Committee to hold hearings. Groups will attempt to form coalitions, which will issue press releases on Thursday, January 7 at noon and testify before the Committee on Saturday, January 9 (March 9 in our parallel universe).

Tuesday evening: Groups prepare for negotiations

Wednesday, January 6:

Negotiation day: Groups will be asked to keep at least one representative in Lorch from 9 am - 4 pm. (Locations TBA). Groups will try to build coalitions to support, modify, or oppose the AIP. Coalitions will create a 1-2 page press release stating their positions, for publication Thursday.

9:30 am: Optional Q and A Session, 473 Lorch
Ann Lin will take questions on the contents of the new briefing book.

10 am - 12 pm: Office hours, Dan Turnquist, 453C Lorch

4:00 pm: If you want a dispensation from joining a coalition, you need to present your request in writing by 4pm. Also leave contact information for someone in your group so that I can get an answer back to you within an hour or so.

Thursday, January 7:

Negotiation day: Groups will be asked to keep at least one representative in Lorch from 9 am - 4 pm. (Locations TBA).

10 am - 12 pm: Office hours, Dan Turnquist, 453C Lorch

2:00 pm -- Coalition Press Releases due in 466 Lorch; please turn in \$25 per person to cover the cost of handouts etc for the exercise at the same time. (Checks can be made out to School of Public Policy. If you pay in cash, please attach a card with your name to the cash.)

1:45-3:45 pm: Office hours, Robert Axelrod, 409 Lorch

Friday, January 8:

Negotiation and testimony
preparation day

10 am - 12 pm: Office hours, Dan Turnquist, 453C Lorch

1:00-2:
:00 pm: Office hours, Bob Stern, 413 Lorch

2:00-4:00 pm: Office hours, Kathryn Dominguez, 462 Lorch

5:00 pm: Turn in IPE evaluations and peer awards ballots to 466 Lorch.

Saturday, January 9:

1:00 pm: Senate Foreign Relations Committee Hearing (Rackham 4th Fl. West Conference Room)

7:00 pm: Awards Dinner
Hearing (Rackham 4th Fl. West Conference Room)

Dessert at dinner will be a potluck; please bring a favorite treat!

Invited Participants, Saturday Hearing:

Bama Athreya, International Labor Rights Fund

Tony Freeman, International Labor
or Organization, Washington Office

Alan Deardorff, School of Public Policy

S
PP 638: The 1999 Integrated Policy Exercise

The Apparel Industry Partnership

Strategic Considerations

The April 1997 Apparel Industry Partnership (AIP) agreement on a model code of conduct was also a model of cooperation. While creating a diverse coalition of clothing manufacturers/retailers, unions, non-profit advocacy groups, and government representatives was not easy, the fact that all of those groups were able to work together gave the April agreement instant credibility. But this coalition succumbed to its internal pressures over the next year and a half. When the November 1998 agreement was announced, it no l

onger had union backing. The advocacy community had been split down the middle, with some groups staying in and others leaving. And in the meantime, the American Apparel Manufacturers Association (AAMA) had announced a challenge to the April AIP agreement. Its code of conduct, known as the Responsible Apparel Production Principles (RAPP), did not have the broad support that the April 1997 agreement commanded, but it did have support from its manufacturing base.

Ye

t the outlook for the AIP was not altogether bleak. The year and a half between the April 1997 and the November 1998 agreements saw increasing activity around the issue of international labor standards in government, in the media, and from numerous industry and advocacy groups. The AIP structure and the two agreements enjoyed a reservoir of good will, partly because of their early appearance, partly because of the unique partnerships behind it. So the defections from the November 1998 agreement did not doom it. What they did do, however, is simultaneously send all of the actors off searching for more support, while making them all more vulnerable to attacks.

The groups that committed to the November agreement—Reebok, the International Labor Rights Fund (ILRF), and the Department of Labor (DOL)—have each invested a good deal of organizational credibility in the success of the agreement. Despite their brave words, an agreement that goes ahead without the unions will be much more liable to attack. They need to try to bring UNITE back to the table, to get open and enthusiastic support from organizations with a good record on social issues, or both.

UNITE has t

he same problem, but in reverse. It has been able to convince the AFL-CIO and the Retail Workers Union to announce their support for their pull-out, and it has brought the ICCR along as well. But if it cannot convince anyone else with a credible position on social issues to join them, UNITE runs the risk of being marginalized. The mood in the country is not particularly friendly to unions; it is not clear that consumers would automatically discredit a label that did not have union support. This is particularly true since UNITE has been attacked, by both the left-leaning Village Voice and the right-wing commentator Robert Novak, for tolerating sweatshops run by its business allies, creating a top-heavy bureaucracy, and disregarding the interests of its workers. The AFL-CIO has close ties to the White House and will not be willing to countenance a campaign smearing the DOL, especially because that would open the door to the much more conservative RAPP. So if UNITE cannot bring more allies to its side, it may need to consider rejoining the AIP, especially if it can extract concessions to make its return worthwhile. At least some of these concessions need to be on the AIP. UNITE, however, might welcome help with Levi-Strauss, which has been under attack by unions for plant closing and restructuring. It might also welcome help with rebuilding its reputation more generally.

Wal-Mart also needs

credibility, but its job is somewhat different. It has supported the RAPP, and defecting from it would damage its alliances with the AAMA. It could, of course, try to create a rapprochement between the RAPP and the AIP. But doing so would almost certainly force groups like the ILRF out and keep other progressive groups from getting in. A more likely possibility is to create credibility by getting support from companies with a good record on social issues. An investment company like Calvert, which needs to temper its social choice activism wi

th attention to the bottom line, or like Levi-Strauss, which has a good reputation despite its labor troubles, would be natural partners. Another possibility is to go for an entirely different set of allies: free trade groups like the USCIB and conservative politicians like Jesse Helms.

The triangular arrangement of these three positions puts a group like Save the Children in a unique position. Its lack of history with the AIP negotiations means that it can adopt any position without having to carry much baggage. Its generally positive reputation as an advocate for children makes its support valuable. It has good reasons to support any of the three major positions on the AIP: it has supported independent monitoring of the kind proposed by the AIP; like the unions, it has argued that income issues are central to any attempt to raise labor standards; and it likes to work closely with companies to establish programs—an approach that attracts companies, like Wal-Mart, which might like or need to sponsor successful pilot projects. Its new president, Annie Publicities-Fine, is eager to take a more active role in the labor standards debate in the U.S. At the same time, though, Save the Children's lack of history on this issue also means that the value of its support is hard to predict; no one knows if its opinion will actually carry much weight. And it is not invulnerable to attack: its child labor projects in Pakistan and India have received positive press, but they have also progressed very slowly. Groups disappointed by Save the Children's stance may try to incite a backlash.

Like Save the Children, the other unannounced actors face complicated choices. Most would prefer to stay on the fence as long as they could. But in the world of the IPE, they do not have that option. Representatives in the House are planning to make codes of conduct a major agenda item in the new Congress. On the Republican side, Rep. Peter Hoekstras (R-MI) Subcommittee on Oversight and Investigations of the House Committee on Education and the Workforce is planning to issue a report that at least tacitly favors the RAPP. On the Democratic side, the Minority Leader, Richard Gephardt (D-MO), is considering whether this is the vehicle to ride to name recognition in a race for the Democratic presidential nomination. Sens. Jesse Helms and Joseph Biden, as chair and ranking member of the Senate Foreign Relations Committee, are beginning to realize that at the very least, they cannot be caught without a response to anything the House might send over. But both also see an opportunity to take a lead on an issue where there is currently a leadership vacuum.

Prospective Congressional action also raises problems for companies like Levi-Strauss and Calvert. Their reputation currently rests on what they have done and continue to do, not on support or opposition to the AIP. But once the AIP and its troubles get legislative and media attention, shareholders and customers will want to know where Levi-Strauss and Calvert stand on the AIP. They need to think now about what their response will be. They also need to find support: the more support they have, the more principled they will seem.

The USCIB is in a similar position. It has not been active in debates such as the one over the AIP in the domestic arena. But because it represents U.S. employers at the ILO, it must take some position on any high-profile action in the U.S. Its December position paper takes a hard line on codes of conduct: they reject efforts at standardization, at independent (non-company sponsored) monitoring,

and at holding companies responsible for the actions of their subcontractors. Of course, if it can keep its position from being undercut by high-profile employers and industry groups or by federal legislation, it will have much more impact. And since it is joined at the ILO by representatives of the AFL-CIO, it has an interest in keeping open the possibility of compromise with the unions. Thus it is in a good position to act as a mediator between the various groups in the simulation, although of course it has more credibility with business and with free trade supporters in Congress.

The IRRC also has an interest in acting as a mediator. While it does not officially take sides or join coalitions in debates such as these, it has to decide what to include in its evaluation of the AIP for its customers. Although it tries to evaluate impartially, it knows that any analysis it produces will have political consequences, intended or not. The other groups in the simulation will lobby the IRRC to make its analysis more favorable to those groups. They might also consider discrediting the IRRC if its evaluation hurts them, or misrepresenting the IRRC's analysis to make their own positions look better. Thus the IRRC has an interest in creating as much agreement as possible between the groups, so it can minimize, or at least anticipate, the attacks and misrepresentations its analysis might call forth.

B
By Tuesday at 1 pm, your group should decide on its own strategic goals for the simulation and write a memo explaining them. Your memo, addressed to the group contact listed on your participants background sheet, should include:

the position you suggest taking on the AIP (including any modifications you would like to see);
the specific goals you wish to achieve, especially if they are different from your stand on the AIP;
the problems/obstacles that you anticipate might block the achievement of your goals; and
the strategy you intend to pursue to achieve those goals and/or overcome those problems, including the coalition partners you will target (and/or those you will avoid).

The importance of these sections will vary depending on your group, but each of them must be covered. This is a confidential memo, so be as blunt as you like; no other group will see it. The memo will be judged on the quality of the analysis and the realism of your strategy. Creative modifications to the AIP will also be recognized.

B
By Wednesday at 5 pm, you should have located at least some coalition partners and put together a press release that all the groups in your coalition can agree to. The press release should:

state a position on the AIP (although you need not mention the agreement by name if your coalition deems it unwise);
justify your position in ways that will appeal to the general public and to their members of Congress;
list (on a separate piece of paper) the coalition partners with

ho have given their open or tacit support to the coalition, and write a few lines explaining why each partner is part of the coalition. If a group has chosen to be a silent member, explain why as well.

This press release WILL be distributed to everyone in the simulation, along with the list of coalition partners (but not their reasons for joining). So remember that you are writing for a public audience, one that includes your opponents. The press release will be judged on its audience appeal and its ability to balance the different interests of the coalition members. The coalition will be judged separately, on its breadth, its depth, its novelty, and its cohesion.

Ground rules:

You can only build coalitions with groups that are in this simulation. In other words, don't bring in Nike, UNICEF, the Catholic Bishops, or the Chamber of Commerce.

You can decide to weight some considerations (discussed here, in the briefing information, or with your contact person) more or less heavily, but you cannot discard any of them. In other words, you cannot invent a president for Wal-Mart who suddenly decides that her company is now going to adopt the same policies as Reebok.

SPP 638: The 1999 Integrated Policy Exercise

The Apparel Industry Partnership

Simulation Participants: Background Sheet

Wal-Mart Group	Calvert Group
Reebok	Investor Responsibility Research Center
Levi-Strauss	U.S.
U.S. Department of Labor	
Sen. Jesse Helms	International Labor Rights Fund
Sen. Joseph Biden	Save the Children International
U.S. Council for International Business	
United Needle and Industrial Trade Employees (UNITE)	

Wal-Mart: With 2,399 stores and annual sales of just under \$118 billion, Wal-Mart is the world's largest retailer. Its visibility, its size, and its corporate pride in programs like Support American Made have made it a constant target of labor rights activists. In 1996, the National Labor Committee attacked its Kathie Lee Gifford line of clothing, charging that the clothes were made by Honduran factories that exploited its under-aged workers. The ensuing publicity encouraged the White House to launch the White House Apparel Industry Partnership. But Wal-Mart

did not participate in the AIP negotiations, preferring instead to aggressively defend itself against charges of using sweatshop labor. While it has not announced a position on the AIP, it has its own Standards for Vendor Partners and supports a set of standards written by the American Apparel Manufacturing Association.

Group contact: Betsey Reithmeyer, Sr. Manager Corporate Affairs

Re

ebok: Reebok is an international manufacturer of athletic wear and gear, with over \$3 billion in sales (in 1996) in over 140 countries. Reebok was a founding member of the AIP and has signed on to both the April 1997 and the November 1998 agreements. Its active role is at least partly due to the attacks upon it: in 1995, it and other soccer ball manufacturers came under attack when it was discovered that Pakistani children between the ages of 4 and 14 were employed in its factories. Reebok actively participated in the ensuing ILO project, known as the Sialkot project, to end child labor in its factories and provide education and income replacement to the displaced child workers. This has not, however, prevented it from coming under fire for other alleged problems, most recently in its factories in China.

Group contact: Douglas Cahn, Vice-President, Human Rights Programs (sent information)

Levi-Strauss: Levi-Strauss is the world's largest producer of brand-name clothing, with sales of \$6.9 billion in 1997. In 1991 and 1992, accusations of contractor misconduct at factories in Saipan and China led Levi-Strauss to develop the first corporate code of conduct, its Business Partner Terms of Engagement. Its code and its Country Assessment Standards are a model for the industry, and it was named to the DOL's Trendsetter List in 1995 and 1996. However, it has not been a formal member of the AIP and has not publicly signed on to either agreement. It has also come under attack by the International Confederation of Free Trade Unions (ICTFU) for closing and consolidating its factories during restructuring, and for alleged anti-union practices.

Group contact: Michael Kobori, Government Affairs (now at Business for Social Responsibility)

Sen. Jesse Helms (R-NC): Jesse Helms was first elected to the Senate in 1972. His conservatism is legendary and, as chair of the Senate Foreign Relations Committee, he has not hesitated to put it into action. He single-handedly held up the nomination of Gov. Weld of Massachusetts as Ambassador to Mexico because of (Republican!) Weld's positions on drugs. He has used confirmations of White House appointees to other posts as bargaining chips, actions that have led him to be known as Senator No. He supported giving the president fast-track trade authority, but his fierce anti-communism led him to abandon free trade positions in the case of Cuba and China. Helms represents a state with an important textile industry. He has not, however, taken any public role (or shown much interest) in international labor standards.

Group contact: Rick Hall

Sen. Joseph Biden (D-DE): Joseph Biden became the ranking member on the Senate Foreign Relations Committee at the beginning of the 105th Congress. The move surprised many: as chair and then ranking member on the Senate Judiciary Committee, Biden managed several high-profile bills, including the 1994 crime bill. But Biden saw the move as an opportunity to make a name for himself in foreign policy. First elected in 1972 at the age of 29, Biden is a consistently liberal senator from a moderate state. Delaware is known for DuPont, the chemical company, and for liberal business incorporation rules that have led numerous companies to establish headquarters there. It is not known for textiles, and despite his service on the International Economic Policy, Export, and Trade Promotion Subcommittee, Biden has not taken any public position on international labor standards.

Group contact: Rick Hall

U.S. Council for International Business (USCIB): The USCIB is the official representative of U.S. employers to international organizations like the ILO. It issues temporary duty-free import licenses (ATA Carnets) and engages in advocacy: it is a membership organization as well as an official spokesperson for the US business community abroad. The USCIB has stayed aloof from the AIP process, but has issued its own statement on codes of conduct. While it supports codes that are voluntarily adopted by business, the USCIB is extremely opposed to attempts to hold companies to an externally imposed standard, to allow monitoring that companies do not contract for themselves, and to make companies responsible for the actions of their subcontractors.

Group contact: John Ritchotte, Manager, International Labor or Affairs

Calvert Group: The Calvert Group, a mutual-fund company, offers the largest family of socially-screened mutual funds in the U.S. It manages around \$5.5 billion in assets and actively uses its institutional influence to affect the practices of companies in which it invests. It also provides information to fund holders about different social issues, including labor standards, or what it calls corporate human rights policies. Calvert endorsed the April 1997 AIP but has taken no position on the November agreement. It is in a difficult position because the head of its outside Advisory Council on social responsibility is the executive director of the Interfaith Center on Corporate Responsibility, the NGO that pulled out of the November agreement.

Group contact: John Likerman, Director, Social Research Division

Investor Responsibility Research Center (IRRC): The IRRC provides research and consulting on social issues to subscribers, mostly institutional investors, who want to take an active role in corporate governance. Founded in the wake of Vietnam-era reforms that gave stockholders the power to challenge the social policies of corporations, IRRC does not take official positions but usually provides information suggesting the need for activity in one area or another. In the course of its research, it can also play an unofficial mediating role between other organizations. The IRRC published a book, *The Sweatshop Quandary*, in 1998, summarizing information about sweatshop working conditions around the world.

Group contact: Peter DeSimon
e, Labor Analyst

Department of Labor (DOL): Under the leadership of Robert Reich, the DOL moved aggressively into the area of sweatshop labor. DOL stepped up its enforcement of wage and hour laws, raiding factories such as one in El Monte, CA, that confined its Thai immigrant workers behind a barbed-wire fence and withheld their wages. It also established a program, Trendsetters, to recognize companies with progressive stands on labor issues, and initiated the White House Apparel Industry Partnership negotiations. Secretary Herman has continued this effort, although she is not as given to publicizing it as Reich. The DOL has published a series of reports on child labor abroad and will be funding some of the ILOs projects in this area.

Group contact: Sonya Rosen, Director,
International Child Labor Study Office (TBA)

International Labor Rights Fund (ILRF): The ILRF was started as the advocacy and monitoring arm of a coalition of religious, labor, human rights and academic groups. It works to link trade policies to the enforcement of internationally accepted worker rights. It has been active in monitoring the Rugmark program, an effort to end the use of child labor in the production of Indian hand-knotted rugs. It has also sought the enforcement of a new law banning the import of goods made with bonded (enslaved) child labor. It was a founding member of the AIP and one of the drafters of the November 1998 agreement. Its decision to stay within the AIP framework earned it a good deal of criticism from UNITE, which tried to influence the union members on ILRFs board of directors to reverse the ILRFs support for the November agreement. The ILRFs critics also suggest that its willingness to stay with in the AIP negotiations may be based on the possibility of earning compensation as a corporate monitor in the future.

Group contact: Bama Athreya, Program Officer

Save the Children International/USA: Save the Children International, a British organization, has a long history of working for childrens rights. It was the primary NGO participant in two ILO programs: the Sialkot soccer ball project and Rugmark. It is known for taking a very cautious approach to codes of conduct, fearing that child workers will simply be fired by companies eager to purify their image. This, they argue, would leave the children and their families in an even worse position than before. Critics of Save the Children reply that it is simply trying to protect its control over international child labor initiatives and the budget it receives for administering programs like Sialkot and Rugmark.

Notably, in the United States, the Save the Children USA affiliate has focused more on other issues -- health, education, rural development -- than on child labor, either domestic or international. It is best known for its corporate and celebrity sponsors: Dennys has a partnership with Save the Children, and Sally Field makes appeals for their child sponsorship program. This work, however, is not unique and does not give the group a distinctive niche. In the world of the IPE, a new president at Save the Children (Annie

Publicities-Fine), has decided to take a more active role in the U.S. politics of labor standards.

Group contact: Ann Lin

UNITE: UNITE is the nations primary garment workers union, with a long history of fighting for workers rights and against Communists. It was a founding member of the AIP and endorsed the April 1997 agreement. By spring of 1998, however, UNITE began to raise questions about the direction of the negotiations. It refused to endorse the November 1998 agreement, arguing that the failure to consider a living wage, the refusal to enforce free and fair unions in China, and the lack of strong monitoring arrangements made the November 1998 AIP agreement one without teeth. Its opponents charge, however, that UNITEs leadership has become too isolated from the best interests of workers, and point to recent media coverage of abuses in UNITE-organized factories. UNITEs exit from the AIP was strengthened by the departure of a leading NGO, the Interfaith Center for Corporate Responsibility, at the same time. It is now engaged in an attempt to convince the boards of the other major NGOs to abandon the AIP as well.

Group contact: Ann Hoffman, Legislative Director

SPP 638: The 1999 Integrated Policy Exercise

The Apparel Industry Partnership

News Updates: February-March, 1999

Associated Press (Belmont, North Carolina) February 5, 1999. Modern Industries announced today that it would close its three factories here, causing a loss of 400 jobs. The maker of the wildly popular "Street Smart," "Simply Street," and "Classic Street" clothing lines, Modern's profits were the second highest in the retail clothing industry last year. But Modern's spokeswoman, Laura Allison, defended the decision by citing competitive pressures. "In order to offer the best clothing at the best prices, we need to constantly streamline our production process and put our designers in closer touch with manufacturers. Our factories in North Carolina are simply too isolated from world fashion trends and the most up-to-date manufacturing technology to allow us to continue to stay at the cutting edge of fashion." Allison did not say where Modern would move its production.

Reuters (Shenzhen, Guangdong Province) February 13, 1999. A fire swept through a factory complex in this southern Chinese industrial city today, killing over four hundred young female sewers in five factories. The factories all made clothing for U.S. and European retailers, including Modern Industries, the maker of the popular "Street Smart" label. Early reports suggest the death toll was high.

h because supervisors, intent on keeping the production line moving, refused to allow the workers to leave their machines until it was too late for most of them to escape. Other workers, locked into dormitories on the factory grounds, could not get out before the buildings burned to the ground. The women, mostly 18-30 year old migrants from China's interior provinces, lived on site and sent their wages home to their families. Investigations are continuing.

Washington

Post (Washington, DC) February 15, 1999. In an unlikely alliance, conservative members of Congress and the AFL-CIO called today for a temporary moratorium on clothing imports from China, pending an investigation into factory subcontractors located there. John Sweeney, president of the AFL-CIO, said, "The tragic Shenzhen fire shows that no one -- not the Chinese workers with no unions to protect them from the deadly demands of their employers, nor the American workers whose safer workplaces cost employers money -- wins when American manufacturers export jobs overseas. Congress must find a way to stop this kind of exploitative subcontracting." Rep. Christopher Cox (R-CA), a longtime critic of the Chinese government, added, "A Communist dictatorship that imprisons its citizens when they attempt to form political parties, and condemns its young women to work in firetraps for profit, is not a government that the United States should deal with. Our principles are worth more than cheap Chinese imports that put our own people out of work."

CNN (Newark, DE) February 20, 1999. Delaware's

outlet centers usually attract a weekend crowd thronging to take advantage of the state's tax-free shopping. This Saturday, however, store managers are struggling with a different crowd -- protestors calling on the brand-name retailers here to stop their dealings with China. Well over 750 protestors, many bused in from Catholic and evangelical Protestant churches in the area, many of them teenagers, blocked store entrances with signs denouncing Chinese imports. "I just don't think it's right that girls my age should die to make the clothing I wear," said Maryellen Roberts, 16. Her friend, Cindy Anderson, carried a sign proclaiming, "Get Smart. Dump Street Smart." The factory fire that killed 494 women in Shenzhen, China earlier this month ignited a storm of protest that has taken the Clinton administration by surprise. While President Clinton has continued to argue that engagement with China is the best way to improve conditions for the Chinese people, his arguments mean little to these earnest young people. "The pictures of those girls in the fire -- I cried for days," said Jill Rogan. "I cut up all my Street Smart clothing and all my friends are doing the same thing." Those friends brought bags of rags to the protest. Protest leaders say those bags will be mailed to Modern Industries, the manufacturer that contracted with many of the Shenzhen factories, to their members of Congress, and to the White House.

Reuters (Beijing, China) February 22, 1999. Chinese le

aders today struck back at international criticism that followed in the wake of deadly factory fires in Shenzhen last month. "American companies violated Chinese labor laws and caused this horrible tragedy. But to protect its companies, American politicians are now blaming their negligence on us," said Zheng Hong, a spokesman for the Ministry of Labor. He condemned American concerns as hypocritical. "People who wish to spread lies about China have said that young girls were working in the Shenzhen factories. In reality, the country where young girls work without protection or help is the United States." He cited a study, authored by two Rutgers University economists, which showed that in an avera

ge week, 147,700 children and teenagers work illegally in the U.S. "The U.S. government's own occupational safety and health experts found that a child is killed at work every five days in the U.S. 200,000 children are injured at work each year," said Zheng. "Let America correct the practices of its own companies before blaming us for deaths they have caused."

Zheng also cited the case

of Wu Quin-Rong, an 11 year-old Chinese immigrant girl murdered in New York last May. An investigation found that she had been working in a Chinatown sweatshop before her death. The incident was publicized as part of an investigation of UNITE, the garment-workers union in the U.S. "We have no 11 year-olds working in factories in China. Yet this is how the American government and American unions treat our people. We demand justice for Wu Quin-Rong's family and for our workers in Shenzhen."

Washington Times (Washington, DC) March 1, 1999. See

Sen. Jesse Helms (R-NC) announced today that he would hold hearings on the relationship between Chinese subcontractors and American apparel companies before the Senate Foreign Relations Committee. The hearings, scheduled for March 9, will examine sanctions proposed by conservative groups and the AFL-CIO, but Helms made it clear that he is also interested in re-examining the White House's efforts to promote standards for American apparel manufacturers abroad. "The White House created the so-called Apparel Industry Partnership three years ago. But just like other Washington boondoggles, it's spun its wheels. If the White House's efforts are constructive, we want to support them. But if it's just a way to polish up the reputation of some large Democratic donors, well, we'll just have to go around the White House to protect the American people, and the Chinese people too," said Helms.

SPP 638: The 1999 Integrated Policy Exercise

The

Apparel Industry Partnership

Guidelines for Testimony

Only coalitions are

invited to testify at the committee hearing. In other words, your coalition will select one representative to carry the ball -- to speak and respond to questions -- for all of the groups in the coalition.

Groups who do not join a coalition

run a real risk of being disinvited to testify, unless they receive a special dispensation from the keeper of the parallel universe (ie, Ann). If you're going to request this dispensation, you need to explain your position in writing by 4pm Wednesday. This will give you enough time to beg your way into a coalition if your request is denied.

The one exception to (1) and (2) is the

two members of Congress. Sen. Helms and Sen. Biden will actually sit on the committee and question witnesses, just as the invited outside participants will.

Thus they do not need to join a coalition, although they may be silent partners

. Obviously, a coalition that has the chair or ranking member on its side will be a little better prepared at the hearing. A senator who joins a coalition also has more of an opportunity to shape the outcome of the hearings.

Because senators need to be "on" for such a long period of time, the two Senate teams will be allowed to change senators in midstream. Currently I don't anticipate more than two speaking senators per Senate team, but this could change depending on how many coalitions we end up with.

Each presenter will have 5 minutes for testimony, followed by 20 minutes for questions from the committee. These times may change depending on how many coalitions we end up with.

You may use overheads if you wish; powerpoint will most likely be available as well.

Take a look at Marina Whitman's memo on testifying, and on the sample testimony she's included. In the same way, each coalition will be asked to prepare an oral statement and a somewhat more expansive written statement. The written statement cannot exceed 8 double-spaced pages, not including exhibits or the answers to the committee's questions.

The committee asks the witnesses to respond to the following questions in their testimony:

Question 1: What are the advantages and disadvantages of using trade sanctions as a policy tool, especially in China?

Question 2: What is the extent to which ILO conventions should guide the activities of American companies who subcontract in foreign countries?

Question 3:
What are the advantages and disadvantages of the White House AIP?

SPP 638:
The 1999 Integrated Policy Exercise

The Apparel Industry Partnership

IPE "Scoring"

The IPE isn't graded, but your team will be competing for awards. These include:

Best group position paper (based on the quality of the analysis and the realism of your strategy; extra points given for creative modifications to the AIP)

Best press release (based on audience appeal and the balancing of

the different interests of the coalition members)

Best coalition (based on breadth (members from different sectors), depth (number of members), novelty (unlikely or difficult partners), and cohesion (balance of different interests))

(Yes) Our coalition may include "silent members": groups that don't publicly declare their membership, but who work with the coalition behind the scenes. These groups should be included on your list of members; include the reason for their "silence."

Best presentation (based on the judgment of the non-student members of the Senate Foreign Relations Committee)

Best testimony (based on the written testimony)

Most successful group (based on the match between the group position paper and the group's subsequent coalition-building activity)

You will also have the chance to decide upon peer awards. These include:

Most important contribution (individual on your team)

Most impressive team (team in the IPE other than your own)

Special mention (nominations of other students or groups that deserve special mention for their work on the IPE)

In order to cast your vote for the peer awards and to help us evaluate the exercise, please fill out the evaluation below. These are anonymous, but please identify your team.

Evaluation:
1=strongly disagree
2=disagree
3=mixed
4=agree
5=strongly agree

The IPE was a valuable learning experience. 1 2 3 4 5

I used knowledge and skills from several different courses in the IPE. 1 2 3 4 5

The negotiation workshop on Tuesday taught

Please identify the team(s), other than your own, whose work most impressed you during the IPE. Explain, in one sentence, what made its work impressive.

Please name any other student or group that deserves special mention for their work on the IPE. Explain, in one sentence, your reason for the nomination.

Please submit ballots and evaluations to 466 Lorch by 5 pm Friday evening!

/=.Rfgh+9]u
S6&'lm7PABCu.:=dfpQ R g z !!g"h"
i"|"#####4\$6\$\$\$[%%%00IIMM^RjRaTbTTT]cUc^cVcUhPU^cU^UcYTTT%V.VYY]]``;dTdUd
ddggk
k<nknpp4qNqittxx~479g/((&(EFE
uOQ\uJUcVhUU^cG./PQRfghiH I *+9:\]tu\],-
4\$
h 4h.hZ
RS&'lm67BCuv-.efQ R g h , !/!"0"gh"i"|"#####M#N##### \$
\$Q\$R\$S\$T\$U\$V\$W\$X\$Y\$Z\$+%)R,S,J.K.333747a<b<@@BBFFIIJJKKLLMMNNOzOPP]R^RI
RoR(oRSSaTTTTTTTTTT2UUUUUV#V\$V%VYYYY%]&~]]}~``
4
h 4h.``d d:d;dggggjjjkm;n<nqq3q4qtthithixxxo{p{}}~4579gh,('(
)*+
4\$
h 4h.h YZ
jktu&'h
h 4
4\$
h 4h.h'(z{DE>?cdw\$
h 4h)h
4

4
h 4h. !CEgrz!"Mpq
OPQRp
4\$
h 4h)h RSTUYZ[rstu

OPQ-QRSTUVWXYZ[\K@Normala c(@ (Heading 1
U]^c"A@"Default Paragraph Font >@ TitleU]c&O&Body Text 2]cOHyperlink^bTZ[%oR`
'RQ\]^_`abcdefg@MMTimes New Roman Symbol"MArialMTimesWingdings"h5f5fY#1&J6CPoor
Kathie Lee Gifford Ann Chih Lin Ann Chih Lin*****++*****++**++**+++++
++++w}l\$

!"#\$%&'()*+,-./0123456789:;<=>?@ABCDEFGHIJKLMNPOQRSTUVWXYZ[\]^_`abcdefghionR
oot Entry@ FxmWordDocument XCompObj @@XSummaryInformation(
FMicrosoft Word
DocumentNB6WWord.Document.6
Oh+0 \$0
LX d
p|'Poor Kathie Lee Giffordoor
Ann Chih Linee nn nn Normalh
Ann Chih Linee
In Microsoft Word 6.0f@@~(8@w`@w`
.+,0
X` 'University of Michigan 6J: Poor Kathie Lee GiffordDocumentSummaryInformatio
n8
===== END ATTACHMENT 3 =====

Timeline for Planning SPP 638: The Integrated Policy Exercise

Ann Chih Lin
May 1999

1. Summer

- ◆ Decide on general topic (for instance, international labor standards, welfare reform) and on dates and a start time (i.e., 1pm Tuesday) for the IPE.
- ◆ Create a website for the IPE. This can be a placeholder website with the topic, an FAQ, the dates, and links to information about previous IPE's. As you research the IPE, the website should be updated with the organizations/policy actors involved, useful websites, etc.
- ◆ Choose the organizations/policy actors that will be represented in the exercise. You need one actor for every 4-5 students, unless you're having multiple groups of students represent the same actor. It makes sense to choose a few extra, in case of extra students who enroll or organizations who don't want to cooperate.
- ◆ Begin researching the organizations: their funding/history; their allies/opponents; their history of work on this particular issue. Pay particular attention to identifying practitioners who would be appropriate contacts for the students, and to websites / sources that could later be part of the students' briefing book.

TIP: Start bookmark folders for each group, so that you have a place to keep websites that might be useful.

TIP: If you're looking for articles in Lexis-Nexis, it's not enough to get the http: address; sometimes the computer won't recognize the address again even if you bookmark it. Make a note of the key words you used to find the article, so that you can find it again if author/date searches don't work.

- ◆ Do a news check every week to keep up with late-breaking stories on the general topic; these are good sources for scenario ideas.
- ◆ Identify a dataset that the students can use to analyze the topic; alternatively, identify a set of articles based on empirical work which the students can critique.
- ◆ Talk with each of the faculty teaching fall core courses about where the topic could fit into their fall course. Help with the preparation that's required.

TIP: This needs to be done early, but probably not until you have some idea of the history/groups involved on the issue and of the dataset you'll be using. That way, you'll be able to suggest ways to integrate the topic into specific courses.

- ◆ If desired, identify a list of guest speakers for the year / prominent judges for the final presentation, and invite them.
- ◆ Schedule a short appearance at Orientation to introduce the IPE.

1. September

- ◆ Write a tentative scenario. (See "Introductory Speech," "Strategic Considerations," "Simulation Participants," and "News Updates" in the 1999 IPE packet for an idea of what a scenario looks like.)
- ◆ Design a tentative schedule of events and list of assignments.

TIP: Anything you want the students to consider/do explicitly has to be made a specific assignment, with instructions. Telling them that there are articles for them to consult and use, for instance, will not produce an in-depth analysis of the strengths and weaknesses of the articles.

TIP: A useful guide to the number of assignments is that teams need at least 24 hours to do one assignment, and that prep time doesn't leave them much time to interact with other teams. So there's a tradeoff between assignments and negotiation time.

- ◆ Contact facilitators of the negotiation workshop, and solicit their input on the schedule and scenario.
- ◆ Let faculty and students know about the tentative schedule; ask faculty which dates they'll be available to participate in the IPE (grading/office hours/judging/leading workshops etc).
- ◆ Continue research on groups and weekly news checks; keep updating the webpage.
- ◆ Identify and hire someone to run the group process workshop.

1. October

- ◆ Design a presentation for the Alumni Board.
- ◆ Work with our Placement Office to identify alumni who are in the organizations we're interested in, or who could help out in other ways.
- ◆ Assemble a draft of the briefing book.

- ◆ Work with our Student Activities people to start scheduling rooms for the exercise.

TIP: Ask the Student Activities people, or one of the secretaries, to be the point of contact with the University room scheduling service. Otherwise messages get crossed. You need rooms for the large group assemblies: the opening and closing assemblies, and any other large group meetings you're scheduling. Then you need space for the negotiation workshops, which will usually require one large room and a lot of space for students to meet in smaller groups. (Rackham is a possibility for this.) Then you need space and computers for the student teams to meet as a team, and meeting rooms for 2-3 teams to meet at once. To the extent that these can be fixed, it's better; that way student teams know how to find each other.

- ◆ Decide what/where the awards banquet will be and schedule a campus room for it, if necessary.
- ◆ Finalize the scenario and schedule.
- ◆ Create an evaluation for the IPE. Check with CRLT about doing an official form for it, if you want one. Make sure they understand the weird scheduling; the CRLT forms are useless if they don't come until the end of Winter Term.
- ◆ If this hasn't been done already, invite practitioners and faculty to ask questions at and judge the final presentations. This is the place to invite two or three prominent outsiders to come to campus. SPP paid a \$200 honorarium and expenses to the outside invitees. Make travel arrangements etc for the invitees.
- ◆ All staff for the IPE (faculty coordinators, GSIs) need to be in town BEFORE the IPE starts, so make holiday travel arrangements that allow for snafus.
- ◆ Continue research on groups and weekly news checks; keep updating the webpage.

1. November

- ◆ Finalize the briefing book; make it into a coursepack and/or finalize the webpage for it.

TIP: This needs to be done before faculty start planning their winter term courses; otherwise there's no room at the copier, the coursepack stores get confused and think the order doesn't need to be available until Winter Term begins, etc.

TIP: You may not want to release the list of policy actors who will be participating yet, just in case it changes. The briefing book only needs to have general information in it.

TIP: In 1999, we asked students to pay \$20 to cover the cost of the materials (which we duplicated for them), the extra paper used in our Xerox/computer room, phone calls, etc. They resented the fee and the late notice of the fee, and there was no efficient collection mechanism for it. If there's going to be a fee over and above the cost of a coursepack produced by one of the local shops, consider asking students to pay it when they register for the course.

- ◆ Finalize the list of practitioners (one from each organization) who will be the student contacts. Write, then call, explaining the project and what we're going to ask them to do. (In 1999, we asked practitioners to allot 45 minutes to an hour for a conference call with the students.) Since this won't happen until the first week of January, they may not be able to make scheduling commitments, but try to get them to do it anyway.
- ◆ Finalize and write instructions for the different assignments.
- ◆ Schedule faculty to participate in different aspects of the IPE.
- ◆ If there is a data-based assignment, find a way to make the data available to the students (web, diskettes, etc).
- ◆ Decide upon a list of awards; keep the different incentives the awards will produce in mind.

TIP: Make sure you have thought through when the different evaluations need to be done (for instance, when do the faculty grading the first assignment have to return it?). This is especially important for the peer awards, because the ballots can't be turned in until late in the exercise, and for the evaluations of the oral and written final presentations. The evaluations need to happen before the awards banquet, in enough time for the awards committee to write in the correct name on the certificates/other awards. Remember to appoint a committee to count up and decide upon the peer awards.

TIP: Ask the faculty who are in charge of the different evaluations to write a citation for you to read at the awards banquet. (Better yet, ask them to attend the awards banquet and give out the awards.)

- ◆ If SPP's decided to try to integrate the IPE topic into winter classes as well, talk with Winter Term faculty about doing this, and help them with the necessary research.

- ◆ Continue research on groups and weekly news checks; keep updating the webpage.

1. December

- ◆ Distribute the scenario, schedule, and the briefing book and/or instructions for getting it. The schedule is important because some students will have to confirm their work schedules around it. Include the names of the judging panel for the final day, to get students excited about the visitors. Also include a contact number for students who are stranded by travel delays.

TIP: If you write up little paragraphs describing each of the judges, the students will have some sense of who they are, and you won't have to scramble around to write an introduction for the judging panel on the day of the final presentations.

TIP: Students should be reminded to let the faculty coordinator know if there is a conflict between their non-SPP courses and their IPE participation. Essentially, students can work/go to class as long as it doesn't conflict with mandatory sessions (the workshops and assemblies). If there's a conflict, the faculty coordinator should write a note to the faculty in charge of the student's class to let them know about the student's absence. Otherwise, the student could get bumped out of the class (many faculty dis-enroll students who register for their classes but don't appear at the first meeting).

- ◆ Confirm and schedule participation with practitioner contacts and judges.

TIP: Schedule a specific time for student groups to call their practitioner contacts, preferably early on the second day of the exercise. (Fixing a specific appointment is VERY important.) You also need to round up 4-5 speakerphones and offices for students to use in order to call their practitioner contact. (Faculty may be willing to give up their offices for half a day to let students cycle in and out to use the phone.) Create a masterlist so you know who's calling who, when.

TIP: Ask practitioners if they would be willing to get e-mail or phone calls from students during the week, after the appointment. Make sure that students know how much their practitioner is willing to be contacted outside of the specific appointment.

- ◆ Write a "Participant Background" sheet for the students; create/finalize any other necessary written material (assignment instructions, mock news reports, etc.)
- ◆ Confirm rooms.
- ◆ Confirm food/arrangements/awards for the awards banquet, and food (if desired) for the workshops/large assemblies.

TIP: Not all students will come to the awards banquet, so you might want to ask them to RSVP. Potluck is possible but the students will be too busy and tired to cook, so the load will fall on faculty. If you're bringing food in, schedule faculty/staff to help set up the room for the banquet.

TIP: In 1999, a committee of faculty/staff (not the coordinator) designed the awards. It's good to have extras because you don't know how many groups will eventually get awards (large coalitions and ties can lead you to run out of certificates.)

- ◆ Confirm faculty participation, including participation of people who are running the negotiation and group process workshops.
- ◆ Check with SPP to see if there will be a copier available for students to use during the exercise. (If not, that's fine too, but students are going to want to know.)
- ◆ After fall grades are in, work with the Director of Student Affairs to create the small groups.

TIP: Type up a grid so that all the students know who is in which small group. (It's useful to put the information for the group's practitioner contact on this sheet as well.)

TIP: In 1999, we tried to make sure that groups had a mix of abilities, tracks, ESL and native language speakers, race/ethnicity/gender, first/second years, past experience, etc. This takes forever; schedule at least an afternoon, perhaps a whole day, to do the matching.

- ◆ Go have a good holiday, and get lots of sleep.

1. Week of the IPE

What you need to do during the week is going to be really dependent upon the schedule. So all I can offer here are a couple of tips:

- ◆ Get back into town early from your holidays, because there's always a disaster to solve.
- ◆ Try to avoid scheduling other things for yourself this week. You may even want to cancel your first week, non-SPP classes. (I didn't, but I'm not sure that was wise.)
- ◆ The phone calls to practitioners are a zoo, because calls go over time/the person's not in the office/ etc, etc. So someone needs to be where the calls are happening, to troubleshoot the process. (Remember that phone jacks in the classrooms are not long-distance enabled, so the students will need a code to allow them to dial out.)

- ◆ Delegate someone to do the A/V set-up for the final presentations. This means someone who will work the sound system, solve PowerPoint problems, get refreshments, help with handouts etc., and probably someone different to videotape the presentations (and to be in charge of getting and returning the equipment).
- ◆ If you are using faculty to advise particular groups, make sure the faculty understand the structure of the exercise and communicate with you about the advice they're giving. Otherwise, the students feel that they don't know whose word to listen to.
- ◆ Require student teams to give you a thank-you letter for their practitioner contact. Otherwise this won't get done.
- ◆ Schedule some time after the IPE is over (and after you've recovered) to organize the materials, revise this timeline, write thank-you notes, etc. Ask SPP to compensate the GSI for helping you do this, and make sure the GSI understands that this will be part of the job.

RECORD TYPE: PRESIDENTIAL (NOTES MAIL)

CREATOR: Bennie C. Rogers (CN=Bennie C. Rogers/OU=OMB/O=EOP [OMB])

CREATION DATE/TIME:29-NOV-1999 14:28:27.00

SUBJECT: Comments are now due on LRM BCR40 - - LABOR Study on Wages, Benefits, Poverty Line, and Meeting Worker's Needs in the Apparel and Footwear Industries of Selected Countries.

TO: Katherine K. Wallman (CN=Katherine K. Wallman/OU=OMB/O=EOP@EOP [OMB])
READ:UNKNOWN

TO: Robin L. Lumsdaine (CN=Robin L. Lumsdaine/OU=CEA/O=EOP@EOP [CEA])
READ:UNKNOWN

TO: Melissa N. Benton (CN=Melissa N. Benton/OU=OMB/O=EOP@EOP [OMB])
READ:UNKNOWN

TO: Michael J. Brien (CN=Michael J. Brien/OU=CEA/O=EOP@EOP [CEA])
READ:UNKNOWN

TO: Michael Casella (CN=Michael Casella/OU=OMB/O=EOP@EOP [OMB])
READ:UNKNOWN

TO: Richard M. Samans (CN=Richard M. Samans/OU=OPD/O=EOP@EOP [OPD])
READ:UNKNOWN

TO: Richard B. Bavier (CN=Richard B. Bavier/OU=OMB/O=EOP@EOP [OMB])
READ:UNKNOWN

TO: Jack A. Smalligan (CN=Jack A. Smalligan/OU=OMB/O=EOP@EOP [OMB])
READ:UNKNOWN

TO: Charles F. Stone (CN=Charles F. Stone/OU=CEA/O=EOP@EOP [CEA])
READ:UNKNOWN

TO: Alejandra O. Ceja (CN=Alejandra O. Ceja/OU=OMB/O=EOP@EOP [OMB])
READ:UNKNOWN

TO: Randolph M. Lyon (CN=Randolph M. Lyon/OU=OMB/O=EOP@EOP [OMB])
READ:UNKNOWN

TO: Larry R. Matlack (CN=Larry R. Matlack/OU=OMB/O=EOP@EOP [OMB])
READ:UNKNOWN

TO: Sarah Rosen Wartell (CN=Sarah Rosen Wartell/OU=OPD/O=EOP@EOP [OPD])
READ:UNKNOWN

CC: Victoria J. Darnes (CN=Victoria J. Darnes/OU=NSC/O=EOP [NSC])
READ:UNKNOWN

CC: John W. Ficklin (CN=John W. Ficklin/OU=NSC/O=EOP [NSC])
READ:UNKNOWN

CC: llr@do.treas.gov (llr@do.treas.gov @ inet [UNKNOWN])
READ:UNKNOWN

CC: dol-sol-leg (dol-sol-leg @ dol.gov @ inet [UNKNOWN])
READ:UNKNOWN

CC: laffairs (laffairs @ ustr.gov @ inet [UNKNOWN])
READ:UNKNOWN

CC: rademachpr@state.gov (rademachpr@state.gov @ inet [UNKNOWN])
READ:UNKNOWN

CC: vince.ancell@usda.gov (vince.ancell@usda.gov @ inet [UNKNOWN])
READ:UNKNOWN

TEXT:
REMINDER: Comments were due on LRM BCR40, by 2:00 PM, today, Monday,
November 29, 1999. Please send your comments to me ASAP.

----- Forwarded by Bennie C. Rogers/OMB/EOP on 11/29/99

09:25 AM -----

LRM ID: BCR40
EXECUTIVE OFFICE OF THE PRESIDENT
OFFICE OF MANAGEMENT AND BUDGET
Washington, D.C. 20503-0001

Wednesday, November 10, 1999

LEGISLATIVE REFERRAL MEMORANDUM

TO: Legislative Liaison Officer - See Distribution
below
FROM: Janet R. Forsgren (for) Assistant Director for
Legislative Reference
OMB CONTACT: Bennie C. Rogers
PHONE: (202)395-7754 FAX: (202)395-6148
SUBJECT: LABOR Study on Wages, Benefits, Poverty Line, and Meeting
Worker's Needs in the Apparel and Footwear Industries of Selected
Countries.

DEADLINE: 2:00 PM Monday, November 29, 1999
In accordance with OMB Circular A-19, OMB requests the views of your
agency on the above subject before advising on its relationship to the
program of the President. Please advise us if this item will affect
direct spending or receipts for purposes of the "Pay-As-You-Go" provisions
of Title XIII of the Omnibus Budget Reconciliation Act of 1990.

COMMENTS: Labor's draft Wage Study is a by-product of the Apparel Industry
Partnership agreement on the charter for the new Fair Labor Association
(the anti-sweatshop monitoring organization created by 10 companies and
selected human rights groups.) The charter called upon Labor to do a
study within 6 months of wages, benefits, poverty, and meeting worker
needs in the apparel and footwear industries in countries around the

world.

PLEASE NOTE, IF WE HAVE NOT HEARD FROM YOU BY THE DEADLINE, WE WILL ASSUME THAT YOU HAVE NO OBJECTION.

DISTRIBUTION LIST

AGENCIES:

52-HEALTH & HUMAN SERVICES - Sondra S. Wallace - (202) 690-7760
7-AGRICULTURE - Marvin Shapiro - (202) 720-1516
110-Social Security Administration - Judy Chesser - (202) 358-6030
62-LABOR - Robert A. Shapiro - (202) 219-8201
114-STATE - Paul Rademacher - (202) 647-4463
118-TREASURY - Richard S. Carro - (202) 622-0650
25-COMMERCE - Michael A. Levitt - (202) 482-3151
128-US Trade Representative - Fred Montgomery - (202) 395-3475
83-National Security Council - Robert A. Bradtke - (202) 456-9221

EOP:

Sarah Rosen Wartell
Richard M. Samans
Larry R. Matlack
Michael Casella
Randolph M. Lyon
Michael J. Brien
Alejandra O. Ceja
Melissa N. Benton
Charles F. Stone
Robin L. Lumsdaine
Jack A. Smalligan
Katherine K. Wallman
Richard B. Bavier

LRM ID: BCR40 SUBJECT: LABOR Study on Wages, Benefits, Poverty Line, and Meeting Worker's Needs in the Apparel and Footwear Industries of Selected Countries.

RESPONSE TO
LEGISLATIVE REFERRAL
MEMORANDUM

If your response to this request for views is short (e.g., concur/no comment), we prefer that you respond by e-mail or by faxing us this response sheet. If the response is short and you prefer to call, please call the branch-wide line shown below (NOT the analyst's line) to leave a message with a legislative assistant.

You may also respond by:

- (1) calling the analyst/attorney's direct line (you will be connected to voice mail if the analyst does not answer); or
- (2) sending us a memo or letter

Please include the LRM number shown above, and the subject shown below.

TO: Bennie C. Rogers Phone: 395-7754 Fax: 395-6148
Office of Management and Budget

Branch-Wide Line (to reach legislative assistant):

395-7362

FROM: _____ (Date)

_____ (Name)

_____ (Agency)

_____ (Telephone)

The following is the response of our agency to your request for views on the above-captioned subject:

_____ Concur

_____ No Objection

_____ No Comment

_____ See proposed edits on pages _____

_____ Other: _____

_____ FAX RETURN of _____ pages, attached to this response sheet