



## TENTH ITEM ON THE AGENDA

**Reports of the Committee on  
Legal Issues and International  
Labour Standards****Second report: International labour  
standards and human rights*****Contents***

	<i>Page</i>
V. Ratification and promotion of fundamental ILO Conventions (Fifth item on the agenda) .....	1
VI. Improvements in standards-related activities of the ILO: Technical assistance and promotion (Sixth item on the agenda) .....	2
VII. Choice of instruments on which reports should be requested in 2005 and 2006 under article 19 of the Constitution (Seventh item on the agenda) .....	6
VIII. The proposed consolidated maritime labour Convention: A progress report (Eighth item on the agenda) .....	7
IX. Report of the Tripartite Meeting of Experts on Labour Standards for the Fishing Sector (Ninth item on the agenda) .....	8
X. Other questions.....	8
Appendix .....	11

## V. Ratification and promotion of fundamental ILO Conventions (Fifth item on the agenda)

1. The Committee had before it a document<sup>1</sup> on the ratification of ILO fundamental Conventions under the campaign launched by the Director-General in May 1995.
2. The representative of the Director-General explained that the format of the document had changed at the request of the Committee, and now gave country-by-country indications on prospects for ratification of the fundamental Conventions. Since the document had been issued, three new ratifications had been registered: ratification of Convention No. 138 by *Lithuania* and *Jamaica* and of Convention No. 182 by *Jamaica*. This meant that these two countries were now among the 99 States that had ratified the eight fundamental Conventions, and that the number of States having ratified a fundamental Convention since the beginning of the campaign was now 156.
3. The Office had received eight additional replies to the Director-General's campaign letter, and the following paragraphs of the Office paper should be modified in consequence: *para. 16* – Qatar continues to support the ratification campaign. It is undertaking additional awareness raising and legislative reforms, and is continuing to cooperate with the ILO in this connection; *para. 21* – the Republic of Korea stated in regard to Conventions Nos. 87 and 98 that the Minister of Labour had submitted a proposal for industrial relations reform. As concerns Conventions Nos. 29 and 105, further research had been commissioned to find solutions to the remaining barriers to ratification; *para. 22* – Sao Tome and Principe has decided to ratify the outstanding fundamental Conventions, but the process has been interrupted by recent events in the country; *para. 23* – Singapore submitted a new report repeating its position; *para. 25* – Thailand reported that Cabinet approved ratification of Convention No. 138 on 7 October 2003. As concerns Conventions Nos. 87 and 98, funds had been allocated for a study on the country's readiness to ratify; and the Government requested the ILO's technical assistance to review possible ratification of Convention No. 111; *para. 26* – Viet Nam plans to complete the process of ratification for Conventions Nos. 29 and 105 by early 2005; *para. 27* – Canada would once again communicate with the two remaining jurisdictions for their views on the ratification of Convention No. 29; *para. 29* – Djibouti indicated in its latest report under the Declaration that it was initiating the ratification process for Conventions Nos. 111, 138 and 182; *para. 59* – Colombia reaffirmed its commitment to ratifying Convention No. 182, and awaited an informal opinion from the Office on a specific provision of the Convention; *para. 72* – Madagascar stated in its most recent report under the Declaration that before ratifying Convention No. 105 it would undertake an advocacy campaign and a national survey, and would hold a national tripartite forum with the assistance of the ILO; *para. 86* – Venezuela repeated the previous information.
4. The Employer members thanked the secretariat for the information and welcomed the success of the campaign.
5. The Worker members noted with satisfaction the ratifications registered and thanked the Office for summarizing the obstacles to ratification of the countries listed. However, it was unfortunate that more than half of the world's labour force was still not covered under some of the fundamental Conventions because large countries had not ratified all of them.

<sup>1</sup> GB.288/LILS/5.

They appealed to countries not to use lack of resources as an excuse for not ratifying, and complimented those countries that had accepted these obligations despite lack of resources. They regretted that in some instances it was impossible to see what the obstacles to ratification really were. They noted in particular that five countries that had filed ratifications of Convention No. 138 had not yet provided a declaration under Article 2(1) of that Convention allowing these ratifications to be registered; the Office should assist these countries. They noted with concern that *Latvia* had lacked resources to translate the instruments. They would have preferred more of this kind of information; they appreciated it when efforts had been made by countries (e.g. *India*) to provide specific information even when they did not intend to ratify. It was suggested that the Office undertake a dialogue with those countries that demonstrated a clear political will to ratify fundamental Conventions, that it provide technical assistance where needed, and perhaps consider other measures. The Office should also seek to devise strategies to deal with the most serious cases, i.e. governments which demonstrated no political will to take any action.

6. Finally, the Worker members observed that Convention No. 87 had the second lowest number of ratifications among the fundamental Conventions, and some of the biggest countries in the world had not ratified it. They emphasized the fundamental importance of both ratification and implementation to allow the supervisory bodies to monitor compliance and suggested that the Office provide a similar report next year, taking into account the comments made and providing more factual information on the circumstances that prevent ratification.
7. The representative of the Government of Venezuela, referring to paragraph 86 of the document, indicated that Convention No. 182 had been submitted in May 2003 and that a communication had been sent to the Office stating that a first reading of the Convention had been approved.
8. The representative of the Government of South Africa welcomed the paper. The ILO was on its way to achieving universal ratification, but more progress was needed. The Office should continue to provide technical assistance to the African continent to implement the Conventions, as 50 out of 53 countries in Africa had ratified all fundamental Conventions. He noted that South Africa had been omitted from the list of those having ratified Convention No. 111 in the appendix to the document.
9. The Committee took note of the document and the information provided orally.

## **VI. Improvements in standards-related activities of the ILO: Technical assistance and promotion** (Sixth item on the agenda)

10. The Governing Body had before it a document<sup>2</sup> on improvements in standards-related activities of the ILO: technical assistance and promotion.
11. The Employer members emphasized the special importance of technical assistance and promotion, which were crucial to the improvement of standards-related activities. They considered that the document prepared by the Office provided interesting insights on a number of points, while regretting that the point for decision did not go far enough and fell

<sup>2</sup> GB.288/LILS/6.

short of the mark compared to what had been said in the preceding paragraphs. The Employer members wholeheartedly endorsed the elements listed in paragraph 2 as means of strengthening standards-related technical assistance. They also approved of paragraph 3, which was a perfectly clear statement of the problem of international labour standards: standards were universal, but standards-related technical assistance and promotional activities were country specific and had to be developed with the social partners. They also supported paragraph 4, which emphasized the need for follow-up to the conclusions of the LILS Working Party on Policy regarding the Revision of Standards and highlighted the role of country profiles and strengthening dialogue with member States. The Employer members agreed that promotional campaigns should not be limited to ratifying States but should rather emphasize the application of the instruments. They welcomed the fact that paragraph 16 emphasized in general the essential role of tripartism in defining standards-related technical assistance and in particular the roles of the Bureau for Employers' Activities (ACT/EMP) and the Bureau for Workers' Activities (ACTRAV) of the ILO.

12. The Employer members wished nonetheless to express their disagreement with the approach with regard to promotional campaigns suggested in paragraph 5. They considered that there was no point in drawing up a list of "leading Conventions" which would be valid for all countries given that there were already fundamental and priority Conventions. They suggested that promotional activities should rather be envisaged in the form of an agreement with each country under consideration. Lastly, with regard to the point for decision, they wished to see a stronger and more dynamic wording showing how to implement the principles set forth in the document and referring to the standards-related technical assistance and promotional policy.
13. The Worker members welcomed the document prepared by the Office, which outlined different approaches to standards-related technical assistance and promotion. With reference to paragraph 2 of the document, they wished to clarify and emphasize that standard setting was a dynamic process and as problems emerged new standards would need to be adopted. The Worker members also stressed the importance of the follow-up to the work done by the LILS Working Party on Policy regarding the Revision of Standards (1995-2002) and of increasing the pace of this follow-up. In this context, they asked the Office to give priority to the publications recommended by the Working Party, including the publication of a new compilation of standards. Against this background, they also considered that time should not be spent on choosing another set of Conventions that would be a blueprint for promoting decent work. Rather, the Office should focus its attention on the 71 Conventions and 73 Recommendations recommended by the Working Party for promotion. This could be done through thematic campaigns, for instance gender-related ones, targeted for a particular year or biennium. They requested that the Office examine this suggestion and provide a tentative time line. In addition, they requested the Office to report in an appropriate manner on the results of the campaign on the Tripartite Consultation (International Labour Standards) Convention, 1976 (No. 144). They supported the proposals for the consolidation of practical materials and the development of thematic databases as well as the follow-up to the supervisory comments. In order to effectively use the country profiles that had already been developed, they felt that the Office should follow these up with country-specific projects. In addition, standards should automatically be a part of any country programme. The proposal in paragraph 16 of the document concerning the tripartite approach and the involvement of ACTRAV and ACT/EMP was fully supported by the Worker members. Finally, while the Worker members could approve the point for decision, they agreed with the Employer members that it would benefit from being reworded in more emphatic terms.
14. The representative of the Government of India, speaking on behalf of the Asia-Pacific group, considered that solid groundwork needed to be done in order to ensure better implementation of ILO standards at the national level. Ratification of standards was not an

end in itself and had to be accompanied by specific measures for putting these standards into practice. In addition, while the principle of the universality of standards was indisputable, the ILO Constitution recognized the existing diversity at the national level. Flexibility devices should be introduced into the Conventions in order to facilitate the application of standards in different national situations. Since its advent in the 1950s, technical assistance had played an important role for the promotion of standards and reaching the ILO's objective of social justice. Now, more than ever before, concrete measures needed to be taken to ensure technical assistance programmes for developing countries with the objective of providing more gainful employment through upgrading skills. His Government suggested that countries which received technical assistance should include in their reports to the Office information on the impact of the assistance already received and needs for further assistance. The Office should also look at developing technical projects for the informal economy in order to identify hazards, the number of workers employed in the informal economy and safety measures that could be taken to minimize existing hazards. The organization of seminars with member States could be useful for this purpose. Finally, he supported the point for decision.

15. The representative of the Government of the Dominican Republic thanked the Office for the document, which gave an overview of the ILO's promotion and technical assistance. He pointed out that these activities were essential to advocacy and capacity building in tripartite dialogue. He expressed his support for the policy with regard to the revision of standards to enable constituents to denounce obsolete Conventions and ratify revised and updated ones, and stated that the LILS Working Party should continue to pursue this policy. He also supported the campaign to promote the fundamental Conventions and Convention No. 144, given that failure to ratify it resulted in violation of workers' rights, and urged that further promotional activities be undertaken in the form of workshops and seminars. Lastly, he stated that the policy of integrating standards in national programmes was very useful and expressed support for paragraph 16 and the point for decision of the document.
16. The representative of the Government of New Zealand supported the statement made on behalf of the Asia-Pacific group. She believed that technical assistance and promotion were vital tools for member States in achieving the objectives of decent work. However, in order to be effective, all assistance had to be linked to the strategic objectives of the ILO, and she emphasized the importance of building relations with other international agencies providing assistance in areas directly relevant to the ILO's core activities. Finally, she supported measures to strengthen regional capacity through budgetary reallocation of resources and measures taken to increase staff mobility. These were complementary elements and provided the context within which technical assistance and promotion could operate.
17. The representative of the Government of Brazil pointed out the fundamental importance of follow-up to the comments made by the supervisory bodies and of technical assistance and promotional activities, which should take ILO standards into account, in particular ratified Conventions. She also pointed out that offers of technical cooperation had been a *leitmotiv* of the sittings of the Committee on the Application of Standards and that it was important for countries to be able to avail themselves of advisory services through the ILO's regional offices, not only in cases where this was recommended by the supervisory bodies, but also when the circumstances so warranted. She concluded that technical assistance should go beyond ratification and application of standards and that the case of Brazil was an example of a successful experience in the struggle against discrimination in employment because it had received technical assistance from the Office and had later continued this experience through its own efforts. She pointed out that this experience could be applied in other member States, and expressed her support for the point for decision.

18. The representative of the Government of Nigeria, speaking on behalf of the Africa group, welcomed the measures aimed at improving ILO standards-related activities. While he agreed, in principle, with the suggestion in paragraph 5 of the document for the selection of 20 “leading Conventions”, he considered that working on a thematic basis would be more practical. Technical assistance could then be developed to support such thematic campaigns. He requested the Office to elaborate on the need for extra-budgetary funding for such campaigns. Country-specific programmes were very important, and he requested that the Office include some of the African countries for such projects. Finally, he agreed with the proposed point for decision.
19. The representative of the Government of France observed that there could be no sound standards-related policy without an active technical assistance policy. He drew attention to the need for the services offered to be appropriate to the national context. He expressed full support for the content of the document and highlighted those elements which he considered to be most positive. The first was the creation of thematic databases. His Government was providing financial support to this project, but it was regrettable that the standards-related policy had to rely on extra-budgetary resources. His Government supported all the initiatives aimed at drawing up country profiles. Lastly, he recalled that, while a discussion on the efficiency of the supervisory machinery (consistency and streamlining) could not be avoided, an effort needed to be made to strengthen technical assistance in each country with regard to standards.
20. The representative of the Government of Norway, speaking on behalf of the Nordic countries, pointed out that technical assistance should systematically follow up on comments made by the supervisory bodies in order to remove problems identified by these bodies and address the underlying causes of non-application of the Conventions. This would optimize the impact of such campaigns.
21. A representative of the Director-General pointed out that discussions on the Working Party would culminate in a number of publications before the end of the year, in particular thanks to funding from the French Government. These publications would include a guide containing a summary of up-to-date and revised Conventions; a CD-ROM which would include all of the documents produced by the Working Party, to be appended to the guide, and a database informing each member State of the Conventions which it is invited to ratify as part of the follow-up to the Working Party’s conclusions.
22. In reply to questions raised concerning extra-budgetary funding, the Executive Director of the Standards and Fundamental Principles and Rights at Work Sector stated that there was only so much the Office could do within the framework of the regular budget. Some of the issues touched on in paragraph 7 of the document were as large as the mandate of the ILO. As regards the point for decision, it had been drafted in order to avoid the impression that the strategy proposed signified a new initiative instead of a better synergy between existing methods of work; also the Office had not wanted to give the impression that this approach would have significant cost implications. On his suggestion, the Committee agreed to strengthen the wording of the decision in the form reflected in paragraph 24 below.
23. The Committee adopted the point for decision in paragraph 19 of the document, as amended.
24. ***The Committee recommends to the Governing Body that the elements developed in the Office document be taken fully into account and systematically pursued in activities undertaken by the Office with member States and the social partners for improved standards-related technical assistance and promotion, including the integration of standards in country programmes.***

## **VII. Choice of instruments on which reports should be requested in 2005 and 2006 under article 19 of the Constitution** (Seventh item on the agenda)

25. The Committee had before it a document<sup>3</sup> concerning the choice of Conventions and Recommendations on which governments might be invited to submit reports in 2005 and 2006 under article 19, paragraphs 5(e), 6(d) and 7(b), of the Constitution.
26. The Employer members were in favour of an examination of the instruments on labour inspection<sup>4</sup> for reports to be submitted in 2005. As regards the reports to be requested in 2006, they stated that they would prefer to postpone the choice of a subject to November 2004, at which time the Office could submit additional options.
27. The Worker members supported the choice of the labour inspection instruments as the subject for the general survey in 2005. The last survey had been undertaken in 1985 and there was a need to assess the impact of recent socio-economic changes on the labour inspection systems. For 2006, they agreed with the proposal that the decision should be deferred until November 2004.
28. The representative of the Government of India stated that general surveys played an important role in ascertaining the position of national law and practice with respect to a given subject area and provided a basis for comparison and exchange of successful practices. For the Office, they served as guides for targeting technical assistance and contributed to the evaluation of standards, including the possible need for their revision. He felt that the general survey in 2005 should be on employment and working conditions of nursing personnel, which would follow on naturally from the general surveys undertaken on minimum wages in 1991, on night work of women in 2000, on dock work in 2002 and protection of wages in 2003. In addition, the instruments on nursing personnel had not yet been selected for a general survey. For 2006, the subject of part-time work should be chosen, as this would provide a useful follow-up to the Global Employment Agenda.
29. The representative of the Government of France stated that, out of the three proposals contained in the document, his preference went to the instruments on labour inspection as the subject for 2005. He emphasized that an in-depth examination of national practice in this area was necessary for a number of reasons, one of them being the fact that Convention No. 81 was a priority Convention. Such an examination would shed light on one of the essential national means of supervising the application of labour laws and regulations on occupational safety and health and working conditions in general. He also pointed out that this would tie in with a number of subjects on which the ILO is currently working with regard to the maritime sector (issues relating to port state control) and occupational safety and health. For 2006, his Government's choice would be part-time work, linked to the discussion of the Global Employment Agenda.
30. The representatives of the Governments of Canada, Japan and the United States supported the choice of labour inspection as the subject for the general survey in 2005 and the proposal to defer until November 2004 the decision to select a subject for 2006.

<sup>3</sup> GB.288/LILS/7.

<sup>4</sup> The relevant instruments are listed in para. 11(a) of the Office paper.

31. The representative of the Government of the United States specified that the choice of labour inspection as the subject for the general survey in 2005 would contribute to the promotion of the priority Conventions and that it was prudent to defer the decision on a subject for the general survey in 2006 until November 2004 in the light, inter alia, of the upcoming general survey on hours at work and in order to hold consultations on the various subjects selected, as well as possible other subjects.
32. The representative of the Government of the United Kingdom stated that while all of the subjects were acceptable, he had a slight preference for part-time work as the subject for 2005 and agreed with the proposal to defer the decision to select a subject for 2006.
33. The Committee accepted by consensus the choice of labour inspection as the subject for 2005 and the deferral to November 2004 of the choice of subject for 2006.
34. *The Committee recommends that the Governing Body –*
- (a) *invite governments to submit reports under article 19 of the Constitution in 2005 on the Labour Inspection Convention, 1947 (No. 81), the Protocol of 1995 to the Labour Inspection Convention, 1947, the Labour Inspection Recommendation, 1947 (No. 81), the Labour Inspection (Mining and Transport) Recommendation, 1947 (No. 82), the Labour Inspection (Agriculture) Convention, 1969 (No. 129), and the Labour Inspection (Agriculture) Recommendation, 1969 (No. 133); and*
- (b) *defer, until November 2004, the examination of the subjects upon which reports might be requested in 2006.*

## VIII. The proposed consolidated maritime labour Convention: A progress report (Eighth item on the agenda)

35. The Committee had before it a paper<sup>5</sup> prepared by the Office to inform the Governing Body of the progress achieved on the proposed consolidated maritime labour Convention since March 2003 in the framework of the High-level Tripartite Working Group on Maritime Labour Standards.
36. The Employer members said that they were following with interest the work of the High-level Tripartite Working Group and were pleased to note that work on the new consolidated maritime instrument was on schedule and that another meeting of the High-level Group would be held in Nantes in January 2004.
37. The Worker members noted the progress achieved and wished success to the High-level Working Group, which had taken up a tremendous challenge in consolidating such a large number of Conventions and Recommendations into a single instrument.
38. The Committee on Legal Issues and International Labour Standards took note of the progress report.

<sup>5</sup> GB.288/LILS/8.

## **IX. Report of the Tripartite Meeting of Experts on Labour Standards for the Fishing Sector** (Ninth item on the agenda)

39. The Committee had before it a paper<sup>6</sup> prepared by the Office informing the Governing Body of the outcome of the Tripartite Meeting of Experts on Labour Standards for the Fishing Sector (Geneva, 2-4 September 2003). This Meeting provided an opportunity for the discussion of issues to be included in the Proposed Conclusions on work in the fishing sector to be considered by the International Labour Conference at its 92nd (June 2004) Session. This would be the first discussion in the context of the double discussion of this agenda item.
40. The Committee on Legal Issues and International Labour Standards took note of the progress report.

## **X. Other questions**

### **Joint ILO/UNESCO Committee of Experts on the Application of the Recommendations concerning Teaching Personnel (CEART) – Allegations from teachers' organizations**

41. The Committee had before it a paper<sup>7</sup> which had as an appendix Annex 2 of the Report of the Eighth Session of the Joint ILO/UNESCO Committee of Experts on the Application of the Recommendations concerning Teaching Personnel (CEART), which met in Paris from 15 to 19 September 2003. Annex 2 contained information on allegations received from teachers' organizations.
42. The Employer members referred to the abovementioned Annex 2, specifically section A.1, paragraph 3(c), and section B.2, paragraph 15(b), noting that both paragraphs mentioned the Committee on Freedom of Association (CFA). The Employer members did not understand how a body external to the ILO could make recommendations directly to initiate a procedure under the CFA of the Governing Body.
43. The Worker members noted with interest the question raised by the Employer members, to which they had not given consideration. They nevertheless supported the point for decision contained in paragraph 3 of the paper before the Committee.
44. The Legal Adviser informed the Committee of the nature of the CEART, which was charged by the Executive Board of UNESCO and the ILO Governing Body to monitor two international recommendations, one joint, the ILO/UNESCO Recommendation concerning the Status of Teachers, 1966, and the other, the UNESCO Recommendation concerning the Status of Higher-Education Teaching Personnel, 1997. In its reports, the CEART made recommendations to the ILO Governing Body and to the Executive Board of UNESCO according to its mandate, and not directly to the CFA. The CEART's mandate in matters of

<sup>6</sup> GB.288/LILS/9.

<sup>7</sup> GB.288/LILS/10/1.

allegations before it was to consider the gaps in regard to issues within one of the two Recommendations which were not covered by other supervisory mechanisms of the ILO, notably the CFA and the Committee of Experts on the Application of Conventions and Recommendations. Regarding the two paragraphs indicated by the Employer members, Bangladesh was not the subject of a freedom of association complaint while Ethiopia was, but the CEART had simply recommended that the ILO Governing Body bring the matter to the attention of the CFA without entering into the substance of the complaint.

45. The Employer members noted that the issue raised was still of concern to them, but agreed to support the point for decision contained in paragraph 3 of the Office paper.
46. The representative of the Government of Japan expressed his respect for the members of the CEART who had investigated the allegation submitted by the All Japan Teachers and Staff Union (ZENKYO). Unfortunately, it was difficult to accept the CEART report as it was based on one-sided assertions from ZENKYO and included misunderstandings of the existing systems and actual conditions in Japan. The personnel management systems for evaluating teachers with insufficient ability were improvements on systems already in place, while the new teacher job performance evaluation systems were being examined. The Government of Japan considered that the various boards of education had developed and were managing these systems appropriately. Therefore, the Government objected to the CEART report in this case and the proposal before the Committee, and requested that the Government's comments be noted in the Committee's report to the Governing Body. Moreover, the Government was willing to provide additional information to the ILO and to CEART which would more accurately reflect its point of view so as to deepen understanding of its ideas and efforts on this matter.
47. *The Committee recommends that the Governing Body –*
- (a) *take note of Annex 2 of the Report on the Eighth Session of the Joint ILO/UNESCO Committee of Experts on the Application of the Recommendations concerning Teaching Personnel (CEART) which concerns allegations submitted to it by teachers' organizations;*
- (b) *authorize the Director-General to communicate the relevant parts of Annex 2 of the CEART Report to the Governments of Bangladesh, Burundi, Ethiopia and Japan and to the teachers' organizations concerned and, where appropriate, to invite them to take the necessary follow-up action as recommended in the Report.*

Geneva, 14 November 2003.

*Points for decision:* Paragraph 24;  
Paragraph 34;  
Paragraph 47.

## Appendix

### Table of ratifications and information concerning the ILO's fundamental Conventions (as at 13 November 2003)

No. 29	–	Forced Labour Convention, 1930
No. 87	–	Freedom of Association and Protection of the Right to Organise Convention, 1948
No. 98	–	Right to Organise and Collective Bargaining Convention, 1949
No. 100	–	Equal Remuneration Convention, 1951
No. 105	–	Abolition of Forced Labour Convention, 1957
No. 111	–	Discrimination (Employment and Occupation) Convention, 1958
No. 138	–	Minimum Age Convention, 1973
No. 182	–	Worst Forms of Child Labour Convention, 1999

### Explanation of symbols in the table

- X Convention ratified.
- O Formal ratification process already initiated (with or without mention of time frame); approval of ratification by the competent body, although the Director-General has not yet received the formal instrument of ratification or it is incomplete (concerns chiefly Convention No. 138) or is a non-original copy; bill currently before the legislative body for approval.
- ▲ Ratification will be examined after amendment/adoption of a Constitution, Labour Code, legislation, etc.
- Convention currently being studied or examined; preliminary consultations with the social partners.
- Divergences between the Convention and national legislation.
- ◆ Ratification not considered/deferred.
- No reply, or a reply containing no information.

All ILO member States not listed in this table have ratified all eight of the fundamental Conventions.

Member State	Forced labour		Freedom of association		Equal treatment		Child labour	
	C. 29	C. 105	C. 87	C. 98	C. 100	C. 111	C. 138	C. 182
Afghanistan	–	X	–	–	X	X	–	–
Armenia	O	O	O	O	X	X	●	O
Australia	X	X	X	X	X	X	◆	●
Azerbaijan	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	O
Bahrain	X	X	●	●	●	X	●	X
Bangladesh	X	X	X	X	X	X	◆	X
Bolivia	▲	X	X	X	X	X	X	X
Brazil	X	X	▲	X	X	X	X	X
Cambodia	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	–
Canada	O	X	X	■	X	X	■	X
Cape Verde	X	X	X	X	X	X	O	X
Chad	X	X	X	X	X	X	O	X
China	●	●	◆	◆	X	●	X	X
Colombia	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	O
Comoros	X	X	X	X	X	O	O	O
Cuba	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	◆
Czech Republic	X	X	X	X	X	X	▲	X
Democratic Republic of Timor Leste	–	–	–	–	–	–	–	–
Djibouti	X	X	X	X	X	O	▲	▲
El Salvador	X	X	■	■	X	X	X	X
Eritrea	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	O
Estonia	X	X	X	X	X	▲	▲	X
Gabon	X	X	X	X	X	X	O	X
Ghana	X	X	X	X	X	X	O	X
Guinea-Bissau	X	X	◆	X	X	X	◆	◆
Haiti	X	X	X	X	X	X	●	●
India	X	X	■	■	X	X	■	●
Iran, Islamic Republic of	X	X	▲	▲	X	X	●	X
Iraq	X	X	●	X	X	X	X	X
Israel	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	▲
Japan	X	●	X	X	X	●	X	X
Jordan	X	X	●	X	X	X	X	X
Kenya	X	X	▲	X	X	X	X	X
Kiribati	X	X	X	X	●	●	●	●
Korea, Republic of	■	■	▲	▲	X	X	X	X
Kuwait	X	X	X	O	O	X	X	X
Kyrgyzstan	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	●
Lao People's Democratic Republic	X	●	●	●	●	●	●	●

Member State	Forced labour		Freedom of association		Equal treatment		Child labour	
	C. 29	C. 105	C. 87	C. 98	C. 100	C. 111	C. 138	C. 182
Latvia	O	X	X	X	X	X	O	O
Lebanon	X	X	▲	X	X	X	X	X
Liberia	X	X	X	X	–	X	–	X
Madagascar	X	●	X	X	X	X	X	X
Malaysia	X	◆	◆	X	X	◆	X	X
Mauritius	X	X	▲	X	X	X	X	X
Mexico	X	X	X	◆	X	X	■	X
Mongolia	O	O	X	X	X	X	X	X
Morocco	X	X	▲	X	X	X	X	X
Myanmar	X	◆	X	●	◆	◆	◆	●
Namibia	X	X	X	X	■	X	X	X
Nepal	X	●	▲	X	X	X	X	X
New Zealand	X	X	▲	X	X	X	◆	X
Oman	X	●	●	●	●	●	●	X
Pakistan	X	X	X	X	X	X	●	X
Paraguay	X	X	X	X	X	X	O	X
Philippines	O	X	X	X	X	X	X	X
Qatar	X	●	●	●	●	X	●	X
Saint Kitts and Nevis	X	X	X	X	X	X	O	X
Saint Lucia	X	X	X	X	X	X	●	X
Saint Vincent and the Grenadines	X	X	X	X	X	X	O	X
Sao Tome and Principe	O	O	X	X	X	X	O	O
Saudi Arabia	X	X	●	●	X	X	●	X
Sierra Leone	X	X	X	X	X	X	O	O
Singapore	X	◆	◆	X	X	◆	◆	X
Solomon Islands	X	–	O	O	●	●	–	–
Somalia	X	X	–	–	–	X	–	–
Sudan	X	X	●	X	X	X	X	X
Suriname	X	X	X	X	▲	▲	O	O
Tajikistan	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	O
Thailand	X	X	●	●	X	●	O	X
Trinidad and Tobago	X	X	X	X	X	X	O	X
Turkmenistan	X	X	X	X	X	X	O	–
Uganda	X	X	●	X	■	■	X	X
United Arab Emirates	X	X	◆	◆	X	X	X	X
United States	◆	X	◆	◆	◆	O	◆	X
Uzbekistan	X	X	O	X	X	X	●	●
Vanuatu	–	–	–	–	–	–	–	–
Viet Nam	●	●	◆	◆	X	X	X	X