- Forest Stewardship Council
- Labour Behind the Label Coalition and the WearFair Charter, Canada;
- Rugmark
- Fair TradeMark Canada / Transfair

In addition, information was provided to participants on a broader range of labels/codes through the circulation of papers prepared by the ILO and others. In particular, documentation was provided on:

- Ethical Trading Initiative, U.K.
- El Salvador Monitoring Group for implementation of The GAP's code
- Guatemala and Nicaragua - codes of ethics
- International Code of Practice for Canadian Business
- Social Accountability 8000 (Council on Economic Priorities, U.S.)

## Reports on Rugmark and the process of establishing Rugmark Canada:

The funding for an office to license and market Rugmark in Canada was not in place until March 1998, so our interim report's evaluation of Rugmark does not yet reflect experience in Canada. However, we reviewed previous research, commissioned a paper, and scheduled two major discussions of Rugmark:

- Pharis Harvey of the International Labour Rights Fund (U.S.), a supporter of Rugmark initiatives in India, Nepal and Pakistan , made a presentation at the November meeting. (See the November minutes, pages 3-6, in Appendix I);
- Devarajan Geetha, a critic of Rugmark, made a presentation at the March meeting, based on the paper we commissioned. (See the March minutes, pages 7-12, in Appendix I.) Geetha works with the Human Rights Research and Advocacy Centre, which in turn supports the work of the Coalition Against Child Labour (India);
- Existing research on Rugmark was circulated to members of the Learning Circle, and staff prepared a bibliography and an analysis of a critique of Rugmark by Canadian journalist, John Stackhouse which had appeared in the *Globe and Mail* (Appendix II).

## Discussion of roles for Canadian NGOs, unions, corporations, and governments in relation to the development of labels / codes:

Through discussion of case studies, we identified many of the issues for companies, NGOs and governments involved in addressing social issues through codes of conduct and labelling systems. We did not attempt to conclude this stage of the project with a set of recommendations. While there was considerable agreement within the group on some of the issues, there was not total consensus. Details of the discussion of criteria for evaluating codes are provided in the minutes: November, pages 10-13; February, pages 11-12; March, pages 3-4 and 12-17.