

**Committee on the Application of Standards**

CAN/PV Serious failure

**Commission de l'application des normes**

04.06.24

**Comisión de Aplicación de Normas**

112th Session, Geneva, 2024

112<sup>e</sup> session, Genève, 2024112.<sup>a</sup> reunión, Ginebra, 2024

Warning: this document is a draft and may contain omissions or errors. It is made available solely for the purpose of verification and correction. Persons referred to in this document are not to be regarded as bound by statements attributed to them. The ILO declines all responsibility for any errors or omissions which this document may contain, or for any use which may be made of it by third parties.

Avertissement: ce document est un projet, qui peut comporter des omissions ou des erreurs et n'est rendu public qu'à des fins de vérification et de rectification. Les mentions contenues dans ce document provisoire n'engagent pas les personnes dont les propos sont rapportés. La responsabilité du BIT ne saurait être engagée à raison des éventuelles erreurs et omissions entachant ce document, ou de l'utilisation qui pourrait en être faite par des tiers.

Advertencia: el presente documento es un proyecto y puede contener omisiones o errores. Solo se publica a efectos de comprobación y rectificación. Las declaraciones que se atribuyen en el presente documento provisional a las personas citadas en él no comprometen su responsabilidad. La OIT queda exenta de toda responsabilidad respecto de cualquier error u omisión que pudiera figurar en el presente documento o que pudiera derivarse del uso del documento por terceros.

**Fourth sitting, 4 June 2024, 4 p.m.****Quatrième séance, 4 juin 2024, 16 h 00****Cuarta sesión, 4 de junio de 2024, 16 horas**

Chairperson: Mr Różycki

Président: M. Różycki

Presidente: Sr. Różycki

**Cases of serious failure by Member States to respect their reporting and other standards-related obligations****Discussion des cas de manquements graves des États Membres à leurs obligations de faire rapport et à leurs autres obligations liées aux normes****Casos de incumplimiento grave por los Estados Miembros de la obligación de enviar memorias o de otras obligaciones relativas a las normas**

**Chairperson** – Now, we move on to the discussion of cases of serious failure of Member

States to respect reporting and other standards-related obligations.

Before giving the floor to the Vice-Chairpersons for their opening remarks, I would like to recall the Committee's working methods when dealing with the cases of serious failure to fulfil reporting and other standards-related obligations.

The Committee has established specific criteria to determine what constitutes a "serious failure" when it examines these compliances. These criteria are contained in document D.1, which is available on the Committee's web page. The cases of serious failure have been identified in the relevant parts of the General Report of the Committee of Experts. It should be recalled that the following criteria are applied:

- none of the reports on ratified Conventions have been supplied during the past two years or more;
- first reports on ratified Conventions have not been supplied for at least two years;
- "Urgent appeals": failure to send reports on the application of ratified Conventions for at least three years;
- none of the reports on unratified Conventions and Recommendations requested under article 19, paragraphs 5, 6 and 7, of the Constitution have been supplied during the past five years;
- no indication is available on whether steps have been taken to submit the instruments adopted during the last seven sessions of the Conference to the competent authorities, in accordance with article 19 of the Constitution;
- no information has been received as regards all or most of the observations and direct requests of the Committee of Experts to which a reply was requested for the period under consideration;

- the Government has failed during the past three years to indicate the representative organizations of employers and workers to which, in accordance with article 23, paragraph 2, of the Constitution, copies of the report and information supplied to the Office have been communicated.

To take account of recent developments, updated information on the countries concerned was provided to our Committee in document CAN/D/SF, which was made available yesterday. This document takes into account the fact that some governments have submitted the required information or reports before the present sitting. The Document also compiles the written information received from governments with respect to these failures as indicated in Part V of document D.1.

Government representatives from the countries mentioned in this document and registered on the list of speakers will be invited to provide information and explanations to the Committee. When providing information to the Committee, governments are asked to provide information on all the cases of non-compliance in one single statement. The governments concerned may, in particular, highlight the challenges they may be facing in fulfilling their obligations and indicate the areas in which ILO assistance and technical cooperation may be desirable. Such information would enable the Committee to have a better understanding of the situation in the country and is helpful to the Office in its response to governments' requests.

At the end of the discussion, I will give again the floor to the Vice-Chairpersons for their final remarks, following which I will present the draft conclusions for approval by the Committee, in accordance with its working methods.

I am now going to open the discussion on serious failure of Member States to respect reporting and other standards-related obligations. I would like to invite the two Vice-Chairpersons to make their introductory statements.

Now I give the floor to Ms Jackie Van Der Meulen, Employer spokesperson to make her introductory remarks. Ms Van Der Meulen you have the floor.

**Employer members** – The Employer members take note that the Committee of Experts have once again expressed concern in their report at the low number of government responses received by the 1 September deadline. We in the Committee collectively count on governments to comply with their reporting obligations under articles 19, 22 and 35 of the ILO Constitution in a timely manner and to prepare their reports in consultation with the most representative employers' and workers' organizations in their countries. We wish to stress that government reports containing complete and relevant information provide an important foundation upon which our supervisory work is built.

The persistently high number of the Committee of Experts' comments – there are 612 observations and 1,053 direct requests this year – is also a concern. It appears that ratification may, on occasion, be undertaken as a political statement or a declaration of intent rather than what it really is, namely the conclusion of a treaty under international law containing legal obligations, all of which are to be complied with, including the associated reporting obligations.

We would like to stress once again that in promoting ratification it is important for the Office to educate Member States of the necessity of making thorough, pre-ratification assessments and that these assessments should occur in consultations with the social partners. These pre-ratification assessments must include, not only an appraisal of the applicable country's capacity to implement the Convention envisaged for ratification, but also

the country's capacity to report on implementation. Ratification should only occur when both the implementation and reporting capacities can be ensured.

We observe that there has been an increase in the number of reports received by the end of the session from 70.9 per cent out of the total number of reports requested last year to 75.3 per cent this year. We also note a decrease in the number of reports submitted after the 1 September deadline, from 59 per cent of reports last year to 54.4 per cent of reports this year. While this decrease in late reports is an improvement it is not yet satisfactory. We therefore ask all governments to make special efforts to provide their reports in a timely manner so that the supervisory bodies can perform their work efficiently and effectively.

We also note with concern that the following 14 countries have not provided the reports due with respect to ratified Conventions for the past two or more years: Afghanistan, Barbados, Comoros, Dominica, Grenada, Haiti, Papua New Guinea, Saint Lucia, Somalia, Syrian Arab Republic, Tonga, Tuvalu, Vanuatu and Yemen. Respectfully this is unacceptable, and we urge the governments concerned to supply all their respective outstanding reports at the earliest opportunity. If the reports cannot be submitted for reasons beyond the control of the given government, we ask that the applicable government should, at a minimum, inform the ILO of its circumstances. In such cases the applicable government may also request ILO technical assistance with the goal of addressing the problem in a sustainable manner.

With respect to the first reports on ratified Conventions, we note with concern that there are nine countries that have failed to supply these reports for two or more years, namely, Djibouti, Grenada, Iraq, Lebanon, Marshall Islands, Sudan, Tonga, Tuvalu and Vanuatu. We would like to stress that first reports are particularly important as they are meant to provide complete information about government action to implement the applicable ratified Convention. As such, first reports provide an indispensable baseline for an initial,

comprehensive assessment of compliance. We therefore call on the Governments of these 11 countries to submit their overdue first reports to the ILO without further delay. Here too, if necessary, the applicable governments are encouraged to request ILO technical assistance to enable them to address the problem in a sustainable manner.

We also note with concern that the number of comments – whether observations or direct requests – by the Committee of Experts to which replies have not been received from the governments remains high. Specifically, there are 35 governments that have not provided responses this year.

On a positive note, we appreciate that the governments of 11 of those 35 countries have provided information regarding their failure to reply to all or most the Committee of Experts comments, namely, Bahamas, Cambodia, Democratic Republic of the Congo, Fiji, Iceland, Islamic Republic of Iran, Madagascar, Montenegro, Romania, Rwanda and Slovenia. We welcome the provision of explanations by these governments for their respective failures, as well as the steps taken to address the situation. We trust that they will be able to meet all their reporting obligations going forward. We would also like to hear from the other governments that have yet to provide their reasons for their unresponsiveness to the Committee of Experts' comments. This high rate of unresponsiveness by governments is an indication that there may be systemic challenges or barriers to reporting. However, without further clarity from applicable governments regarding the reasons for their unresponsiveness, we are not in a position to either diagnose or recommend broader remedies for addressing these deficiencies.

We also note with regret that the following 16 countries have not provided reports on unratified Conventions and Recommendations requested under article 19 of the ILO Constitution for the past five years: Barbados, Chad, Djibouti, Dominica, Equatorial Guinea, Haiti, Marshall Islands, North Macedonia, Papua New Guinea, Saint Lucia, Sao Tome and

Principe, Singapore, Timor-Leste, Tuvalu, Uganda and Yemen. We suggest that the Office, together with the applicable governments, work towards identifying the underlying reasons for these reporting deficiencies and develop effective remedies.

We welcome the decision of the Committee of Experts to further extend the practice of “urgent appeals” for cases meeting certain criteria of serious reporting failure that require this Committee’s attention. This enables the Committee to have a direct and serious dialogue on this point with the governments concerned and to remind them that the Committee of Experts will examine the substance of the matter at its next session, even in the absence of a government report. We note with appreciation that all reports that were pending for more than three years have been examined following the launch of urgent appeals and we trust that there will be the same positive results in future.

Furthermore, we appreciate that, with the assistance of the Office, the Committee of Experts and this Committee have decided to strengthen the follow-up given to cases of serious failure.

Finally, and before concluding, we wish to comment on the social partners’ role and participation in the regular supervisory system. Under article 23(2) of the ILO Constitution, governments of Member States have an obligation to communicate copies of their reports to representative employers’ and workers’ organizations. Compliance with this obligation is essential to ensuring the proper involvement of the social partners in standards’ implementation at the national level.

We observe that the social partners submitted 1,276 observations to the Committee of Experts this year, which is an increase as compared to last year at 1,156. Two hundred twenty-one of this year’s observations were communicated by employers’ organizations which is up from 212 last year and 1,055 were communicated by workers’ organizations, again an

increase from 944 last year. We welcome the overall increase in submissions, and we trust that the Office will continue to provide technical assistance, including capacity building, to social partners where needed to enable them to provide relevant comments to the Committee of Experts.

The International Organization of Employers (IOE) together with ILO ACT/EMP is supporting employers' organizations in submitting up-to-date and relevant information to the Committee of Experts in law and in practice in their respective countries. In particular, employers' organizations are critical in highlighting when governments have failed to take into account the needs and realities of sustainable enterprises when implementing ratified Conventions and routinely make suggestions on how this could be improved.

We trust that the Committee of Experts, in their assessments, will give due consideration to the comments from employers' organizations, as well as any additional comments made by employers' representatives in the discussion of the Committee.

**Chairperson** – Thank you very much, and now I give the floor to Ms Claire Middlemas, the Worker spokesperson, to make her introductory statement.

**Worker members** – Reporting obligations are fundamental to the work of our Committee. Not only that, they are fundamental to the proper functioning of the ILO's standard-setting system. The first fundamental obligation to which I would like to refer is that which goes to the very essence of the ILO. This is the obligation to communicate to the respective organizations of workers and employers, copies of the reports and information communicated to the ILO. Tripartism is at the heart of the ILO and this is reflected in particular in the need to involve the most representative workers' and employers' organizations in the dialogue that is being established with the ILO. A serious failure in this regard consists of not having indicated for three years or more the workers' and employers' organizations to which



copies of the reports have been communicated. No serious breach of this obligation has been alleged against an ILO Member State for several years. If this formal obligation is universally respected, there is still a need for genuine tripartite social dialogue to be put in place in the Member States to guarantee the tripartism promoted by the ILO. We will have the opportunity to see in other discussions in this Committee that a lot of effort still needs to be made in this area.

The second fundamental obligation related to standards is the obligation under article 19 of the ILO Constitution, which requires Member States to submit a Convention adopted at a session of the Conference within one year to the competent authorities, with a view to transforming it into law or taking other measures. This obligation makes it possible to enhance the Standard-Setting Committees of the ILO and to reflect the standard-setting activity of the ILO at the national level. Any Member State which does not provide any indication that initiatives have been taken to submit the instruments adopted during the last sessions of the Conference is in a situation of serious failure to comply with this obligation. Twenty-six Member States were in this situation at the time of the publication of the Committee of Experts' report. The Democratic Republic of Congo has since provided information on this subject that allows this Member State to be removed from the list of States in serious breach of this obligation.

The third obligation is that which requires the submission of a report within the framework of the theme chosen by the Governing Body for the preparation of the General Survey by the Committee of Experts. This obligation also applies to the Member States which have not ratified the Conventions concerned. This obligation is fundamental in that it allows the ILO to identify areas of action to support and encourage the ratification of instruments by Member States. If a Member State does not provide any report expected for the carrying out of an overall Survey in the course of five consecutive years, it will be in serious breach of this

obligation. Twenty-one Member States were in this situation at the time of the publication of the report of the Committee of Experts. In the meantime, five Member States have submitted a report on the subject. However, we regret that the failure to respond to this call for five consecutive years has irreparably deprived the ILO of being able to benefit from the information this Member State can provide at the appropriate time. This obviously also applies to the Member States that is still in serious breach of this obligation.

After these obligations, which are imposed independently of the ratification of instruments, there are a series of obligations that are imposed by the ratification of ILO Conventions. The first of these is the obligation to communicate to the Committee of Experts an initial report on the application in law and practice of a Convention newly ratified by the Member State concerned. The ratification of Conventions by Member States is obviously the objective that we must pursue as tripartite constituents. These ratifications make it possible to initiate an essential dialogue between the ILO and the Member States concerned to assess the implementation of international Conventions in a national context. The first reports are of crucial importance in that they are particularly detailed in order to enable the ILO to have a comprehensive view of how a Convention is implemented in the country concerned. Failure to provide a first report for at least two years thus constitutes a serious breach of this obligation. Eleven Member States were in serious breach at the time of the publication of the Committee of Experts' report. Since then, two Member States, Fiji and the Cook Islands have regularized the situation by providing their first expected reports.

Secondly, the ratification of Conventions entails the need to be able to submit regular reports on the basis of the reporting cycle defined for each country. This is also an essential process for the dialogue that must take place between the ILO and Member States. If none of these reports is provided for at least two years, it will be a serious breach on the part of the Member State concerned. Fifteen Member States were in this situation at the time of the

publication of the experts' report. One Member State, Antigua and Barbuda, has since regularized the situation.

Finally, the dialogue between the ILO and Member States often leads to observations or direct requests from the bodies of the ILO's standard-setting system. The responses to these observations or requests are fundamental to continue this dialogue. Unfortunately, some Member States do not respond to these comments or requests. This is also a serious breach. At the time of the publication of the report of the Committee of Experts, 35 Member States had not responded to most, if not all, of the observations and direct requests made. Some of these Member States did submit reports but did not respond to observations or direct requests. The response to the questions raised by the bodies of the ILO standard-setting system is fundamental and testifies to the value that the ILO's constituents attach to dialogue with them. We note that between the publication of the Committee of Experts' report and the special session, eleven Member States provided information in response to the observations and direct requests of the Committee of Experts. We encourage them to continue along this path, and invite other Member States to follow up as well, if necessary by having recourse to the ILO's technical assistance. This year, the Committee of Experts issued eleven urgent appeals against Member States that had not transmitted any report for three years or more. This procedure allows the Committee of Experts to draw to the attention of the Member States concerned that an examination of the conformity of the legislation in practice will be carried out, even in the absence of a government report.

In this year's report, the Committee examined seven cases that had previously been the subject of an urgent appeal. This procedure is essential in that it ensures that the work of the ILO's standard-setting system is not paralyzed, despite the difficulties for the Member States concerned to provide the requested reports. It will be interesting to hear from the Member States concerned about the difficulties they are facing, and I hope that after the respective

interventions from workers and employers that governments will use this opportunity to take the floor in this discussion. It cannot be stressed enough that Member States can have recourse to the technical assistance of the ILO to assist them in this reporting task. The difficulties encountered in this regard must never be an obstacle to ratifying an ILO Convention. If these difficulties were to lead to such consequences, it would be an important signal for the ILO to strengthen its technical assistance, and also a strong signal for the Member States concerned on the need to strengthen their systems of labour administration, as we have just heard in the General Survey discussion.

In addition, there are many tools that are available to tripartite constituents to help them participate fully in the ILO's standard-setting system. Examples include the managing international labour standards reporting website which focuses specifically on reporting obligations, and the online guide on established practices of the ILO supervisory system which, in turn, makes it possible to understand the essential role of these reporting obligations for the supervisory system. We can only invite Member States to take note of these new tools, and invite the Office and the experts to ensure the greatest possible visibility of them. In addition to these tools, the training of government officials responsible for producing the requested reports is an absolute necessity. In this regard, ILO constituents can rely on the training programmes offered by the ITC Centre in Turin which will be able to train government officials in the reporting obligations incumbent on Member States, and thus avoid having to identify shortcomings in this area.

Many Member States were able to regularize this situation between the publication of the Committee of Experts' report and the holding of this special session. In total, out of the 63 Member States concerned by one or more serious breaches, 17 of them have regularized one or more serious breaches for which they were accused. This is a very positive signal that we would like to highlight, and we encourage other Member States to request the technical

assistance of the Office, which we have no doubt they will be fully prepared to provide in order to regularize their situation.

Our committee cannot afford to evade the fundamental issue of reporting obligations. The work of the ILO, and more particularly that of our Committee, is based on the reports provided by the Member States, as well as on the observations submitted by trade unions and employers' organizations. Failure to meet these obligations inevitably disrupts the proper functioning of the ILO's many areas of work, meaning the ILO is not in a position to fully assess the implementation of its standards-setting instruments in the Member States, and to provide the necessary responses. Ensuring the effective implementation of ILO instruments means ensuring respect for the dignity and rights that workers must derive from ILO instruments. Let us not lose sight of the fact that this is the purpose of these reporting obligations.

**Chairperson** – Thank you very much, as I can see no request for the floor I now give back the floor to Ms Middlemas, the Worker spokesperson for her concluding remarks, the floor is yours.

**Worker members** – Well, we had really hoped that we would hear from some governments so I am sorry to have to hear from me again, it is a shame.

The aim of this special session is to make us aware that these reporting obligations, beyond the formalism that they may present, are fundamental in that they stimulate dialogue between Member States and the ILO, and underpin the dynamics of tripartite social dialogue, as well as the respect and promotion of International Labour Conventions. Member States must commit themselves fully to these processes.

With this in mind, it would be advisable to actively promote the ratification of Convention No. 144 on Tripartite Consultations concerning International Labour Standards, as well as its

correct application, as this can also contribute to the greater compliance with reporting obligations.

As we were able to discuss in the context of the General Survey, strengthening labour administrations can be one way of enhancing Member States' ability to meet these reporting obligations. Ratification and effective implementation of Convention No. 150 is therefore also appropriate in this context.

We have also taken note of the written information transmitted and of the difficulties encountered by certain Member States and are pleased to point out that these Member States generally call on the ILO for assistance, and that the Office systematically responds favourably and with great efficiency.

We have also taken note of the information provided by one Member State, which pointed to an ongoing crisis situation that would not enable it to resolve in the short term its serious shortcomings identified. First of all, it should be pointed out that the shortcomings identified had already occurred long before the crisis arose. Although this is a factor to be taken into account, we have already pointed out during the COVID-19 crisis that reporting obligations cannot be waived, even in times of crisis. We hope that the Member State in question will do everything in its power to resolve the shortcomings identified as soon as possible.

We regret that some Member States appear to be wilfully ignoring their reporting obligations. The approach towards these Member States should be firmer than towards the Member States with proven technical difficulties or insufficient capacity. The urgent appeal procedure is a first response, but it applies indiscriminately to Member States acting in good or bad faith.

Within the framework of activities to promote international labour standards, additional resources could still be allocated to technical assistance and support activities for Member

States and social partners, to enable them to meet their standards-related obligations and to engage them actively in the ILO's tripartite dialogue.

We have taken good note of the commitments made by certain governments, and we hope that these will be followed by concrete action to ensure full compliance with their obligations.

It is essential that all these governments, and particularly those which have not provided any information to the Committee, put an end to these serious breaches and bring themselves into compliance as soon as possible.

Proactive support through the Office's technical assistance will remain essential to enable Member States to fully meet their standards-related obligations.

**Chairperson** – Thank you very much, and now I give the floor to Ms Van der Meulen. Ms, you have the floor.

**Employer members** – We would like to conclude by reiterating that in order to be effective, the ILO's regular supervisory system depends on governments' reports that contain complete and relevant information and that are sent regularly and on time. It is also critical that the Committee of Experts takes note of the additional comments from the social partners, as they provide key context. It is only with all of these inputs that the supervisory bodies can properly assess the implementation of ILO standards. Overall, we have reason for optimism but also significant room for improvement in the fulfilment of reporting obligations this year. To that end we support all efforts aimed at enabling the supervisory system to do its work more efficiently, including the streamlining of reporting and the extension of possibilities for e-reporting. We stress however, that these efforts can only be successful if they are accompanied by the consolidation and simplification of the ILO standards themselves. Such consolidation and simplification would lead not only to better implementation of standards

but also focus government reporting on the more critical issues facing the world of work. In that regard we are encouraged by the ongoing efforts of the standards review mechanism.

**Chairperson** – Thank you very much. As announced, now I will read out the draft conclusions on cases of serious failure with reporting.

The Committee takes note of the information provided in written information submitted by the Governments of **Plurinational State of Bolivia, Brunei Darussalam, Chad, Congo, Equatorial Guinea, France** (New Caledonia) and **Rwanda**.

However, the Committee regrets that the Governments of **Afghanistan, Angola, Antigua and Barbuda, Barbados, Belize, Comoros, Djibouti, Dominica, Gabon, Gambia, Grenada, Guinea-Bissau, Haiti, Hungary, Iraq, Lebanon, Liberia, Libya, Marshall Islands, Netherlands** (Sint Maarten), **North Macedonia, Papua New Guinea, Saint Kitts and Nevis, Saint Lucia, Saint Vincent and the Grenadines, San Marino, Sao Tome and Principe, Singapore, Solomon Islands, Somalia, South Sudan, Sudan, Syrian Arab Republic, Timor-Leste, Tonga, Tuvalu, Uganda, United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland** (British Virgin Islands), **Vanuatu, Yemen** and **Zambia** did not make statements or provide any written communication.

The Committee notes in particular the specific difficulties mentioned by some governments in complying with their constitutional obligations related to reporting and the submission of the instruments adopted by the International Labour Conference to the competent national authorities. It also takes note of the promises made by some governments to comply with these obligations in the near future. The Committee recalls that the governments can avail themselves of ILO technical assistance to comply with their reporting obligations.



### 1. Failure to supply reports for the past two or more years

Concerning the failure to supply reports for the past two or more years on the application of ratified Conventions, the Committee recalls that reporting on the application of ratified Conventions is a fundamental constitutional obligation and the basis of the supervisory system. The Committee also stresses the importance of respecting the deadlines for such reporting. The Committee expresses the firm hope that the Governments of **Afghanistan, Barbados, Comoros, Dominica, Grenada, Haiti, Papua New Guinea, Saint Lucia, Somalia, Syrian Arab Republic, Tonga, Tuvalu, Vanuatu** and **Yemen** will supply the reports due as soon as possible, and decides to note these cases in the corresponding paragraph of its General Report.

### 2. Failure to supply first reports for the past two or more years

Concerning the failure to supply first reports for two or more years on the application of ratified Conventions, the Committee recalls the particular importance of this submission of the first report on the application of ratified Conventions. The Committee expresses the firm hope that the Governments of **Djibouti, Grenada, Iraq, Lebanon, Marshall Islands, Sudan, Tonga, Tuvalu** and **Vanuatu** will supply the first reports due as soon as possible, and decides to note these cases in the corresponding paragraph of its General Report.

### 3. Urgent appeals

Concerning the urgent appeals, the Committee underlines the fundamental importance of sending the report and the detailed information requested in the first report on the application of ratified Conventions. The Committee stresses the importance of the information provided in the reports submitted by governments on ratified Conventions to enable the regular supervision by the Committee of Experts. The Committee expresses the firm hope that

the Governments of **Afghanistan, Comoros, Grenada, Marshall Islands, Saint Lucia, Sudan, Syrian Arab Republic, Tuvalu** and **Vanuatu** will send the reports due as soon as possible, and decides to note these cases in the corresponding paragraph of its General Report.

The Committee brings to the attention of these Governments that the Committee of Experts could examine in substance at its next session the application of the Conventions concerned on the basis of publicly available information, even if the Governments mentioned have not sent the reports due. The Committee reminds governments that they can request technical assistance from the Office to overcome their difficulties in this respect.

#### 4. **Failure to supply information in response to comments made by the Committee of Experts**

Concerning the failure to supply information in response to comments made by the Committee of Experts, the Committee underlines the fundamental importance of clear and complete information in response to the comments of the Committee of Experts in order to permit continued dialogue with the governments concerned. The Committee expresses the firm hope that the Governments of **Afghanistan, Antigua and Barbuda, Barbados, Comoros, Congo, Djibouti, Dominica, France** (New Caledonia), **Grenada, Haiti, Netherlands** (Sint Maarten), **Papua New Guinea, Saint Lucia, San Marino, Singapore, Solomon Islands, Somalia, South Sudan, Sudan, Syrian Arab Republic, Tuvalu, United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland** (British Virgin Islands), **Vanuatu** and **Yemen** will supply the requested information in the future, and decides to note these cases in the corresponding paragraph of its General Report.

## 5. Failure to supply reports for the past five years on unratified Conventions and

### Recommendations

Concerning the failure to supply reports for the past five years on unratified Conventions and Recommendations, the Committee stresses the importance it attaches to the constitutional obligation to supply reports on non-ratified Conventions and Recommendations. The Committee expresses the firm hope that the Governments of **Barbados, Chad, Djibouti, Dominica, Equatorial Guinea, Haiti, Marshall Islands, North Macedonia, Papua New Guinea, Saint Lucia, Sao Tome and Principe, Singapore, Timor-Leste, Tuvalu, Uganda and Yemen** will comply with their obligation to supply reports on non-ratified Conventions and Recommendations in the future. The Committee decides to note these cases in the corresponding paragraph of its General Report.

## 6. Failure to supply submit instruments to the competent authorities

Concerning the failure to submit instruments to the competent authorities, the Committee recalls that compliance with the obligation to submit Conventions, Recommendations and Protocols to competent national authorities is a requirement of the highest importance to ensure the effectiveness of the Organization's standards-related activities. The Committee expresses the firm hope that the Governments of **Angola, Belize, Plurinational State of Bolivia, Brunei Darussalam, Dominica, Equatorial Guinea, Gabon, Gambia, Grenada, Guinea-Bissau, Haiti, Hungary, Lebanon, Liberia, Libya, Saint Kitts and Nevis, Saint Lucia, Saint Vincent and the Grenadines, Solomon Islands, Syrian Arab Republic, Timor-Leste, Tuvalu, Vanuatu, Yemen and Zambia** will comply with their obligation to submit Conventions, Recommendations and Protocols to the competent authorities in the future. The Committee decides to note these cases in the corresponding paragraph of its General Report.

**7. Failure to indicate during the past three years the representative organizations of employers and workers to which copies of the report and information supplied to the Office have been communicated**

In relation to the failure to indicate during the past three years the representative organizations of employers and workers to which copies of the reports and information supplied to the Office have been communicated, the Committee stresses the importance it attaches to the constitutional obligation, under article 23, paragraph 2, of the Constitution, of governments to communicate copies of the reports and information supplied to the Office to employers' and workers' organizations. The Committee recalls that the contribution of employers' and workers' organizations is essential for the evaluation of the application of Conventions in national legislation and in practice for their participation in ILO supervisory mechanisms.

The Committee welcomes the fact that this year again no Member State has failed to indicate during the past three years the representative organizations of employers and workers to which copies of the reports and information supplied to the Office have been communicated. The Committee expresses the firm hope that this is a sign that genuine tripartite social dialogue has been established in all ILO Member States. The Committee decides to note this positive development and to encourage Member States to continue in that direction in the corresponding paragraph of the General Report.

And now may I take it that the Committee is ready to adopt the conclusions?

*(The conclusions are adopted.)*