



Governing Body

313th Session, Geneva, 15–30 March 2012

GB.313/WP/GBC/1

Working Party on the Functioning of the Governing Body and the International Labour Conference

WP/GBC

Date: 12 March 2012

Original: English

FIRST ITEM ON THE AGENDA

Improving the functioning of the International Labour Conference and the Regional Meetings

Context

1. Following the meeting of the Working Party (WP/GBC) held during the 312th Session of the Governing Body (November 2011), the Governing Body requested the Office to produce a document consolidating all points raised during the discussions of the Working Party and to convene a meeting of the Geneva-based tripartite consultative group¹ in order to develop a plan of work, including time frames.²
2. At its meeting on 9 February 2012, the consultative group had before it an issues paper (appended) which presented, in tabular form, the proposals made in November, divided into seven main chapters: A. General issues; B. ILC structure; C. ILC agenda setting; D. ILC plenary; E. Working methods of ILC committees; F. ILC delegates and participants; and G. Efficiency gains and others. The issues paper also summarized the reactions the members of the Working Party had expressed to the questions that had been submitted for debate at the 312th Session of the Governing Body.³
3. It was recalled that the consultative group had no decision-making powers and that its role was to facilitate discussion by the Governing Body by raising a number of questions and identifying broad orientations which could then feed into the deliberations of the Working Party.
4. Part I of this paper summarizes, chapter by chapter, the key issues and views expressed during these informal consultations, for the consideration of the Working Party. Part II addresses the future plan of work of the Working Party.

¹ The Geneva-based tripartite consultative group consists of the regional coordinators and secretaries of the Employers' and Workers' groups.

² GB.312/INS/13, para. 13.

³ GB.312/WP/GBC/1.

Part I

A. General issues

5. A broad consensus emerged on the following points: (i) the need to conduct the reform process within the existing constitutional framework; (ii) the need to strengthen the International Labour Conference (ILC), as the supreme body of the Organization; (iii) the maintenance of the five main functions of the ILC⁴ (constitutional, political, technical, forum and assembly); (iv) the need to establish a timetable for the reform process, bearing in mind that guidance on this process from the new Director-General, to be elected in May 2012, would be of a great importance; and (v) the reform process should be consensus-driven, giving constituents a sense of ownership of the ILC.

B. ILC structure

6. With regard to the linkages between the Regional Meetings (which also fall within the mandate of the Working Party) and the ILC and the need for more coherence between these two forums, it was considered that priority should be given to examining the functioning of the ILC. Examination of Regional Meetings should take place later in the light of progress made in respect of the ILC. As for the duration of the ILC, the view was widely shared that its current length was an obstacle to participation at the desired level, and hence to constituents' sense of ownership both of the Conference and its outputs. Reducing the duration would be beneficial, but only in conditions which ensured that the Conference could satisfactorily and fully carry out its functions. If the preparatory processes were improved, there might be an impact on the duration of the Conference and its structure.
7. The innovative procedures and format of the Maritime Session of the ILC in February 2006 were highlighted as a possible source of inspiration. However, it was noted that, although preparations had been highly efficient, the duration of the Conference itself had been the same. The specific nature of the Maritime Conference was also underlined. Moreover, it was recognized that the cost of technical preparatory conferences should not be underestimated and should be kept in mind in any consideration of the possibility of replacing a first Conference discussion with such a preparatory conference.
8. The Legal Adviser confirmed that the examination of the reports submitted by member States on the ratification and implementation of labour standards was the only item that must be placed on the agenda on the basis of constitutional provisions. The number of other technical items to be placed on the agenda of the Conference was decided by the Governing Body based on practice and determined the number of technical committees to be established by the Conference.

C. ILC agenda setting

9. The consultative group recalled its previous discussion of 2 February 2012 on the ILC agenda-setting process and reiterated some of their conclusions, as follows:

⁴ As set out in GB.312/WP/GBC/1, para. 17.

- The selection of Conference agenda items to be submitted to the Governing Body (other than the items for recurrent discussions in accordance with the ILO Declaration on Social Justice for a Fair Globalization) should be a process under constant review, based on extensive consultations with the constituents. In that respect, three major sources were identified as potential “generators” of proposals: the Office; the outcome of ILO meetings and issues emerging from the world of work; and the constituents themselves.
- Even though the recurrent discussion should be considered as part of the preparatory work in the process of agenda setting and would generate new agenda items for future sessions of the Conference, this process should not automatically transform the recurrent discussion into a double discussion.
- A slot should be kept open until the Governing Body session in June to allow for the possible selection of an item as follow-up to the work of one of the technical committees, including the committee for the recurrent discussion, or a topical issue requiring urgent examination. It was recognized that the timing of final decisions on agenda items needed to take into account not only the advantages of addressing issues of topical importance, but also the need for adequate time for preparation, including for standard setting.

D. ILC plenary

10. It was recognized that the plenary sittings did not enjoy the general interest that was desired. At the same time, the right to address the plenary was generally considered to be of fundamental importance.
11. The overall view was that the topic and format for discussion of the Report of the Director-General should be treated at a later stage, to give the new Director-General an opportunity to present his/her vision of its role. It was nevertheless recognized that giving the Director-General the opportunity to interact with the ILO constituents through the discussion of his/her Report was an important feature of the ILC.
12. Alternative and innovative solutions, such as thematic sessions instead of one continuous plenary, should be explored, with the aim of making the plenary sittings more interactive and attractive.
13. While the visits of an increased number of Heads of State and Government to the Conference was considered to be a positive development for the Organization, efforts should be made to ensure that they were more efficiently integrated into the overall workplan of the ILC.

E. Working methods of ILC committees

14. It was agreed that transparency, predictability and objectivity should prevail in the working methods of Conference committees, including those of the Committee on the Application of Standards. In that respect, it was underlined that the results of the discussions of the informal Tripartite Working Group on the Committee of Experts on the Application of Conventions and Recommendations should feed into the discussions of the Working Party (WP/GBC). In this regard, it was proposed that the preliminary list of cases to come before the Committee on the Application of Standards be distributed to member States at least two weeks before the ILC.

15. It was noted that general discussion items were valued agenda items at the ILC. However, a degree of disappointment was expressed concerning the quality of follow-up in recent instances, and it was suggested that the selection of general discussion items should be more strategic. In some cases, they could be considered preparatory work for standard-setting activity.

F. ILC delegates and participants

16. The question of balance in the composition of national delegations at the ILC was raised. The Office was requested to provide the Working Party with more disaggregated data on the composition of delegations, particularly regarding group and gender. It was observed that the size of national delegations should allow their members to cover all items on the ILC agenda.

G. Efficiency gains and others

17. It was recognized that the Office needed to adopt a more cost-effective approach to the management of the Conference. Further to the programme and budget requirement to reduce the ILC budget, some measures had already been identified by the Office, including:
- better planning of interpretation services;
 - reduction of overtime hours;
 - avoiding extended sittings for non standard-setting or recurrent discussions;
 - ways to make savings in the preparation of the *Provisional Record*.
18. It was also agreed that the reform of the ILC should not be seen as a purely cost-cutting exercise. The primary aim was to design an ILC which was able to carry out its constitutional mandate and functions effectively.
19. The consultative group recognized the importance of the publication of the *Provisional Record*, but agreed to examine further the various options that had been put forward to reduce its production costs.

Part II

The way forward

20. The prevailing opinion after the discussions in the consultative group was that, in the light of the above and the forthcoming election of the Director-General, it was premature to establish a firm timetable for the future plan of work of the Working Party. However, it could be envisaged that, in the light of the discussion to be held in March 2012 by the Working Party and the guidance it might provide to the Office concerning the next steps of the reform process, the Office would prepare a paper which would incorporate the views of the newly elected Director-General. This paper could initially be submitted to a meeting of the consultative group to be held during the summer months. It would then be for the Governing Body, in November 2012, to set out a more detailed agenda of reform items with a proposed time frame in which they should be addressed.

ILC Reform/Working Party GBC

Issues Paper

(For informal consultations – February 2012)

1. Following the meeting of the Working Party (WP/GBC) held during the 312th Session of the Governing Body (November 2011), the Office was requested to prepare an issues paper to be discussed by the Geneva-based tripartite consultative group.
2. Based on the interventions made during the meeting of the Working Party, the proposals have been divided into seven main chapters: A. General issues; B. ILC structure; C. ILC agenda setting; D. ILC plenary; E. Working methods of ILC committees; F. ILC delegates and participants; and G. Efficiency gains and others.
3. Within each chapter, the Office has followed the order of presentation at the November 2011 meeting. The numbering has been introduced to facilitate references to respective proposals during the next phase of the consultations.

A. General issues	
Proposals:	Office comments:
<p>1. Government G: <i>“... objectives of this exercise should be, first, to strengthen the ILC as the highest policy-making body of the ILO. Second, to ensure that its deliberations respond to addressing issues and contemporary challenges. Third ... to enhance transparency of efficiency in its procedures. Fourth, to guarantee the predictability in the proceedings ... and, fifth, to enhance objectivity of documents and procedures.”</i></p> <p>2. GRULAC: <i>“... It is crucial ... that the functioning of the ILO should be improved: (1) so it can serve and answer better to the needs of its tripartite constituents; (2) so it can fulfil its mandate as a high-level body in which vital decisions are taken and which sets out the most important orientations for the ILO; and to continue perfecting procedures with a view to enhancing objectivity, predictability and transparency ...”</i></p> <p>3. ASPAG: <i>“The five major functions of the Conference namely its constitutional function, political function, technical function, forum function and assembly function, should be meticulously examined for further fundamental improvement and higher level of efficacy.”</i></p> <p>4. AFRICAN G.: <i>“... improvements can be introduced regarding the five essential functions”.</i></p> <p>5. Workers: <i>“... any discussion to improve the Conference should aim at strengthening the supreme organ of the Organization, particularly, its standard-setting and supervision functions and improve its tripartite participation. We therefore reaffirm a commitment to the five functions of the Conference as identified in paragraph 17: constitutional;</i></p>	<p>General comments:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> – It seems that there is a general consensus on the main functions of the ILC as set out in paragraph 17 of GB.312/WP/GBC/1. – It seems that there is also a general consensus to work within the existing framework of the ILO Constitution. <p>Can we take these two assumptions as part of the framework of the present exercise?</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> – Proposal 5.A: As a legal matter, the standard-setting and recurrent discussion functions could be considered a sine qua non (see Preamble and art. 9 of the ILO Constitution; ILO Declaration on

<p><i>political; technical; forum; and assembly ... Our engagement in any discussion on Conference improvement can only take place if there is an agreement on these fundamentals.”</i></p> <p>6. Workers: <i>“We also agree with paragraph 20 of the document, in that any measures that may eventually be adopted in the future to improve the functioning of the Conference, should remain within the constitutional framework of the Conference. “</i></p> <p>7. Employers: <i>“... We agree firstly that this reform must indubitably be carried out within the framework and in the limits of the Constitution.”</i></p> <p>8. France: <i>“... We must put our priorities in order. Is the ILC first and foremost a parliament of labour, which votes texts and approves the budget? Is it a political platform, a showcase for the Organization, a tripartite forum, or is it a little bit of all this at the same time? Once we have our priorities in order of importance that will help us to determine the means that need to be put in place.”</i></p> <p>9. China: <i>“... it is essential to improve the efficiency and transparency of the Conference. All proposals concerning the structure and procedures of the Conference must be based on that.”</i></p>	<p>Social Justice for a Fair Globalization, 2008).</p> <p>– Proposal 8.A: The “constitutional” and “political” functions concern constitutionally-mandated substantive outputs of the ILC, while the categories “technical”, “forum” and “assembly” concern the nature of the ILC and its procedures. How the different functions interrelate is relevant to this exercise to achieve efficiency, transparency, while maintaining the ILC’s essential role, as many noted. The constitutional and political functions could be properly prioritized recognizing the imperative nature of certain constitutional functions of the ILC; and the technical, forum and assembly functions treated as means to achieving the substantive functions.</p>
---	--

B. ILC structure	
Proposals:	Office comments:
<p>1. GRULAC: <i>“The objective of any reform of the current structure of the Conference must be to enhance its clarity and transparency. More than structural changes, improvements in procedures, working methods and the functioning of meetings are called for.”</i></p> <p>2. AFRICAN G.: <i>“... a greater number of Regional Meetings would have a significant effect on the success of the Conference. To this end, the agendas of Regional Meetings should be brought into line with the ILC agenda, such that Regional Meetings provide a preparatory framework for Conference sessions ...”</i></p>	<p>– Proposal 2.B: On the linkage between Regional Meetings (RMs) and the ILC, while increased frequency of RMs may be difficult to operationalize, in particular due to the present budget constraints, it may be useful to consider tighter coherence across the RMs in relation to the developments concerning the ILCs</p>

- | | |
|--|--|
| <p>3. IMEC: “... need for more in-depth reform of the present structure of the ILC, alternating between full sessions and lighter sessions, as suggested in past debates, might be desirable. On the other hand, the ILC should still meet today’s demands of efficiency and results. The experience made in relation with the elaboration and the adoption of the Maritime and Labour Convention should be kept in mind. Therefore, IMEC sees a need in reviewing the whole process of the Conference and find a more efficient means to address some of the more routine procedural issues. For example ... it should be possible to reduce the length of the opening session and make it possible to start work in the committees earlier on the opening day. If necessary, Standing Orders should be adjusted to allow more efficiency.”</p> <p>4. IMEC: “... sees a link between the ILC reform and the reform of the Regional Meetings ... Therefore, IMEC would have appreciated that the discussions on the cost merits for the Regional Meetings ... had been reflected in the paper too ...”</p> <p>5. Workers: “... not convinced that, in the light of the suspension of the Resolutions Committee in 2006, the transfer to the Selection Committee of urgent resolution is a good solution. What happened this year with the resolution on policy coherence, showed the limitation of using the Selection Committee as a body to debate the political content of resolution. Another issue is resolutions in general as opposed to urgent resolutions. When the Resolutions Committee still existed, it allowed the Conference, every two years, to have important policy debates. We could therefore think of re-establishing the Resolutions Committee, for instance, to replace a general discussion every two years by a Resolutions Committee ...”</p> <p>6. Workers: “... Our group would be opposed to the idea of alternating between the lighter and a full session of the Conference as this would go against the principle of strengthening the Conference and its tripartite participation.”</p> <p>7. Workers: “... We also do not understand the link made between the ILC reform and the reform of Regional Meetings. We hope this is not the way for shifting policy decision on a regional basis in meetings where there is not participatory approach in the agenda setting for example nor real tripartism in the action. We do not see the added value of Regional Meetings as preparatory meetings of the ILC as proposed by some of the Governments.”</p> <p>8. Switzerland: “... feel that it is necessary to go further in reforming the Conference. There is a pressing need to alternate complete sessions with lighter sessions, as far as possible without general discussions. The Office should provide concrete proposals along these lines ... The holding of technical preparatory conferences would contribute to improving the effectiveness of the discussion of draft standards. This was possible when drawing up the Maritime</p> | <p>between RMs, and to include the RM results at higher visibility in the Director-General’s Reports to the ILC.</p> <p>– Proposal 3.B: To avoid the opening day formalities relating to suspensions of the Standing Orders, one could consider proposals for revision of the Standing Orders in some of the areas subject of consistent suspensions since 2008 (see para. 31 GB.312/WP/GBC/1).</p> <p>– Proposal 4.B: See comment to proposal 7.B (ILC structure)</p> <p>– Proposal 5.B: On the Resolutions Committee, the agenda of the ILC already has a built-in biennial rhythm for a P&B year and non-P&B year: this biennial cycle provides for no Resolutions Committee in P&B years. However, Resolutions Committees in non-P&B years have been suspended since 2006, leaving only urgent and formal resolutions. One could consider further lightening the agenda, either in the way proposed by the Workers or in other ways.</p> <p>– Proposal 7.B: The main reason why the Office raised this question was because, in the past, suggestions have been made to hold Regional Meetings in Geneva immediately after or before the ILC. This would reduce the financial burden both for Governments and for the Office.</p> <p>– Proposal 8.B: One would need to keep in mind the needs of Members who do not regularly attend the ILC due to costs constraints and distance. Regarding preparatory technical conferences/ commissions, experience shows that they are costly. Apart from the technical and political considerations, a cost-comparison in</p> |
|--|--|

<i>Labour Convention (MLC, 2006), in a single session, without clashing with the rules in force ... Such technical preparatory conferences do not necessarily have to coincide with the sessions of the Conference. The Office paper should also explore the possibility of placing these technical preparatory conferences within the sphere of sectoral activities so as to replace meetings of experts, sectoral meetings and even global dialogue forums ...”</i>	relation to a first discussion could also be useful. Is there enough merit in this idea (Switzerland), for the Office to make concrete proposals?
---	--

C. ILC agenda setting

Proposals:	Office comments:
<p>1. GRULAC: “... consider it essential that the process of establishing and preparing the agenda should be made more simple and objective. Thus, items that do not encounter significant support should not be retained as proposals year after year. Items should be as current as possible and should follow labour market developments for a general discussion.”</p> <p>2. AFRICAN G.: “... When drawing up the agenda, the Office must stress priorities and promote tripartite consultations.”</p> <p>3. IMEC: “... It is of utmost importance to ensure a transparent decision-making process for setting the ILC agenda that facilitates the participation of the three groups. The use of electronic expression of preference is an option to be considered. The objectives should be to identify current and emerging issues for which the ILC can develop focus concrete responses. The process also needs to be sufficiently flexible to allow changes to address urgent new issues as they arise. The Office should support the agenda selection process by developing well explained and justified proposals on timely and forward-looking issues. These should include issues proposed by the Governments, Workers’ and Employers’ groups, standard setting items identified in the conclusions of the recurrent discussions, and recommendations of the standard review mechanism once it is operational. Items that are not chosen year after year should be removed from the list.”</p> <p>4. Netherlands: “... stress the need for a more central role of the recurrent discussions in the process of preparing for the ILC agenda. The 2008 Declaration ... introduced the important recurrent item discussions at the ... Conference ... The main purpose ... is to better understand the current needs of constituents ... On the basis of that experience ... we feel that the recurrent item discussion ... should be more central to the ILC and its agenda setting. Not only by having the recurrent discussion itself but also in its preparation and its follow-up. The GB should decide on the basis of the conclusions of the recurrent discussion if it should be followed up by the Conference. If that is the case this could take the form of either standard setting or general discussion which addresses specific aspects that came up in the recurrent discussion. This way we would be truly acting in the spirit of the 2008 Declaration ...”</p>	<p>– Proposals 3.C and 4.C: The Office has proposed that the ILO constituents take advantage of the ongoing informal consultations on the 2014 ILC agenda, to discuss the modalities of selection of the Conference agenda items. A short note has been prepared, highlighting, among others, the possible implications of the 2008 Declaration in that regard.</p>

- 5. Switzerland:** *“... reducing the Governing Body discussion on the Conference agenda to a single round, as close as possible to the Conference, is a possibility to be examined. Abandoning general discussions, in so far as possible, is an option for consideration, since such discussions are not part of the Conference’s constitutional mandate. One solution would be that a general discussion could be held, even in plenary, on the report of the Director-General. Another option would be once again to reinforce sectoral activities, and reformat general discussions to take place within the framework of meetings of experts, technical meetings or global dialogue forums.”*

D. ILC plenary

Proposals:

- 1. GRULAC:** *“... recognize that plenary sittings do not enjoy the general interest that is desired and believe that we should discuss means of making them more attractive. However, tripartite delegates should retain the right to take the floor in plenary.”*
- 2. IMEC:** *“... the last review of the ILC resulted in the current arrangement, whereby the plenary session takes place during the third week. This allowed savings by reducing the needs to rent the plenary hall for a full two weeks. However, with the introduction of numerous high-level guests and panels, we have experienced that plenary sessions are now being scheduled in the second week, eliminating such savings. In addition, many speakers addressed a near-empty plenary hall. While the selection of high-level speakers and the quality of the panel discussions have been excellent, there still is a need to balance such events with the requirement to complete the work of the agenda of the Conference, including the adoption of the Committee Reports. IMEC suggests that a working group explores alternatives that could improve efficiency while protecting the right of delegates to address the ILC.”*
- 3. Workers:** *“... The two points on suspension of rules on time limits at the Conference, panels and high-level summits deal with the interactive nature of the Conference and high-level participation. While Workers support such dimension in both cases, we want to stress that the tripartite nature of the Organization needs to be enhanced. Too many times we have seen speaking slots mostly allocated to Governments with no Worker and Employer participation.”*
- 4. Workers:** *“... we do not deny that the participation rate for the plenary debate outside speeches of Heads of State is unsatisfactory. We are ready to discuss how to make the speeches of the delegates ... become part of the real life of the Organization.”*
- 5. Workers:** *“... are happy that the document sees value in maintaining the voting process in the plenary as a democratic affirmation of the Conference. We also noted that time has been saved in relation to the debate on the Director-General*

Office comments:

- Proposal 2.D: In fact, the Office has always booked the plenary room for the entire duration of the ILC in order to accommodate planned or last-minute high-level guests and panels, as well as other unforeseen events.

<p>report by having some of the Director-General replies provided in writing.”</p> <p>6. Employers: “... There is no denying ... that the plenary debate is a succession of monologues, followed by any circumstantial event that might capture attention, but let’s not be fooled: it is the crisis that has made us relevant over the past few years ...”</p> <p>7. Employers: “... we should not avoid the subject of the length of the Conference. Frankly we already know that to capture and retain the attention of relevant personalities from the field of governments, workers and employers over a three-week period is a losing battle ... In fact, today, we have two Conferences – a technical one and a political one, and between the two ... there is a clear split. The split occurs because participants coming for the technical part normally leave on the Friday or Saturday of the second week, and those arriving for the political part turn up with almost no knowledge of what has been discussed the previous week ...”</p> <p>8. Switzerland: “... In lighter sessions, plenary sittings could be limited to the essential functions of the Conference: the standard-setting and technical functions ... The discussion of the Report of the Director-General should be restricted to two days, organized around round tables or high-level interactive debates. One day should then suffice for adopting the committee reports without discussion, including the budget, and for fulfilling the other technical and standard-setting functions.”</p>	<p>– Proposal 8.D: There is room for innovation, so long as the right of Members to speak at the time of adoption of reports is preserved (this apart from the Credentials reports which do not so permit.).</p> <p>Is there enough merit in this idea (Switzerland), for the Office to make concrete proposals?</p>
---	--

E. Working methods of ILC committees	
Proposals:	Office comments:
<p>Technical committees:</p> <p>1. GRULAC: “... all the committees ... can and must be improved with a view to ensuring more transparency, objectivity and predictability. As a suggestion ... stresses that the relation between the work of the Committee on the Application of Conventions and Recommendations in its analysis of the Global Report, and the committees for recurrent discussion items, should be re-evaluated, because we cannot see positive results coming from discussions held separately”.</p> <p>2. IMEC: “The standard-setting role of the ILC is central for the ILO but the methods of standard setting might also need to be reviewed in the light of the discussions in LILS on ensuring updated and relevant standards. Does the current framework ensure sufficient flexibility for future challenges?”</p>	<p>– Proposal 1.E: The synergy between the discussion of the General Survey by the Committee on Application of Standards and the report by the recurrent item Committee will be improved as of 2014 when the timing of the General Survey discussion will take place the year before the recurrent item Committee discussion on related strategic objective (see GB.309/10 and subsequent decision).</p> <p>– Proposal 2.E: What kind of modalities should be envisaged?</p>

<p>3. IMEC: <i>“Regarding the recurrent discussions, it will be important to ensure that they are prepared and carried out in a manner that fulfils the objectives of the 2008 Declaration ... Recurrent discussions are intended to permit an assessment of the impacts of ILO work and identification of needs of constituents in order to ensure that the ILO fully understands and strengthens its response to the needs of its constituents.”</i></p> <p>4. Workers: <i>“... We also believe that, especially, in the case of technical committees, the use of panels should be exercised with care as one should not transform committee work in exchanges of views. Rather, one needs to ensure to keep the focus on reaching negotiated tripartite conclusions, and it is, of course, obvious that the use of panels ... should not be used in committees whose purpose is to adopt standards as the time should be used to reach a consensus of the text of the instrument.”</i></p> <p>5. Switzerland: <i>“... Improvements to the working methods of the technical committees ... should only concern standards issues, to the extent that general discussions should be dropped. Preparatory technical conferences would be made responsible for preparing, finalizing and consolidating draft standards in a single session. Five working days should suffice to complete this finalization and consolidation.”</i></p>	<p>– Proposal 3.E: See comments to proposals 3 and 4.C (ILC agenda setting) as well as 1.E</p> <p>– Proposal 5.E: See comment to proposal 8.B (ILC structure)</p>
<p>Standards Committee</p> <p>6. Government G: <i>“... notes that the deliberations of this Working Party are closely linked to the discussions in the informal working group of the Conference Committee on the Application of Standards. Both groups should work in a coordinated, coherent and convergent manner.”</i></p> <p>7. GRULAC: <i>“... ways of increasing the predictability, objectivity and transparency of the proceedings of the Standards Committee should be sought. The delay in publishing the list of individual cases ... reveals the need for more clearly defined rules. This delay ... has seriously compromised the capacity of many delegations from our region to participate adequately in the Conference ... GRULAC thus maintains that the discussions of the informal Working Group ... should be incorporated into the deliberations of the present Working Group.”</i></p> <p>8. AFRICAN G.: <i>“... Regarding improvements to the working methods of the Standards Committee, the African group considers that the Committee’s functioning should be re-thought, taking account of criteria of transparency, objectivity and equity”</i></p> <p>9. IMEC: <i>“The Committee ... experienced again this year some difficulties with respect to efficient use of time, primarily due to the late editions of the list of cases. Since the Committee’s work is essential for the credibility of the whole Organization, we see, with deep concern, on this development ...”</i></p> <p>10. Workers: <i>“... Taking into account the specificity and technicity of the Committee on the Application of Standards ... it is not a solution at all to integrate the work of the specific tripartite working group in this Working Party.”</i></p>	<p>General comments: Since the Tripartite Working Group of the ILC Committee on the Application of Standards was set up, it has already met 11 times. Its recommendations for increasing transparency and enhancing its working methods have been submitted to the Conference Committee on application of Standards each year at the beginning of its work for consideration and adoption. The issues dealt with are over and above the matters covered by the provisions of Section H of the Standing Orders of the Conference. The outcome of the work of the Working Group which have already been adopted by the Conference Committee and thus by the ILC can be submitted to this Working Group for review for any Standing Orders’ implications that it may have. It is important to note that an advanced preliminary list of cases is sent to Member States at least two weeks before the beginning of the ILC.</p>

- 11. ASEAN:** "... we believe that the Committee on the Application of Standards should make available as soon as in advance the preliminary list and final list of cases to be discussed and make clear criteria for the section of those cases."

F. ILC delegates and participants

Proposals:

- 1. GRULAC:** "... the fundamental criteria here is balance in tripartite delegations ... We believe that limiting numbers in delegations is neither desirable nor reasonable."
- 2. ASPAG:** "... ever-increasing cost implication of the increase of non-ILO constituents' participation ... for each non-ILO participant we are paying US\$1,800 from the pocket of the governments. In view of the capacity constraints with respect to resources and premises, ASPAG suggests that the implication of such an alarming trend for the organization of the Conference be given high priority ..."
- 3. IMEC:** "... has noticed the dramatic increase in the number of participants from national delegations over the past years. We also note that the Constitution already sets out some regulations concerning the composition of member delegations. It would, therefore, help inform this discussion if the secretariat could provide us with further information on the composition of national delegations and on the impact of the increased number of participants on the functioning of the ILC."
- 4. Workers:** "... Paragraph 32 tells us that in 2011 a total of 7,500 persons (all categories combined) attended the Conference. We would like to know what these categories are and get disaggregated figures including, regarding staff and its distribution. The figure of 1,750 staff for 4,000 participants seems, to us, disproportionate. While for us, all ILO staff should use the opportunity of the conference to create positive links with the constituents, we need to be rigorous, especially in indicating who has been temporarily hired and for what."
- 5. Workers:** "...in favour of maintaining the largest possible access to the ILC in order to maintain the parliamentary function, but we can find a way to better select the core group of participants from those who need to have a sporadic access to the Conference."

Office comments:

- Proposal 1.F: See attached as Annex 1, a more detailed table on the composition of national delegations
- Proposal 2.F: When establishing the average cost by participant, it needs to be noted that some important costs components (including interpretation) are independent of the number of participants.
- Proposal 3.F: See Annex 1. The main impact of the increased number of participants can be summarized as follows: (i) no alternative space to the Palais des Nations (UNOG) currently available in Geneva; (ii) need to use three large Committee rooms (presently Rooms XVII, XVIII, XIX); (iii) increased security and other support services burden; (iv) more badges to be produced and distributed; (v) more copies to be printed.
- Proposal 4.F: In fact, in 2011 the number of ILO staff actually working at the ILC as part of the secretariat was 460. The figure of 1,750 staff comprises all ILO and other support staff carrying a staff badge. Many ILO staff come to the Palais des Nations only for a specific meeting or discussion during the ILC, taking advantage of the presence of some constituents to meet with them. In any event, they do need a badge to have access to the ILC premises. Annex 2 details the 7,500 badges issued per category.

<p>6. Workers: <i>“... It is also very necessary to remind...the need for gender balance both in delegations as well as in access to speaking time. We are ready to work with the Office in order to discuss more stringent rules.”</i></p> <p>7. Workers: <i>“... There is also the issue of access of NGOs ... We certainly believe that bona fide international non-governmental organizations are an important participant in the ILC. Trade unions have established working relations with many of them. On the other hand, there is the tendency to almost value more their presence, than the presence of social partners, and this is unacceptable ...”</i></p> <p>8. Japan: <i>“... expresses strong concerns about establishing limits regarding the size of delegations ... Limiting the size ... could have negative effect on the active contributions to the discussions and thus, the outcome of the International Labour Conference.”</i></p> <p>9. Switzerland: <i>“... There is no need to introduce rules governing the size of delegations. The provisions of the Constitution must simply be applied ... that is, two Government delegates, an Employer delegate and a Worker delegate, with each delegate accompanied by no more than two advisers for each item on the agenda of the session. From the moment of registration of credentials ... the Office must determine which delegations are not in exact conformity with the terms of the Constitution and inform the countries concerned. Then, at the very beginning of the Conference, the Credentials Committee should submit a report to the Officers of the Conference proposing not to register excess numbers of advisers and other persons ...”</i></p>	<p>– Proposal 7.F: Since 2011, a clear priority is given to ILC delegates and INGOs speeches are systematically placed at the end of each plenary sitting.</p> <p>– Proposal 8.F: See Annex 1.</p> <p>– Proposal 9.F: The provisions limiting the number of delegates, advisers and persons appointed in accordance with article 2(3)(i) of the ILC Standing Orders are already being strictly applied. The only way to further limit the size of the delegations would be to introduce new limitations, in particular to the maximum number of persons in the categories of participants developed by practice (persons accompanying the Minister and other persons attending the Conference). This would require amendments to the Standing Orders.</p>
--	---

G. Efficiency gains and others	
Proposals:	Office comments:
<p>Efficiency gains</p> <p>1. ASPAG: <i>“... administration cost lies in the ever increasing number of participants that continue to break records year after year. The number of servicing personnel regular staff, short-term staff, interpreters, and daily contacted staff in the meantime has reached an average of 1,750 persons each year. ASPAG wonders if the number of servicing staff is in any reasonable manner proportionate to the total number of ...participants that it stands at only 4,500.”</i></p> <p>2. ASPAG: <i>“... also wishes the secretariat to provide ... a disaggregated list of three categories of expenditure, namely, interpretation, local short term staff, and particularly paid overtime, that all together account for approximately 70 per cent of the...budget...whereas expenditure on interpretation services that presently stands at 42 per cent...continues to be the single biggest portion of the cost ... the working group ... should prioritize examining the possibility of establishing a</i></p>	<p>– Proposal 1.G: See comment to proposal 4.F as well as Annex 2.</p> <p>– Proposal 2.G: Please see disaggregated list of the three categories of expenditure in Annex 3. In-depth cost-benefit analysis has shown that the most cost-effective operational basis for the management of interpretation in the ILO is to draw upon independent interpreters to</p>

permanent ILO interpretation office whose staff may flexibly serve other ILO administrative events.”

- 3. IMEC:** *“... Wider and better use of technology. Arrangements should be made to allow submission and amendments electronically and to provide screens for the drafting in more technical committees whenever amendments are being discussed ... A review of the distribution of Conference reports and papers, reducing the number of paper copies must be a priority. As far as possible, documents should instead be made available electronically either by email or by posting them on the website. Draft committee reports should be made available for review also for experts who have returned to capitals password protected, if necessary. Setting a percentage target for a reduction of paper would help focus minds on this issue and has worked well in other organizations.”*

- 4. Workers:** *“... The Office should actually have indicated how many of these meetings require interpretation and which ones are just taking place in a room free of charge – as it should be – and with no interpretation ... Paragraph 36 states that almost 50 per cent of the costs of the Conference are for interpretation. We need to address this issue but we can also look at the larger picture supported by more information. First, we need to ascertain that interpretation is indeed a vital tool for an international organization... You will recall that my colleagues in the labour administration committee last June asked for more interpretation and more access of documents in different languages ... This is not an issue for a simple cut of resources. Furthermore, the document says in paragraph 36 that the high cost is also due to the fact that the Office does not have permanent interpretation staff. One could maybe calculate what costs would be entailed by having some permanent staff taking care of the GB Conferences and technical meetings over the year ...”.*

perform this work (see Annex 4). This fact explains the relative volume of expenditure on interpretation at the Conference, in comparison with other meetings services, many of which are largely covered by the regular budget. In this respect, determining factors include the seasonal nature and tripartite structure of the meetings organized by the ILO. The management of the related professional conditions of work is a complex task, in which potential efficiencies are being constantly sought. The limits of efficiency gains are expected to be reached in 2012. Thereafter, the only remaining possibility for savings would lie in a review of the number, duration and timetable of preparatory group meetings.

- Proposal 3.G: The ILO has been a pioneer in the introduction of new technologies in the ILC, such as the electronic voting system and the Sub Amendment Management Module (SAMM). These efforts will be pursued in the future. Furthermore, the ILC budget for 2012–13 was reduced by 10 per cent and it is proposed to take additional measures for the 2012 ILC, among them: (i) the abolition of evening/night sessions for non-standard setting committees (general and recurrent item discussions); (ii) the review of the handling of Provisional Records for plenary speeches.
- Proposal 4 G: See attached as Annex 5, the trends in the number of meetings organized during the ILC, with and without interpretation.

<p>5. ASEAN: “... Measures to cut down costs can be made with respect to numeral restriction of delegates, translation, interpretation and document printing. The alternation between full sessions and lighter sessions should also be discussed ...”</p> <p>Others</p> <p>1. IMEC: “... Limiting the number of <i>side events</i> and making them subject to the approval of the officers of the Conference, the Office should also refrain from scheduling side events and other briefings on issues of particular interest to Governments in conflict with group meetings and committee sessions.”</p>	<p>– Proposal 5.G: See the various Annexes.</p>
---	---

ANNEX 1

Trends in the level of participation at the ILC (REGISTERED delegates)	2003	2004	2005	2006	2007	2008	2009	2010	2011	% increase (compared to 2003)
Governments	1671	1740	1886	1808	1945	2006	2011	2068	2152	28.79%
Delegates	308	329	330	317	326	324	327	322	328	6.49%
Advisers and substitute delegates	932	997	993	936	1017	1049	949	1109	1101	18.13%
Persons appointed in accordance with Article 2, para. 3(i)	19	32	37	31	59	44	88	59	61	221.05%
Ministers attending the Conference	117	122	119	131	127	134	147	122	138	17.95%
Persons accompanying the Ministers	98	92	124	166	147	156	156	152	214	118.37%
Representative of a State or Province	6	10	16	11	10	8	7	12	19	216.67%
Other persons attending the Conference	191	158	267	216	259	291	337	292	291	52.36%
Employers	582	629	628	684	691	727	637	648	663	13.92%
Delegates	148	155	154	149	153	158	153	154	150	1.35%
Advisers and substitute delegates	396	425	413	434	429	450	350	402	405	2.27%
Persons appointed in accordance with Article 2, para. 3(i)	12	18	20	43	33	34	42	31	26	116.67%
Other persons attending the Conference	26	31	41	58	76	85	92	61	82	215.38%
Workers	813	926	904	933	968	1063	1074	1108	1179	45.02%
Delegates	144	150	158	150	160	158	156	158	155	7.64%
Advisers and substitute delegates	502	539	491	522	559	575	481	610	579	15.34%
Person appointed in accordance with Article 2, para. 3(i)	53	58	53	63	49	60	98	68	87	64.15%
Other persons attending the Conference	114	179	202	198	200	270	339	272	358	214.04%
TOTAL	3066	3295	3418	3425	3604	3796	3722	3824	3994	30.27%
Afghanistan	8	10	8	11	9	14	16	12	14	75.00%
Albania	13	17	16	8	13	13	14	11	13	0.00%
Algeria	28	35	42	33	39	29	31	42	37	32.14%
Angola	11	15	12	14	16	14	12	14	11	0.00%
Argentina	34	57	51	70	64	63	62	76	76	123.53%
Armenia		4	6	6	7	7	0			-
Australia	15	14	11	20	11	9	11	12	16	6.67%
Austria	13	13	21	28	19	16	17	16	17	30.77%
Azerbaijan	6	10	17	27	27	22	17	9	20	233.33%
Bahamas	12	27	14	10	10	18	8	7	12	0.00%
Bahrain	15	14	15	18	21	18	18	23	25	66.67%
Bangladesh	7	9	10	8	13	12	18	18	14	100.00%
Barbados	9	9	11	13	13	11	9	11	10	11.11%
Belarus	10	10	14	13	22	18	18	21	20	100.00%

ANNEX 1

Trends in the level of participation at the ILC (REGISTERED delegates)	2003	2004	2005	2006	2007	2008	2009	2010	2011	% increase
Belgium	37	40	42	41	42	49	46	50	51	37.84%
Belize		2	2	3	1		4			-
Benin	18	21	22	22	21	20	25	25	22	22.22%
Bolivarian Republic of Venezuela	29	28	32	26	42	43	37	40	35	20.69%
Bolivia (Plurinational State)	7	7	6	6	9	4	7	10	9	28.57%
Bosnia and Herzegovina	5	7	6	10	8	10	5	7	6	20.00%
Botswana	10	14	12	14	13	12	11	13	14	40.00%
Brazil	59	54	50	48	57	70	112	159	162	174.58%
Brunei Darussalam					18	17	15	12	16	-
Bulgaria	19	22	17	21	22	21	17	20	15	-21.05%
Burkina Faso	19	19	19	22	26	25	33	36	36	89.47%
Burundi	7	7	5	7	8	8	10	6	9	28.57%
Cambodia	14	11	11	7	10	16	5	10	11	-21.43%
Cameroon	21	14	19	24	22	13	23	26	40	90.48%
Canada	34	29	36	29	38	29	29	26	33	-2.94%
Cape Verde	6	8	7	7	7	8	6	9	10	66.67%
Central African Republic	4	10	9	12	13	12	10	13	19	375.00%
Chad	9	12	9	10	12	15	20	16	21	133.33%
Chile	37	34	41	42	55	41	51	47	46	24.32%
China	29	37	54	55	45	42	48	77	60	106.90%
Colombia	35	45	43	51	57	67	83	72	90	157.14%
Comoros					5	6	3	6	8	-
Congo	18	30	22	22	23	33	23	37	50	177.78%
Costa Rica	10	11	10	8	7	6	6	10	10	0.00%
Côte d'Ivoire	20	26	25	30	38	42	45	54	46	130.00%
Croatia	7	12	11	13	10	21	11	11	15	114.29%
Cuba	11	23	22	14	16	15	11	13	12	9.09%
Cyprus	24	23	19	22	19	23	24	24	23	-4.17%
Czech Republic	28	25	27	32	22	27	34	20	19	-32.14%
Democratic Republic of the Congo	11	16	50	19	36	49	25	34	38	245.45%
Denmark	35	26	30	28	31	32	29	20	32	-8.57%
Djibouti	9	7	6	6	8	7	10	9	8	-11.11%
Dominican Republic	15	17	14	18	14	28	34	38	54	260.00%
Ecuador	10	9	15	12	13	13	13	13	14	40.00%

ANNEX 1

Trends in the level of participation at the ILC (REGISTERED delegates)	2003	2004	2005	2006	2007	2008	2009	2010	2011	% increase
Egypt	25	25	23	39	24	38	38	40	37	48.00%
El Salvador	16	9	19	8	9	6	6	11	10	-37.50%
Equatorial Guinea	7	6	4		0		4	5	12	71.43%
Eritrea	8	6	6	6	9	8	7	6	8	0.00%
Estonia	10	8	7	7	9	5	7	7	9	-10.00%
Ethiopia	10	10	9	11	13	9	10	13	11	10.00%
Fiji	5	5	6	8	5	5	6	6	6	20.00%
Finland	29	25	23	27	22	25	25	29	19	-34.48%
France	50	63	63	48	59	54	63	53	68	36.00%
Gabon	20	15	25	22	17	39	44	46	42	110.00%
Gambia		2	2	1	3	5	6	6	6	-
Georgia	12	13	13	11	13	17	18	15	14	16.67%
Germany	47	46	33	34	49	46	40	41	72	53.19%
Ghana	25	26	35	33	35	43	39	46	59	136.00%
Greece	67	68	49	41	64	66	56	32	32	-52.24%
Guatemala	11	15	21	20	14	12	11	13	16	45.45%
Guinea	14	20	29	22	36	60	49	43	24	71.43%
Guinea-Bissau	5	2	3	2	5	5	3	7	5	0.00%
Guyana		3		4		1		4		-
Haiti	6	11	15	4	11	5	9	7	3	-50.00%
Honduras	7	11	12	8	8	7	11	14	12	71.43%
Hungary	33	33	41	33	29	32	37	29	36	9.09%
Iceland	12	13	10	13	12	13	8	8	8	-33.33%
India	34	38	29	34	37	38	44	41	44	29.41%
Indonesia	50	67	43	68	64	52	40	68	82	64.00%
Iraq		16	12	10	15	17	11	11	18	-
Ireland	23	29	27	16	13	14	14	7	10	-56.52%
Islamic Republic of Iran	36	34	43	33	27	36	25	42	29	-19.44%
Israel	15	21	14	21	19	18	19	15	18	20.00%
Italy	35	43	25	27	33	27	30	20	25	-28.57%
Jamaica	10	16	18	18	20	17	14	12	16	60.00%
Japan	83	73	75	67	82	68	56	61	65	-21.69%
Jordan	20	15	20	16	17	15	24	15	8	-60.00%
Kazakhstan	7	8	7	9	8	11	6	10	6	-14.29%

ANNEX 1

Trends in the level of participation at the ILC (REGISTERED delegates)	2003	2004	2005	2006	2007	2008	2009	2010	2011	% increase
Kenya	43	27	20	24	34	30	37	30	28	-34.88%
Kiribati	6	7	7	7	4	7	7	7	7	16.67%
Kuwait	24	26	26	22	34	27	32	39	33	37.50%
Kyrgyzstan	2	2	3						2	0.00%
Lao People's Democratic Republic	3	5	5	8	6	7	7	10	6	100.00%
Latvia	7	5	6	9	6	10	6	6	7	0.00%
Lebanon	21	20	17	16	28	25	20	26	21	0.00%
Lesotho	5	9	9	10	11	30	12	10	9	80.00%
Liberia		4	6	16	12	16	11	15	18	-
Libyan Arab Jamahiriya	9	14	15	20	24	20	17	12	0	-100.00%
Lithuania	8	10	8	7	9	9	7	7	8	0.00%
Luxembourg	28	26	31	28	29	28	29	24	32	14.29%
Madagascar	10	10	9	10	10	9	8	10	5	-50.00%
Malawi	12	9	5	9	8	7	8	5	6	-50.00%
Malaysia	45	59	26	32	28	38	27	34	39	-13.33%
Maldives								3	8	-
Mali	16	14	19	20	21	23	17	19	21	31.25%
Malta	24	21	20	18	16	18	20	16	21	-12.50%
Mauritania	12	11	13	12	17	26	10	20	19	58.33%
Mauritius	9	13	6	12	11	12	12	10	13	44.44%
Mexico	43	44	47	46	37	66	52	43	57	32.56%
Mongolia	8	8	8	12	14	9	10	11	13	62.50%
Montenegro					10	15	8	9	7	-
Morocco	21	30	35	30	31	40	37	43	35	66.67%
Mozambique	12	12	13	9	12	10	23	13	17	41.67%
Myanmar	17	14	9	14	15	16	16	14	14	-17.65%
Namibia	12	13	11	13	13	14	17	17	19	58.33%
Nepal	7	8	8	11	14	14	14	20	20	185.71%
Netherlands	29	38	41	31	40	36	39	36	42	44.83%
New Zealand	14	12	11	15	15	15	13	12	11	-21.43%
Nicaragua	11	19	13	12	4	4	5	7	6	-45.45%
Niger	14	14	15	16	14	20	23	21	24	71.43%
Nigeria	45	34	76	69	74	68	71	83	78	73.33%
Norway	33	38	34	34	37	38	49	45	55	66.67%

ANNEX 1

Trends in the level of participation at the ILC (REGISTERED delegates)	2003	2004	2005	2006	2007	2008	2009	2010	2011	% increase
Oman	18	20	19	27	32	36	34	39	30	66.67%
Pakistan	9	7	9	9	8	8	8	11	13	44.44%
Panama	9	11	13	17	18	15	14	17	18	100.00%
Papua New Guinea	8	9	8	10	3	12	14	12	15	87.50%
Paraguay	9	15	8	9	10	14	13	8	15	66.67%
Peru	10	11	9	11	9	11	10	13	12	20.00%
Philippines	52	18	64	41	34	52	42	59	31	-40.38%
Poland	27	23	23	19	22	22	28	21	24	-11.11%
Portugal	41	43	38	39	30	36	46	36	29	-29.27%
Qatar	14	12	18	18	24	28	20	25	25	78.57%
Republic of Korea	35	40	50	41	32	41	37	35	56	60.00%
Republic of Moldova	7	7	7	6	6	7	3	5	6	-14.29%
Romania	37	26	34	43	29	27	23	21	29	-21.62%
Russian Federation	30	24	31	35	34	24	29	24	27	-10.00%
Rwanda	7	7	4	2	8	6	6	6	4	-42.86%
Saint Kitts and Nevis				1	3	6				-
Saint Vincent and the Grenadines			4	0	3	3				-
Samoa						3				-
San Marino	13	11	11	11	18	12	12	12	10	-23.08%
Sao Tome and Principe	4	4	3	2	5	0	7	8	3	-25.00%
Saudi Arabia	20	16	13	15	14	17	17	20	33	65.00%
Senegal	23	30	29	36	28	32	48	54	44	91.30%
Serbia	21	18	22	15	19	23	14	14	18	-14.29%
Seychelles	4	5	4	4	4				5	25.00%
Sierra Leone	6	7	4	0			3		3	-50.00%
Singapore	19	22	21	26	24	29	25	29	31	63.16%
Slovakia	16	18	19	23	24	26	20	18	20	25.00%
Slovenia	14	14	14	16	20	23	11	12	12	-14.29%
Solomon Islands					4	6				-
Somalia	2	2	3	0	4	6	7	2	3	50.00%
South Africa	32	30	38	39	42	28	32	41	48	50.00%
Spain	36	40	39	38	36	36	38	50	47	30.56%
Sri Lanka	19	16	22	18	23	24	20	20	20	5.26%
Sudan	15	13	18	23	20	21	19	23	22	46.67%

ANNEX 1

Trends in the level of participation at the ILC (REGISTERED delegates)	2003	2004	2005	2006	2007	2008	2009	2010	2011	% increase
Suriname	5	6	5	5	5	5	5	4	5	0.00%
Swaziland		10	11	12	14	17	16	15	15	-
Sweden	25	22	31	23	22	23	32	21	25	0.00%
Switzerland	30	27	22	21	21	22	23	28	28	-6.67%
Syrian Arab Republic	16	18	16	17	20	17	17	22	7	-56.25%
Tajikistan	3	3	3	4	3	1	2		2	-33.33%
Thailand	24	31	30	23	29	40	27	32	27	12.50%
The former Yugoslav Republic Macedonia		7	8	3	9	7	11	8	9	-
Timor-Leste		2	5	16	4	5	12	4		-
Togo	8	12	9	16	18	20	26	36	36	350.00%
Trinidad and Tobago	11	15	11	9	10	12	11	10	11	0.00%
Tunisia	22	25	33	28	22	22	23	23	19	-13.64%
Turkey	76	91	98	102	80	74	83	43	45	-40.79%
Turkmenistan									1	-
Uganda	13	18	18	12	12	13	15	15	13	0.00%
Ukraine	9	14	14	21	23	25	16	25	20	122.22%
United Arab Emirates	15	15	15	21	22	21	21	27	28	86.67%
United Kingdom	45	48	51	49	47	48	36	29	24	-46.67%
United Republic of Tanzania	16	26	26	34	31	33	37	30	30	87.50%
United States	57	56	51	56	64	54	62	39	46	-19.30%
Uruguay	12	13	16	14	16	18	15	16	21	75.00%
Uzbekistan		2	2	2			7	5	6	-
Vanuatu			3		0			4		-
Viet Nam	11	15	19	12	14	12	15	13	17	54.55%
Yemen	14	10	9	14	11	13	8	10	10	-28.57%
Zambia	11	10	17	27	19	31	21	16	18	63.64%
Zimbabwe	26	19	22	17	27	20	21	19	28	7.69%

ANNEX 2

Based on Data from ILC 2011 (average of 1'750 staff, total of 7'500 badges issued)

Staff Secretariat List	460
Cabinet, executive & regional directors and assistants	45
** Committee staff (average of 35 per technical committee and 70 for APPL committee)	215
Legal office, credentials & registration / information	30
Secretariat Services (daily bulletin, clerk office, program, provisional record, speakers list etc..)	80
Relations with the constituents (ACTRAV, ACTEMP, Governments, INGOs, Protocole)	40
DCOMM	30
Technical & administrative services	20
* Interpreters	340
Other external staff	175
* Ushers & messengers & document distribution	40
* Room operators	15
* Word processing operators	60
External technical suppliers (IT, Web casting, photocopiers, travel agency, ...)	60
Transportation (mini-buses)	40
Other ILO staff visiting the Conference (badges issued)	775
TOTAL Staff	1750
* External recruitments	
** Partial external recruitments	
Delegations	4500
Visitors	800
Press	100
Special guests & entourage (badges issued)	350
TOTAL	7500

ANNEX 3

Component	2007	2008	2009	2010	averaged over the period 2007-10
Interpretation	41.72%	42.60%	42.16%	42.56%	42.26%
Other ST staff	14.82%	17.16%	16.20%	17.75%	16.48%
UN staff sound technicians	0.18%	0.14%	0.19%	0.18%	0.17%
Committee recruitment, travel & manual payments	6.77%	9.48%	8.13%	8.57%	8.23%
Cabin operators	0.80%	0.76%	0.68%	0.79%	0.76%
DISTRIBUTION assistants	0.63%	0.57%	0.50%	0.60%	0.58%
Messengers	0.45%	0.49%	0.41%	0.51%	0.47%
Nurse	0.06%	0.05%	0.11%	0.06%	0.07%
TRAITEXT Pool Conf	2.40%	2.19%	2.19%	2.63%	2.35%
TRAITEXT Provisional Records	0.58%	0.65%	0.77%	0.42%	0.60%
TRAITEXT Transcription Plenary	0.67%	0.57%	0.99%	1.01%	0.81%
Other GS staff	0.96%	0.95%	0.92%	1.05%	0.97%
REPRO operators	0.32%	0.30%	0.38%	0.67%	0.42%
Ushers	1.02%	1.00%	0.93%	1.26%	1.05%
Overtime	12.80%	12.19%	11.36%	11.68%	12.01%
Overtime G	10.83%	9.42%	9.06%	9.55%	9.72%
Overtime P *	1.97%	2.77%	2.30%	2.13%	2.29%
External printing	13.02%	9.92%	10.48%	10.46%	10.97%
Equipment rental	5.32%	5.55%	4.23%	4.94%	5.01%
Premises	7.27%	4.91%	4.86%	6.58%	5.90%
Others	5.05%	7.68%	10.70%	6.01%	7.36%
P staff at standard cost	1.95%	0.45%	1.65%	0.13%	1.05%
Local staff cost at actual	0.01%	0.01%	0.05%	0.01%	0.02%
Travel ILO Staff servicing meetings	0.38%	0.38%	0.43%	0.35%	0.39%
Travel delegates/non ILO staff			0.07%	0.02%	0.05%
Subcontracts excluding individuals		0.96%	0.99%	1.16%	1.04%
Subcontracts - individual sub-contractors		0.80%	1.51%	0.03%	0.78%
Security cost	1.27%	1.18%	1.27%	1.40%	1.28%
Communications	0.07%	0.05%	0.71%	1.38%	0.55%
Other miscellaneous costs	0.38%	0.50%	0.77%	0.52%	0.54%
Hospitality	0.42%	0.44%	0.44%	0.48%	0.44%
Stationery & Office Supplies	0.43%	0.16%	0.32%	0.32%	0.31%
Office Equipment and Furniture	0.06%	0.17%	0.03%	0.12%	0.09%
Seminars and training	0.08%	0.06%	0.06%	0.06%	0.07%
ILC 2009 Crisis Summit Expenditure			2.29%		

* Direct costs only (paid overtime for externally recruited professionals). In-house P staff time-off compensation not included.

Annex 4**Recruitment of ILO permanent interpreters**

Standard costs per work-month (P1 - D1) 2012-13 \$21'949.00

		Per year	Per biennium
1 team EFS	6	\$1'580'328.00	\$3'160'656.00
1 team EFSGRAC	16	\$4'214'208.00	\$8'428'416.00
6 teams (avg. needed for GB)	96	\$25'285'248.00	\$50'570'496.00
15 teams (avg. needed for ILC)	240	\$63'213'120.00	\$126'426'240.00

ILO Total current Interpretation expenditure \$8'154'761.90 \$16'309'523.81

--> corresponds to fewer than 2 teams EFSGRAC

Conclusion: 2 full teams of in-house permanent interpreters would only permit the servicing of 33% of the current volume of Governing Body activity, or 13% of ILC activity.

ANNEX 5

Trends in the number of meetings organized per ILC		2007	2008	2009	2010	2011
With Interpretation	ILC Plenary Sessions	13	11	18	18	17
	ILC Committee sessions	78	81	93	90	81
	Employers	71	76	67	74	77
	Workers	70	70	79	68	73
	Regional groupings	75	61	51	61	66
	Bilaterals		3	3	3	2
	Others	12	25	13	16	40
Sub-Total "With"		319	327	324	330	356
Without Interpretation	ILC Committee sessions	18	9	14	24	11
	Employers	10	17	5	14	17
	Workers	48	44	43	73	90
	Regional groupings	73	112	103	125	83
	Bilaterals	141	98	81	72	90
	Others	61	67	89	81	88
Sub-Total "Without"		351	347	335	389	379
TOTAL		670	674	659	719	735