

► Record of Proceedings

7B**International Labour Conference – 112th Session, Geneva, 2024**

Date: 30 July 2024

Report of the Recurrent Discussion Committee on Fundamental Principles and Rights at Work

Contents

	Page
Introduction	3
General discussion	4
Opening statements and discussion point 1	4
Discussion point 2	12
Discussion point 3	17
Discussion of the draft conclusions.....	22

Introduction

1. The Committee for Fundamental Principles and Rights at Work, established by the International Labour Conference at its first sitting on 3 June 2024, was originally composed of 193 members (109 Government members, 8 Employer members and 76 Worker members). To achieve equality of strength, each Government member entitled to vote was allotted 152 votes, each Employer member 2071 Votes and each Worker member 218 votes. The composition of the Committee was modified four times during the session and the number of votes attributed to each member adjusted accordingly.
2. The Committee had before it Report V: *Fundamental principles and rights at work at a critical crossroads* (ILC.112/Report V(Rev.)), prepared by the International Labour Office (hereinafter the Office report) for consideration under the fifth item on the agenda of the 112th Session of the International Labour Conference: “A recurrent discussion on the strategic objective of fundamental principles and rights at work, under the follow-up to the ILO Declaration on Social Justice for a Fair Globalization, 2008, as amended in 2022” (Social Justice Declaration).

The Committee elected its Officers as follows:

Chairperson: Ms Claudia Fuentes Julio (Government member, Chile) at its first sitting

Vice-Chairpersons: Mr Tom Mackall (Employer member, United States of America) and Mr Magnus Norddahl (Worker member, Iceland) at its first sitting

3. The Committee appointed a drafting group to prepare and submit a set of draft conclusions for its consideration. The drafting group was composed as follows:

Government members: Mr A. Fall (Senegal), Mr C. F. Kamara (Sierra Leone), Mr S. Gao (China), Mr N. Komada (Japan), Ms S. Morgan (United States), Ms C. H. Greenidge (Barbados), Mr I. Liberatore (France), Mr T. Bevers (Belgium)

Employer members: Mr T. Mackall (United States), Mr G. Ricci (Guatemala), Mr A-S Oyerinde (Nigeria), Mr D. Opio (Uganda), Ms E. Nagasawa (Japan), Ms J. Tinsley (Australia), Ms A. Vauchez (France), Ms C. Barsan (Germany)

Worker members: Mr M. Zante (Burkina Faso), Mr A. Amoussou (Benin), Mr J. Vogt (United States), Mr J. E. Onate (Mexico), Mr C. Roberts (Canada), Ms S Amponah (United Kingdom), Mr M. Norddahl (Iceland), Mr P. Dimitrov (Bulgaria)

4. The Chairperson noted that the Committee was taking place at an opportune moment. Changes and challenges, highlighted in the Office report prepared for the Committee, were affecting progress on the fundamental principles and rights at work (FPRW). The Committee should ensure that the International Labour Organization (ILO) and its members were equipped to address the challenges and make use of the opportunities that arose.
5. The Representative of the Secretary-General (Ms Manuela Tomei, Assistant Director-General) said that fundamental principles and rights at work (FPRW) were essential to people’s well-being and dignity and to fostering sustainable economic growth and social progress. The

ILO Declaration on Fundamental Principles and Rights at Work, as amended in 2022 (1998 Declaration) underscored the obligation to uphold freedom of association and collective bargaining, the abolition of forced labour and all forms of discrimination, the elimination of child labour, and the right to a safe and healthy working environment. As such, it represented a cornerstone of social justice. In the past seven years, since the last recurrent discussion, unprecedented challenges, linked to crisis, geopolitical tensions and climate change had arisen. This directly led to a slow down, stagnation, if not reversal, in respect of FPRW, including freedom of association and collective bargaining, which remained under threat in many regions. More than 27.6 million people were trapped in forced labour, child labour had increased since 2017, discrimination continued to undermine opportunities for people, and in 2019 almost 3 million people died from occupational accidents and diseases while 395 million workers sustained a non-fatal work injury. At the same time, new opportunities were arising. Major transformations spurred by technological progress and climate change were opening up unprecedented opportunities for innovation, productivity and economic growth. There was a need to promote FPRW with renewed vigour, promoting integrated and holistic approaches, balancing attention across the five FPRW, strengthening national legislation and enforcement, reinforcing social dialogue, improving evidence-based actions and impact measurement, building partnerships for promotion of FPRW in tandem with the other strategic objectives of decent work and mainstreaming FPRW in responses to emerging challenges on digitalization of work, climate change and shifting economic dynamics. The Committee's guidance would be crucial leading up to the 2025 Second World Summit for Social Development.

General discussion

Opening statements and discussion point 1

Since the last recurrent discussion in 2017, what have been the most important developments and how have these impacted the respect, promotion and realization of fundamental principles and rights at work?

6. The Employer Vice-Chairperson recalled that the mandate of the discussion was to understand the realities on the ground and assess the results achieved and inform future action. The Committee should not engage in policy discussions. However, the 1998 Declaration remained an important framework, strongly supported by the Employers' group and, as universal human rights that were inseparable, interrelated, indivisible and mutually reinforcing, applicable to both workers and employers. FPRW were on an equal footing with each other, with no hierarchy. The Office report emphasized that since the 1998 Declaration considerable progress had been achieved but that there were significant implementation gaps. Further progress required political will, effective labour market governance and inclusive social dialogue.
7. The Employers' group considered that the Office report disproportionately focused on negative aspects and did not properly account for positive action taken, such as the universal ratification of the Worst Forms of Child Labour Convention, 1999 (No. 182). However, statistics showed an overall increase in child labour, demonstrating that ratification alone was insufficient to the realization of FPRW. Another positive development was in improvements in workplace safety. There had been a 10 per cent decrease in work-related mortality from 2000 to 2019. Since 2017, national action plans on child labour and forced labour had been adopted, as well as reforms to discriminatory legal provisions barring women from specific occupations and types of work. In 2022, a safe and healthy working environment had been included in the ILO's framework of fundamental principles and rights at work.

8. Despite progress, challenges linked to root causes persisted and impeded realization of FPRW. Such challenges included failure to implement Conventions, whether ratified or not, the breadth of informality, lack of good governance and rule of law, the need to mitigate corruption, inadequate capacity-building and awareness-raising of the social partners. They also included a lack of education and training, specifically within small and medium-sized enterprises and, finally, a lack of evidence-based data and reporting. High levels of informality impeded formal markets: diligent efforts were required to promote formalization. Weak governance and corruption also undermined progress. Quality data were key to inform effective decision-making.
9. The Committee's conclusions must be practical, based on learning from failures and successes; they must uphold Member States' primary obligation to respect human rights; they must acknowledge the importance of root causes and promote good governance, the rule of law and social protection; they must address informality and incorporate the role of sustainable enterprises; they must be faithful to the 1998 Declaration in promoting an enabling environment for sustainable enterprises, affirming the practical reality that economic development through sustainable enterprises advanced FPRW and decent work. Strong building blocks from the employers' standpoint were therefore effective good governance, formalization and strong social dialogue. Continued efforts in that direction were needed from the Office and the constituents.
10. The Worker Vice-Chairperson stressed that the current discussion came at a critical point, as FPRW, and human rights more generally, were coming under attack worldwide. He stated that the world was further away than ever from delivering the agreed objectives to attain sustainable development, including Sustainable Development Goal 8. Deregulations, employment insecurity and precarious, non-standard forms of employment were on the rise. Independent, self-employed workers, workers on variable working hours contracts, on temporary contracts or in multiparty employment relationships continued to be deprived of fundamental labour rights and basic labour protection. Independent workers encountered barriers to trade union representation and were unable to negotiate working conditions. The use of artificial intelligence (AI) was an alienating influence and contributed to employment insecurity. Global supply chains contributed to social dumping, with low wages and low labour costs, while labour had never been, and never would be, a commodity. Governments were failing to regulate in favour of worker rights. There were over 2 billion workers employed in the informal economy, working outside the rule of law. Demographic ageing and pressures on public budgets made it difficult to protect FPRW.
11. Multiple crises, including armed conflict and climate change, darkened the picture further. Climate change was already impacting seriously on workers, notably through heat stress. Technological changes required just transition measures. Trade union rights were under attack across the world, especially freedom of association and collective bargaining rights. According to the International Trade Union Confederation Global Rights Index, 87 per cent of countries were violating the right to strike, while other countries were violating civil liberties and collective bargaining. Moreover, forced labour and child labour were on the rise, along with discrimination in employment. Occupational safety and health were major issues globally, with 3 million workers dying each year and a 5 per cent increase in the mortality rate since 2015. Such trends did not reflect natural phenomena: inadequate regulation, austerity and incentives for hiring workers on precarious contracts were all measures promoted by international financial institutions.
12. Political will, labour market governance and social dialogue were critical to solutions. Universal ratification and implementation of FPRW should be promoted. Following the inclusion of a safe

and healthy working environment as a fifth category of FPRW, a strategy should be set out to promote the ILO Occupational Safety and Health Convention, 1981 (No. 155) and the Promotional Framework for Occupational Safety and Health Convention, 2006 (No. 187). There was an urgent need to boost multilateral coherence, including ILO engagement with the World Trade Organization (WTO) and with international financial institutions. The Office should ensure that FPRW were integrated into its technical support to the constituents and Member States, with emphasis on freedom of association and non-discrimination. Progress had been made in that connection, but more efforts were needed, given that FPRW were instrumental in promoting international labour standards in general and achieving the constitutional objectives of the ILO. FPRW were immutable, enabling rights for the achievement of the ILO strategic objectives. The ILO should build on the commitments of the ILO Centenary Declaration for the Future of Work, 2019 (ILO Centenary Declaration), with all workers guaranteed enjoyment of FPRW, including limits on working time and protection of health and safety. The mutually reinforcing nature of FPRW called for an integrated approach for their realization. There was a need for space to reflect on how the ILO could do that better and to promote a higher level of commitment in the future.

13. The Government member of Belgium, speaking on behalf of the European Union (EU) ¹ and its Member States, said that North Macedonia, Montenegro, Serbia, Albania, Ukraine, Georgia, Iceland and Norway aligned themselves with the statement. He expressed regret that a revised version of the Office report, specifically of its paragraph 96, had been uploaded without transparent communication to the constituents. While there was regression in advancing FPRW since 2017, there was current momentum to advance the rights. The inclusion of a safe and healthy working environment among FPRW in 2022 was welcome. Multiple crises, including COVID-19 and the geopolitical disruption caused by armed conflicts, deterioration in the rule of law and climate change, all hampered realization of FPRW. Digitalization and the development of artificial intelligence introduced possibilities for improved productivity and working conditions, but they also brought threats to privacy and to transparency of working conditions. Informality was a challenge for a large section of the labour force. Labour markets could not keep up with the number of entrants, resulting in increased precarity. There was pressure on working conditions and an increased risk of forced labour. FPRW should be fully applied in global supply chains. Enforcement had been a key challenge, and a horizontal approach was needed. Sustainability and just transition needed to be addressed through policy coherence and respect for rights at all levels. Freedom of association and collective bargaining were a gateway for all FPRW rights. The Committee's conclusions should be action-oriented, in order to assist the ILO and the constituents to fully and urgently implement all FPRW and guarantee their effectiveness.
14. The Government member of Gabon, speaking on behalf of the Africa group, noted that important progress had been made since the adoption of the 2017 framework for action. However, COVID-19, armed conflict and poverty all had an impact on realization of FPRW. In respect of the rural economy, the Office report highlighted different challenges to the recognition of FPRW and a slowing down in progress towards universal ratification of the Freedom of Association and Protection of the Right to Organise Convention, 1948 (No. 87) and the Right to Organise and Collective Bargaining Convention, 1949 (No. 98), with notable gaps observed for agricultural and domestic workers who were still without freedom of association

¹ Unless otherwise specified, all statements made by Government members on behalf of regional groups or intergovernmental organizations are reported as having been made on behalf of all Government members of the group or organization in question who are Members of the ILO and are attending the Conference.

or collective bargaining rights. Some informal workers became victims of forced labour through lack of access to credit and a lack of awareness of their rights, due to insufficiently trained public institutions.

15. Child labour impacted everyone on the African continent. There was an alarming increase in child labour resulting from lax protections for farm workers. The ILO should examine root causes, including poverty, lack of social protection and informality. Discrimination inhibited decent work and social justice. Persons with disabilities were often victims of discrimination, with inadequate social protection, unable to enjoy their FPRW. The inclusion of a safe and healthy working environment among FPRW was an important step. The group invited other countries to ratify Convention No. 187 and to implement policies that addressed the gaps. The group welcomed the greater attention being paid to mental health at work. In the promotion of FPRW and their effective implementation, it was important to avoid controversial terms, which could result in their disrespect. The ILO should respect general terminology for communities facing discrimination.
16. The Government member of Qatar, speaking on behalf of the countries of the Cooperation Council for the Arab States of the Gulf (GCC), noted the different factors that had hindered implementation of FPRW since 2017, stemming from many years of crisis. Those problems highlighted in the Office report all impacted labour and decent work, with the COVID-19 pandemic as a key factor in undermining resilience. The result was backsliding from progress previously made, including in respect of child labour. For the GCC, lessons must be learned from those events, in order to mitigate or avoid vulnerabilities in future health crises. It was important to protect all people from all kinds of dangers. The inclusion of a safe and healthy working environment among FPRW was welcome, adding an important dimension to the rights. GCC countries had taken initiatives to strengthen policy coherence through national strategic plans, including in relation to forced labour and migration, with labour inspection systems put into place to ensure proper working hours. GCC countries benefited from experience-sharing on policy formulation and implementation. Those advances allowed GCC states to create a propitious environment for women's employment, with zero tolerance for sexual harassment. Initiatives had also been taken to improve social protection for migrant workers and to make sure they benefited from social insurance and had access to their rights.
17. The Government member of Switzerland, agreeing with the comment made by the Government member of Belgium, speaking on behalf of the EU and its Member States, regretted not having received a corrigendum, and wished that in future the Office would communicate all changes made to the report. Switzerland recognized the role of FPRW in ensuring sustainable economies and stressed the need to take all FPRW together on an equal basis. Important progress had been made in Switzerland with the ratification of the Protocol of 2014 to the Forced Labour Convention, 1930, and in developing the National Action Plan to Combat Human Trafficking 2023–2027, including implementation mechanisms at federal and cantonal levels and efforts to strengthen labour inspection and identify victims.
18. The Government member of Australia noted the importance of combating all grounds of discrimination. Since 2017, the Office and the constituents had taken important steps towards realization of the 1998 Declaration. Australia welcomed ratifications and improved implementation efforts but noted that renewed focus was required. Australia had ratified nine of the ten fundamental Conventions, as well as the Protocol of 2014 to the Forced Labour Convention, 1930. The country had taken steps to promote health and safety, to improve the collective bargaining framework and protections against sexual harassment. Australia had introduced new protections for workplace delegates and established a new clear pathway for casual employees to convert to permanent work. It had established the first federal

Anti-Slavery Commissioner and was working with partners in the Asia Pacific region on the Better Work programme to promote labour standards. The ILO should promote and achieve universal ratification of FPRW.

19. The Government member of the United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland welcomed the inclusion of occupational safety and health among FPRW. The Government was disappointed that references to the Office's work to address discrimination of LGBT+ workers had been removed from the Office report. The United Kingdom was committed to tackling gender equality and in March 2023 had held its first strategic summit on the employment of women and girls. It was important to promote capacity-building to improve social conditions in global supply chains. She noted that capacity-building for those participating and investing in supply chains was key to effecting lasting change. The United Kingdom's Partnership Against Child Exploitation (PACE) programme was an example of a tool to help enterprises and investors to identify and understand child labour risks in specific supply chains. Since the last discussion, AI technologies had brought improvements, but the deployment of this technology needed to respect human rights. A global response was needed, as a recent United Kingdom AI safety summit had highlighted, when discussing options for internationally coordinated action.
20. The Government member of Saudi Arabia said that his Government wished to share its vision for 2023 and its commitment to sustainable development. That vision required continued social dialogue with the tripartite constituents. The Government rejected all types of discrimination and had taken steps to enrich its national protection framework. Women's empowerment had increased from 19 per cent in 2014 to 34 per cent in 2023. Many more people with disabilities were employed in the country and there were important initiatives to combat child labour. Saudi Arabia was interested in advancing the right to maternity leave and committed to the provision of proper health services. The Government had put in place national programmes on occupational safety and health and had taken steps to combat forced labour.
21. The Government member of Japan stressed his Government's commitment to decent work. In order to address root causes, the ILO should embrace a "One ILO" approach. More holistic and coordination action was needed. Japan had recently joined the Global Coalition for Social Justice and had held the presidency of the Group of Seven (G7) in 2023. The G7 countries remained committed to supporting decent work and Japan had encouraged other countries to join the Alliance 8.7 in fighting child labour. In relation to human rights violations in global supply chains, Japan had intensified its efforts in providing technical assistance on occupational safety and health issues in global supply chains, with a focus on the Asia Pacific region.
22. The Government member of Honduras welcomed the discussion as vitally important to ensure recognition of FPRW. Since the last meeting, humanity had seen many events affecting decent work, including COVID-19, digitalization and the climate crisis. Efforts should be made to combat such crises, to address forced labour and child labour, and to eliminate all sources of discrimination in work. Honduras had ratified all the fundamental Conventions and was committed to decent work. Representation at international forums was important in allowing nations to advance collectively. Honduras was proud to be a member of the Global Coalition for Social Justice and was actively seeking to realize social justice for all.
23. The Government member of Türkiye noted the destructive effects of the various crises and armed conflicts, and their costs in terms of the economic and social fabric, including the loss of millions of jobs. Climate change had brought adverse risks but including occupational safety

and health as part of FPRW was an historic achievement. Informality threatened efforts to realize decent work, while technological progress could increase informal work models. Technological transformation had resulted in higher levels of precariousness. The increased use of AI could lead to the loss of millions of jobs. Artificial intelligence could also increase worker surveillance, degrading job quality further. Freedom of association and collective bargaining were indispensable to attaining decent work, but the lack of protection against anti-union discrimination continued to be an important obstacle to progress.

24. The Government member of Canada noted that, since 2017, governments, workers and employers had faced challenges, including COVID-19 and growing international conflicts. Unionization had declined and fewer workplaces were covered by collective bargaining agreements. Economies had undergone structural challenges that presented both opportunities and challenges for FPRW, including the transition towards an environmentally sustainable economy, the digital transformation of the world of work, and an increasing number of workers in non-standard forms of employment, including in the platform economy, which posed challenges for workers and could complicate the provision of labour and social protection in law and collective agreements. Workers in vulnerable situations should be protected through a sound occupational safety and health system. The ILO had a proactive leadership role in eliminating discrimination in the world of work for all groups and on all grounds, including on sexual orientation and gender identity. It was noted with regret that the Office report removed references to the tools related to LGBTIQ+ persons.
25. The Government member of China noted the importance of FPRW in view of its large population of workers. This was emphasized through its labour laws and regulations enacted since 2017 for the protection of workers' rights. The focus was on four key areas, firstly the promotion of collective bargaining, which included undertaking tripartite coordination of labour relations at all levels and collaboration with the ILO office in Beijing to gather collective bargaining cases to develop training and manuals for the promotion of collective bargaining. Second, she underlined China's consistent opposition to forced labour and noted China's 2022 ratification of the Forced Labour Convention, 1930 (No. 29), and the Abolition of Forced Labour Convention, 1957 (No. 105), which had demonstrated commitment to workers' protection, to opposition to forced labour and to participation in international labour governance. Third, she highlighted China's vigorous actions to eliminate discrimination in employment, and in particular gender-based discrimination in the recruitment practices of employers. Measures had also been taken on labour inspection and labour market discrimination, particularly for women. The number of women in new forms of labour had risen due to flexible working arrangements. Fourth, actions had been taken to strengthen the protection of the rights and interests of workers in new forms of employment. China had seen a rapid increase in the number of workers relying on internet platforms for work and had issued guidance defining labour protection responsibilities for enterprises in accordance with labour and civil relations. Through administrative guidance on the use of labour, strengthening supervision and inspection, and other means, China had guided and urged enterprises to use labour in accordance with the law, and to effectively safeguard the rights and interests of workers in new forms of employment.
26. The Government member of the United States of America emphasized the significant ongoing and new challenges facing FPRW since 2017, including restrictions on civic space, breakdowns in the rule of law, growth in the informal economy, green and digital transitions (including the rapid increase in development and use of AI), and a pandemic. Trade union density rates had continued to decline globally, and vulnerable groups of workers were not fully represented. Workers had faced violence and threats, including intimidation, blacklisting, and gender-based

violence and harassment. New forms of work had presented new opportunities, but also challenges to workers' effective representation and collective voice. Forced labour and child labour had increased globally despite the universal ratification of Convention No. 182 in 2020.

27. More needed to be done to address discrimination and the promotion of inclusive labour markets for all workers, in particular to address the unique needs of women, persons with disabilities, migrant workers, LGBTQI+ persons, and other members of underserved communities. The inclusion of a safe and healthy working environment was welcomed as a FPRW, and the United States was open to discussing how occupational safety and health could be included in the integrated strategy on fundamental principles and rights at work.
28. Governments, multilateral organizations, the business community and civil society were increasingly recognizing the importance of integrating the worker's voice into supply chain risk assessments, and in approaches to remedy. The Global Coalition for Social Justice would provide an important opportunity to promote multilateral coherence and to highlight the importance of FPRW to achieving social justice and inclusive economic growth.
29. The Government member of Argentina also noted the global challenges since 2017, and in particular COVID-19, which had resulted in a loss of jobs and livelihoods that had reversed achievements made. Although these economic repercussions had reduced, armed conflicts resulting in upheavals in supply chains remained. In addition, the deterioration of the rule of law, erosion of civil and human rights, and the shrinkage of the democratic space had undermined FPRW. A long-term view must be taken to see the effects of climate change and the impact on structural formations of how workers organized. Further political, legal and instructional efforts should be made to close the gaps in implementation of the 1998 Declaration. FPRW must be guaranteed to uphold other labour rights, and to bring about inclusive, sustainable and lasting development. A renewed, coherent commitment to promote FPRW must be made.
30. The Government member of Barbados underscored Barbados' critical development in the expansion of the legal frameworks for the protection of workers' rights, through the extension of current laws and the development of new laws. These were a result of in-depth consultations among stakeholders and included a law on safety and health at work. Barbados had ratified the Violence and Harassment Convention, 2019 (No. 190), and had passed laws on safeguards against sexual harassment and discrimination and the prevention of discrimination. Through a minimum wage order of 2021, minimum wages had been set at a national level, with specific hourly rates for certain sectors. However, poverty crises and debt, cost-of-living and climate crises had had implications on the progress towards Sustainable Development Goal 8. In particular, the 2022 Bridgetown Initiative for the Reform of the Global Financial Architecture had brought sharply into focus the need to ensure livelihoods were climate resilient and supported a just transition in employment.
31. The Government member of Côte d'Ivoire outlined its achievements in promoting FPRW, noting that the right to collective bargaining had been enshrined in the Ivorian Constitution and the Labour Code. Forced labour had been prohibited by the Labour Code and the Protocol of 2014 to the Forced Labour Convention, 1930, had been ratified. An early warning system of child labour had been established as an essential component of the national action plan to combat child trafficking and exploitation. Discrimination in employment had also been prohibited by the Labour Code, which outlined equal pay for work of equal value, regardless of gender. Côte d'Ivoire had ratified Convention No. 155 and had produced a national occupational safety and health policy and programme for the country. In addition, a global

strategy for labour inspectorates had been planned to address related issues in the coming years, but further action would be required in that respect.

32. The Government member of Senegal concurred with the challenges in realizing FPRW in several countries, including Senegal, particularly due to obstacles to exercising civil liberties and human rights, informality, political instability and the decreasing democratic space, particularly in enterprises. Senegal had analysed its system of social dialogue and, as a result, had implemented a national action plan to strengthen social dialogue to enhance collective bargaining by providing capacity-building for stakeholders on freedom of association, the right to organize and collective bargaining, and negotiation techniques. Child labour had been aggravated by the loss of family income due to the economic crises caused by the pandemic. Senegal had adopted a national framework plan on the elimination of child labour, which aimed to eliminate the worst forms of child labour by 2030. Senegal had drafted a national occupational health and safety policy to address health and safety at work. The country had also ratified Convention No. 187. In addition, the labour and social security inspectorates had increased inspection activities to ensure compliance with regulations.
33. A representative of the Institution of Occupational Safety and Health said that the Office report showed that policy and regulatory gaps, as well as limited institutional capacity, had been persistent barriers to realizing occupational safety and health at a national level. The extension of legal occupational safety and health protection to unprotected workers had remained unaddressed and underdiscussed. While some initial progress had been made, the institution had often been unable to reach more vulnerable and marginalized workers in informal economies due to resourcing constraints. With the ILO and other partners, the institution had supported workers in the agriculture, fisheries and garment industries in remote rural locations to better understand their working conditions and the compounding risk factors and harms faced. Further partners would be welcome to join in that work.
34. A representative of the International Young Christian Workers pointed to the shortage of decent work opportunities that had forced many young workers to accept poor-quality, lowly paid jobs, without access to social protection. The contractualization, informalization, flexibilization and digitalization of work had denied the basic rights of workers on freedom of association, having a decent salary and access to social protection. Those problems had never been addressed by the authorities concerned, while young workers maintained the right to just work and a dignified life, which could not be achieved if they were continually exploited.
35. The Employer Vice-Chairperson highlighted the numerous points of convergence during the discussion, and the clear and widespread commitment to FPRW. There were structural barriers, widely mentioned by speakers, in particular the prevalence of informality and the adverse consequences of persistent informality, and the importance of addressing those and other root causes impeding implementation of FPRW. All FPRW must be addressed in an integrated manner, and they were universally applicable to all. The Employers welcomed the strong recognition of the value and importance of occupational safety and health as a FPRW and hoped that those areas of alignment would provide a solid foundation for a constructive and balanced outcome.
36. Precarious work did exist in the informal economy, however use of the terms such as "precarious", "insecure" and "non-standard forms of work" should be avoided, in favour of the agreed language of "diverse forms of work." The associated language had been linked to the platform economy, and care should be taken not to pre-judge prior to the forthcoming standard-setting discussion on the platform economy in 2025. Regarding global supply chains, the real challenges lay with the small and medium-sized enterprises that were purely domestic

in nature. Moreover, businesses that remained in the informal economy fell outside of the programmatic efforts of governments.

37. The Worker Vice-Chairperson reaffirmed the validity of the 1998 Declaration and reiterated that FPRW remained universal, inalienable and enabling rights, and applicable to all workers regardless of the sector, type of work or type of contract. The Committee's conclusions should underscore that point. Governments had made efforts to promote FPRW, including the work on strengthening the minimum wage. As stated by the Government member of Gabon, child labour trends were worrying, and there was a need for effective implementation. The Government member of Qatar had raised an important point, when outlining his Government's efforts on initiatives and cooperation on labour migration and labour inspection, regarding the vital nature of learning from each other. The Workers' group welcomed the news from Saudi Arabia regarding the increase in participation of women in the labour market, and from China on the promotion of collective bargaining, increasing the number of workers who were covered by collective agreements, and the access to employment protection for those in non-standard forms of work. Argentina had made a valid point regarding the importance of FPRW in times of crisis and the need to be able to have inclusive and sustainable development.
38. The overall regression in FPRW since the last recurrent discussion was deeply worrying. New problems included the challenges of digitalization, the rise of AI, the rise of the platform economy, growing numbers of armed conflicts and disasters, situations of fragility, climate change, the rise of global supply chains, and the rise in precarious forms of work. The ILO's priorities and future actions, including the new integrated strategy on FPRW, should specifically seek to address those conditions.
39. As previous speakers had noted, the breadth of informality was impeding FPRW. Formalization efforts had to be a part of any strategy for the promotion of workers' rights. The ILO Transition from the Informal to the Formal Economy Recommendation, 2015 (No. 204) provided an important framework for action. The Workers' group supported all action to strengthen labour inspectorates, a point made by several governments. Greater multilateral coherence to promote FPRW was a necessity. The Worker's group echoed the request for the Global Coalition of Social Justice to serve as a vehicle for the promotion of labour rights internationally.

Discussion point 2

Which policies, initiatives and practices at national and global levels have contributed to the respect, promotion and realization of fundamental principles and rights at work and, taking stock of the Integrated Strategy on Fundamental Principles and Rights at Work 2017–2023, which challenges and lessons learned should be drawn by ILO Member States and the Office in view of advancing social justice?

40. The Worker Vice-Chairperson stated that there were worrying deficits in policies and practices needed to support the realization of FPRW. The situation was compounded by the lack of ratification by Member States of core labour standards and, even where there was ratification, systematic violations occurred. Deregulation, the weakening of employment protection and collective bargaining had in many countries been adopted as part of a strategy for job creation, often promoted by international organizations. That approach was erroneous. Countries should take measures to promote formalization, in line with Recommendation No. 204. Member States' enforcement capacity must be strengthened to identify rights and sanction non-compliant employers. More action should be taken to protect domestic workers, platform workers, self-employed workers and to address the gender pay gap and labour migration issues. Regulation should extend throughout the entire length of global supply chains, in

particular regarding respect and promotion of freedom of association and collective bargaining. The group welcomed efforts made by some countries and regional organizations to extend protections to workers in non-standard forms of employment. It was important to highlight the continued relevance of the employment relationship as a primary gateway for ensuring labour rights. Employment misclassification would be combated by introducing a legal presumption of an employment relationship. Robust anti-discrimination legislation and effective enforcement should be introduced to counter multiple and intersecting forms of discrimination. The gender pay gap could be addressed through the introduction of transparency measures, as well as work-life measures. Migrant policies were undermining workers' rights in some countries and should be addressed through an examination of the intersection between migration and social and labour policies. The group reaffirmed its desire for strengthened international level frameworks to support decent work in supply chains, currently under ongoing discussion at the ILO. Responsible business conduct in supply chains could not be guaranteed without respect by multinational enterprises for freedom of association and collective bargaining. Better conditions should be put in place for transnational union organizing. With respect to climate change, the group recognized that an increasing number of countries were putting in place plans to safeguard workers who might be affected, but in very few cases, through collective bargaining on just transition. Finally, greater coherence between the lending conditions imposed by international financial institutions and fundamental labour standards was required.

41. The Employer Vice-Chairperson said that important policies, programmes and practices had contributed to the advancement of FPRW, including occupational safety and health policies, and reforms to discriminatory practices for women. The social partners had contributed to progress in recruitment and had provided support to micro, small and medium-sized enterprises (MSMEs) and self-employment. They had engaged with informal enterprises to support their formalization and had undertaken capacity-building on FPRW to support their members and in social dialogue to foster joint action. ILO technical assistance at the national level had been key for the constituents, such as in Uzbekistan and Qatar. The conclusions must acknowledge the importance of ILO initiatives to advance FPRW, including the ILO Helpdesk for Business on International Labour Standards of the Tripartite declaration of principles concerning multinational enterprises and social policy (MNE Declaration), and the ILO Global Business Network on Forced Labour, a powerful tool for sharing best practice on FPRW. Funding should be streamlined to allocate further resources to the network. The Better Work programme and Alliance 8.7 both helped promote FPRW and had an impact at local and global levels. The Office report could have capitalized better on those positive aspects, and should have assessed follow-up to the 2017 resolution concerning the second recurrent discussion on fundamental principles and rights at work (2017 resolution), which informed the following points that should be included in the conclusions: firstly, the need to recognize that resources were limited. The focus must be on agreed thematic areas, rather than on creating new areas. The 2017 resolution called for an integrated strategy for FPRW, involving balanced support for all FPRW, and ensuring coherence with other ILO strategic objectives. The conclusions should reaffirm the need for demand-driven focusing of efforts responding to the constituents' needs and fostering synergies between the ILO's four strategic objectives. Conversely, the Employers did not support the Office's description of a new "integrated approach", which would most likely diffuse, rather than sharpen, the focus on targeted interventions. Integrated strategies should address the root causes of the decent work deficit at the national level. The conclusions should highlight the positive relationship between sustainable enterprises, productivity growth and the promotion of and respect for FPRW. The Annual Review under the follow-up to

the 1998 Declaration provided an opportunity to develop and drive good practice, and that should also be reflected in the conclusions.

42. The Government member of Gabon, speaking on behalf of the Africa group, said that Member States in Africa continued to promote respect for and implementation of FPRW. Action taken to promote freedom of association and collective bargaining included the repeal of legislation prohibiting union membership for reasons of age or nationality. Member States had taken steps to strengthen the labour inspectorates, for example in the fishing sector. The group had also taken measures to align the school-leaving age with the minimum age of employment, as a means of combating child labour. Integrated action had been engaged regarding child labour, in conformity with the Durban Call to Action on the Elimination of Child Labour. Africa lacked specialists and doctors in occupational safety and health, and work was required to strengthen the capacities of government officials and labour inspectors. The countries also needed a tool to evaluate existing policies and programmes.
43. The Government member of Belgium, speaking on behalf of the EU and its Member States, said that North Macedonia, Montenegro, Serbia, Albania, Ukraine, Georgia, Iceland and Norway aligned themselves with the statement. She enumerated recent initiatives adopted by the EU on minimum wages and pay transparency, social dialogue and health and safety legislation, and trade policies. The EU had a zero-tolerance policy regarding child labour, and had adopted legislation on corporate sustainability due diligence, forced labour, corporate sustainability reporting and on platform work. The EU recalled that freedom of association and collective bargaining were enabling rights that underpinned the realization of FPRW. Protection from all grounds of discrimination should be promoted, paying due attention to multiple and intersecting forms of discrimination – the ILO could step up its action in that connection. Following the inclusion of the right to a safe and healthy working environment as a fifth category, it should be integrated into a holistic strategy to advance the mutually reinforcing nature of FPRW. The EU counted on the Global Coalition for Social Justice to enhance policy coherence leading up to the 2025 Second World Summit for Social Development.
44. The Government member of Qatar, speaking on behalf of the GCC, noted the consensus in the Committee on commitments and progress made, but also noted comments concerning insufficient attention paid to the root causes of FPRW deficits, and systematic problems related to implementation. Lack of human and financial resources should be addressed through specific methodologies, efficient governance and sustainable reform.
45. The Government member of the United Kingdom listed some of the latest initiatives taken in the United Kingdom, including legislation related to Convention No. 190 and the United Kingdom's LGBT rights programme focused on eliminating violence, discrimination and stigma. Gender participation and pay gaps remained a challenge at the domestic level and specific measures had been adopted accordingly. Since 2017, the United Kingdom had concluded 17 trade agreements that referenced FPRW, and research had recently been undertaken on levers to reduce business and human rights abuse in supply chains – an initiative in which the ILO could play a role.
46. The Government member of Canada stressed that FPRW contributed to achieving social, economic and development objectives, with freedom of association and collective bargaining as enabling rights. Canada, at the federal level, had recently taken action to prohibit the use of replacement workers during a strike or lockout, while the Government had enacted legislation to address forced labour in the context of supply chains, banning the importation of goods produced using forced labour, as well as legislation at the provincial level to protect young

workers, for example from hazardous forms of work. Regarding discrimination, Canada had introduced two new designated groups in the Employment Equity Act: Black people and 2SLGBTQI+ people. Work on reducing the pay gap was also going ahead.

47. The Government member of the United States highlighted the Presidential Memorandum on Advancing Worker Empowerment, Rights and High Labor Standards Globally, signed in November 2023, which included action to protect and promote respect of FPRW. In 2021, a task force on worker organizing and empowerment had been established, together with the Forced Labor Enforcement Task Force, while in 2022, the Interagency Task Force to Combat Child Labor Exploitation had been created. The Government advocated a whole-of-government approach to promoting FPRW, emphasizing the enabling rights of freedom of association and collective bargaining. Research had shown that the prevalence of child labour was lessened where adult workers enjoyed those rights.
48. The Government member of Honduras referred to the recent tripartite meeting held in the country, with ILO support, to define its Decent Work Country Programme for 2024–27. Honduras had reopened tripartite social dialogue, in order to prevent collective labour conflicts and anti-union violence. The Government was in the process of ratifying Conventions Nos 155 and 187, as well as Convention No. 190. Regarding the Discrimination (Employment and Occupation) Convention, 1958 (No. 111), a labour inspectorate protocol to identify and sanction discrimination at work was under development. International cooperation and multilateralism were critical to guaranteeing sustainable and inclusive social protection.
49. The Government member of Mexico outlined the 2019 reforms introduced by the Government to restructure the labour system to allow trade unions to undertake their work freely and democratically. Over 30,500 collective labour agreements had since been concluded, benefiting more than 5 million workers. Gender equality in union representation was promoted. The labour reform included provisions for employers and workers to implement measures against discrimination and harassment in the workplace and further provisions to combat trafficking in persons and child labour. The Government had engaged the process of ratifying Convention No. 187.
50. The Government member of Colombia indicated that the Government was taking steps to guarantee access to social protection for workers in precarious or informal employment. Digitalization and the use of AI required special attention with regard to safeguarding FPRW, by ensuring human participation both at the design stage and in system supervision. Colombia was working to identify risks arising from remote work and in designing appropriate inspection, surveillance and control strategies for such work. Freedom of association and collective bargaining must be inclusive, with strengthened trade unions. It must cover formal employment, but also rural and emerging employment.
51. The Government member of Türkiye said that FPRW were guaranteed under the Constitution in her country. The social partners engaged in social dialogue to address issues arising from the world of work, such as in setting minimum wages. The Government had implemented plans and programmes to prevent industrial accidents and occupational diseases, and those were effectively monitored. Türkiye prioritized the prevention of child labour and promoted the access of women, persons with disabilities and young persons to the labour market, through specific incentives and financial mechanisms.
52. The Government member of Brazil noted worldwide challenges to the effective application of FPRW. Social dialogue was essential to addressing those issues. In Brazil, tripartite councils, and tripartite and interministerial working groups, had been reactivated and were deliberating on platform work and the implementation of the Labour Relations (Public Service) Convention,

1978 (No. 151). The Employ More Women Act of 2023 had introduced the concept of gender equality in parenthood, making it possible for women and men to share parental leave. Further action had been taken to ensure equal pay for men and women under the Equal Pay Act.

53. The Government member of Mozambique said that the Government had ratified Conventions Nos 155 and 187 in 2024 and was in the process of ratifying Convention No. 190. Also in 2024, legislation had extended maternity leave from two to three months and had introduced paternity leave and remote work. Efforts were under way to improve the protection of agricultural workers and to extend social security to self-employed workers.
54. The Government member of India said that India was making strides towards fulfilling its Sustainable Development Goal targets. International labour standards were key to advancing principles of governance in the world of work and to mitigating the effects of economic and social crises. Social dialogue was a core pillar of decent work and provided a linkage between international labour standards and the country's legal framework. India's labour regulatory system was informed by international labour standards, with four individual codes, respectively on wages; social security; industrial relations; and occupational safety, health and working conditions. Social security cover had been extended to informal sector workers, migrant workers, and gig economy and platform workers. Discriminatory legislation had been amended to allow women to take up work previously prohibited to them. Action had been taken to install a minimum wage in the formal and informal sectors, and to prevent gender discrimination in matters related to wages and recruitment. The informal sector occupied a significant portion of employment and economic activity, and the Government had taken a number of initiatives to improve the skills and lifelong learning of informal workers. The Government had also instigated a range of in-kind social protection measures. India's latest Decent Work Country Programme was focused on promotion of FPRW.
55. The Worker Vice-Chairperson said that, while efforts made by governments to promote various aspects of FPRW were commendable, major challenges persisted. The role of social dialogue and collective bargaining as enabling rights made it all the more important to protect those rights and remove barriers to union organizing. The group agreed with its Employer counterparts on the importance of social dialogue to support FPRW, although the Employer Vice-Chairperson had not included freedom of association and collective bargaining to that end. The inclusion of a safe and healthy working environment among FPRW was encouraging countries to examine the ratification of the Occupational Safety and Health (Dock Work) Convention, 1979 (No. 152), and Convention No. 187. Universal ratification and implementation of those instruments was essential. The group upheld their view, contrary to the Employer Vice-Chairperson's statement of his group's view, that an integrated approach to implementation of FPRW was essential.
56. The Employer Vice-Chairperson highlighted the points of convergence his group had observed during the discussion, noting the success stories that had been evoked by the Africa group, India and the Government member of Belgium on behalf of the EU and its Member States. However, matters had been raised that could not be endorsed by the Employers' group, such as the mischaracterization of work as "precarious, insecure or non-standard". In the ILO Centenary Declaration, the term "diverse forms of work" was used. Such forms of work should not only be considered in negative terms. They could also create opportunities in the formal economy. Precarity was an informal economy issue. Criticism had been levelled at global supply chains, however the ILO focused on all supply chains, whether global or not. While the group did not maintain that supply chains were free of problems, the Office report also highlighted their importance in advancing FPRW. Moreover, there was an ILO supply chain strategy that spanned the period up to 2027, which was not to be negotiated in the current

discussion. Mandatory human rights due diligence, under agreed ILO policy, was promoted under the voluntary framework of the United Nations (UN) Guiding Principles on Business and Human Rights. Some countries had asserted that freedom of association and collective bargaining were enabling rights for the other FPRW. That was a variation of the language used in the 2008 Social Justice Declaration, which referred to FPRW as “both rights and enabling conditions”. The group agreed with the importance of freedom of association and collective bargaining, but the root causes of FPRW deficits were not due to the absence of those rights. In Latin America, a reduction in child labour had resulted from policies including aligning the minimum school leaving age with the minimum age of employment. Access to social protection and wage policies could also help. Promoting sustainable enterprises and an enabling environment would help address informality and establish social protection floors. The group supported an integrated strategy, indeed it considered it critical to making progress. However, an integrated approach, where one FPRW could not be addressed without addressing all the others, would simply complicate and impede progress.

Discussion point 3

In pursuing social justice, how can the Organization scale up its action to support Member States, including through an integrated strategy, and which additional efforts are needed to further respect, promote and realize fundamental principles and rights at work? What priorities should be identified within the areas of partnerships, international policy coherence, institutional capacity-building, research, development cooperation, Decent Work Country Programmes and standards-related action? What actions should the Office and Member States take to achieve the universal ratification and effective implementation of the ten fundamental Conventions and the Protocol of 2014 to the Forced Labour Convention, 1930?

57. The Employer Vice-Chairperson recalled the gaps in implementation of FPRW at the national level, the need to address the root causes of those gaps, and the need for inclusive economic growth to foster sustainable enterprises. In order to achieve this, Member States must: eliminate implementation gaps; promote formalization in line with Recommendation No. 204; promote sustainable and inclusive economic growth; create an enabling environment for sustainable enterprises as a major driver of productivity and job creation; innovate to support MSMEs and newly formed enterprises; establish means to monitor and adapt policies and practices; and harness the potential of technology and digitalization.
58. The Employers’ group supported the following ILO actions on internal coherence: continuing to develop and pursue an integrated strategy on FPRW providing balanced support to all FPRW, integrating efforts on occupational safety and health; strengthening existing tools and instruments (in particular better resourcing for the ILO Helpdesk for Business on International Labour Standards, the ILO Global Business Network on Forced Labour, and the Child Labour Platform); and continuing to focus on the three thematic areas articulated in 2017 by strengthening the synergies between all ILO actions. ILO action should target root causes, the capacity of labour inspectorates, promoting sustainable enterprises, including building on synergies between the Fundamental Principles and Rights at Work Branch and the Sustaining Competitive and Responsible Enterprises (SCORE) programme. More should be done to increase the visibility of the ILO as a central, widely accessible repository for reliable FPRW data.
59. The Employers’ group wished the Office to undertake: peer-reviewed and scientifically rigorous research on the economic and social impact of informality on the realization of FPRW; evidence-based research and collection of data leveraging technology and digitalization to tackle the root causes of FPRW deficits; and action-oriented research on best practices on

integrating FPRW into MSMEs and newly formalized enterprises. Greater priority must be given to effective implementation of FPRW at the national level. To that end, a restructuring of the Annual Review questionnaire and the development of a user-friendly survey instrument to facilitate follow-up actions and support from the ILO were proposed.

60. The Worker Vice-Chairperson stressed the importance of the Office continuing to promote universal ratification and effective implementation of ILO core instruments, with a special focus on freedom of association and collective bargaining. The ILO should better promote ratification of core labour standards in Decent Work Country Programmes and technical assistance efforts and better respond to and ensure the allocation of resources for technical assistance requests made under the Annual Reviews.
61. Regarding standards, the Office should specifically promote Conventions Nos 87, 98, 155 and 187. The Office should improve linkages between the 1998 Declaration and the ILO supervisory system outcomes and the ILO integrated strategy on FPRW. Violations and deficits noted by the ILO supervisory system should result in immediate responses at the national level and should affect development cooperation, Decent Work Country Programmes and technical assistance.
62. The Office should continue an integrated approach to FPRW and to focus on the five thematic areas of: informality; conflict and crisis situations; digital platform work and other emerging forms of work; supply chains; and climate change action and just transition. There should be a balance in attention and resources across all five FPRWs, with freedom of association, collective bargaining, gender equality, non-discrimination and inclusion kept as cross-cutting priorities in the integrated strategy. The ILO should build the capacity of workers' organizations to promote the realization of rights at work for all workers, with a focus on the most vulnerable.
63. The Workers' group requested more regular data collection and research on: (i) forced labour and updates on the Forced Labour Observatory; (ii) transnational social dialogue; (iii) public procurement; (iv) the impact of non-standard forms of work and new technologies on FPRW; (v) FPRW in the context of a just transition towards a zero-carbon economy; (vi) human rights due diligence laws and their implementation in line with international labour standards; and (vii) trade and labour provisions in trade agreements on FPRW, as well as on import bans on goods made using forced labour. The recent decision for the Office to publish its Social Dialogue Flagship Report regularly was welcome. It was stressed that the ILO must actively engage in ongoing discussions for international business and human rights, especially with regard to a binding UN business and human rights treaty.
64. To build partnerships for supporting FPRW, the ILO should further engage with the World Bank, the International Monetary Fund and multilateral development banks, as well as with the WTO. The ILO must advocate for high-level political commitment to FPRW, including universal ratification of ILO labour standards, and within the UN system. FPRW must be a core part of the Global Coalition for Social Justice and the forthcoming Second World Summit for Social Development.
65. The Government member of Gabon, speaking on behalf of the Africa group, stated that the ILO must examine the root causes of barriers to implementation of international labour standards in many contexts, including Africa. That would require implementation of the integrated strategy, taking account of the social and cultural context. The ILO should also increase support for ratification of other fundamental ILO Conventions and increase monitoring and follow-up of activities, policies and plans on respecting FPRW at work. The Africa group welcomed the ILO's commitment to strengthening the capacity of governments in the area of labour inspections and institutions to solve labour disputes. The Organization

should ensure that national strategies related to FPRW at work were adequately resourced to allow an appropriate response to needs.

66. The Government member of Belgium, speaking on behalf of the EU and its Member States, said that the ILO's priorities and future actions must match the challenges of transition and crises, and recalled the relevance of the 2030 Agenda for Sustainable Development. The ILO should continue analysing the impact of climate change on FPRW and associated climate adaptation and mitigation measures. A follow-up to the integrated strategy covering all five FPRWs, in line with the "One ILO" approach, would be appreciated. The Office should continue providing technical assistance, taking into account the interdependence and mutually reinforcing nature of FPRW. A holistic and integrated approach to the respect, realization and promotion of FPRW was required. There should be better interplay between the findings of ILO supervisory bodies and the technical assistance provided.
67. The ILO should further explore how the decline of collective bargaining and trade union density could be addressed, including the gaps in representation for most vulnerable workers. Continued attention should be paid to strengthening the capacity of the social partners, and to cooperation with civil society, including in the context of the Global Coalition for Social Justice. Further research was required into barriers to the full realization of FPRW and into good policy practices. The ILO should continue its work on data collection and analysis as a basis for evidence-based policymaking and should make efforts to reinforce Member States' data capacities as well. It should maintain its advocacy in the multilateral system on mainstreaming FPRW across all policy fields, including within the United Nations, with international financial institutions and regional economic organizations.
68. The Government member of Switzerland indicated the Government's wish to see greater coherence in internal and external ILO policies. The "One ILO" approach should be applied in a coherent fashion throughout all ILO offices. The Organization should collaborate with partners, including international financial institutions, at an international level on economic development cooperation. The Better Work programme and the interdepartmental approach in Ethiopia were examples that should be expanded more broadly in the ILO and among the constituents.
69. The Government member of the United Kingdom suggested an iterative process of continual improvement to be developed through constituent knowledge-sharing and Office operationalization through technical assistance and decent work country programmes. The ILO supervisory system could also play a key part in diffusing knowledge within the Organization of developments and trends to support equal focus on ratifying and implementing FPRW. The United Kingdom's locally led approach to international development could be an example approach to respond to the different needs of Member States. New capacity-building levers could include business investors who had an influence on combating human trafficking and forced labour in supply chains.
70. The Government member of Mexico provided examples of the ILO initiatives to combat child labour in Latin America and the Caribbean, and highlighted its partnerships, including as a Pathfinder Country of Alliance 8.7 and as Co-chair, with Qatar, of the Fair Recruitment Initiative. Those types of exchanges of experience, capacity-building, and cooperation could help boost respect for, and implementation of, FPRW.
71. The Government member of China recommended the strengthening of policy coordination and cooperation, as well as the enhancement of development cooperation for developing countries. More discussions should be held to explore Member States' diversity in terms of culture, history and legal systems. The supervisory system should ensure that its comments

on implementation efforts were up to date, fact based and took consideration of diversity. Platform workers must be protected, as flexible and new forms of employment had been important channels for Chinese workers to increase income, while at the same time posing challenges in the protection of workers' rights. The Office should conduct research on: (i) employers' responsibilities and the employment relationship; (ii) extending social security coverage; and (iii) the impact of and responses to digital technological advancement and AI on labour rights and lifelong learning.

72. The Government member of the United States emphasized that FPRW were mutually reinforcing and should be implemented in a balanced manner. That had not yet been achieved through the current strategy. Reports had outlined that less focus had been given to freedom of association than to forced labour and child labour, which were increasing in global estimates. The Government strongly supported according higher visibility and work density to less frequently covered FPRW categories, in particular freedom of association and collective bargaining, and announced in November 2023 in this regard a new project of up to US\$40 million to support countries and research activities on freedom of association and collective bargaining. Additional attention was also needed to promote gender equality, non-discrimination and inclusion. The Office should, for example, develop country-based qualitative and quantitative research on the labour market situation of women, persons with disabilities, people living with HIV, indigenous and tribal peoples and other population groups affected by discrimination and exclusion, including on the grounds of race, sexual orientation and gender identity. ILO development cooperation and the ILO supervisory machinery should develop synergies. Given the lack of information on "One ILO" initiatives undertaken from 2017 to 2023, further details in that regard would be welcome.
73. The Government member of Canada echoed the recommendations for the Office to streamline its operations through increased internal coordination, and to maximize the use of resources when addressing the uneven distribution of funding between FPRW. Regarding discrimination, the ILO had a key role in assisting the constituents to better understand barriers and gaps by providing disaggregated data on discrimination and the intersectionalities of discrimination. Particular focus should be placed on the inclusion of mental health considerations when integrating safe and healthy work environments. Regarding technical assistance, priority should be given to the integration of FPRW into the UN Sustainable Development Cooperation Framework and ILO Decent Work Country Programmes, complemented by building the capacity of employers' and workers' organizations for meaningful social dialogue. The ILO supervisory system could take on an important role in identifying targeted interventions. The Government strongly encouraged initiatives such as the Equal Pay International Coalition (EPIC) for equal pay for work of equal value. The ILO should provide ongoing advice on FPRW in the context of increasing due diligence legislation, responsible business conduct in supply chains, and labour provisions in trade agreements.
74. The Government member of Barbados recommended action to leverage the regional similarities in the design of context-specific programmes to promote FPRW and to facilitate knowledge-sharing among members in real time. Priorities for action included the modernization of labour legislation, which should be informed by related gap analyses. This was of particular importance to small island developing States, where the effects of the climate crisis were clear. It was also vital that resources were directed to capacity-building in labour inspection, which was essential to promoting FPRW. The ILO must continue to form and strengthen relationships within the UN system and international financial institutions to promote FPRW. The ILO must intensify advocacy to ensure that FPRW were included in international treaties for trade and financing. The Global Coalition for Social Justice could

provide a common backdrop for the development of coherent policies at the international level. Promotion of FPRW must include the actors in the social and solidarity economy.

75. The Government member of Türkiye reflected positively on the ILO's assistance in Türkiye and noted a desire to see an expansion of these activities in the region. The ILO should limit itself to universally accepted terminology, in order to respect Member States' diversity of culture and legal systems. There was a need to strengthen support for women in the labour market, to continue the eradication of child labour and forced labour, and to offer training for non-employment educational training.
76. The Government member of Egypt outlined several legislative efforts, projects and programmes the Government had undertaken in support of FPRW, including freedom of association and collective bargaining. Measures had been taken that aimed at achieving gender equality, empowering women economically, enabling them to reconcile family duties with work requirements, and eliminating all forms of discrimination. The Egyptian delegation, while supporting much of the content of the Office report, rejected in substance paragraphs 41 and 96 as they introduced new categories that did not align with international human rights law and did not enjoy the consensus of all ILO constituents.
77. The Government member of Indonesia noted the importance of the protection of a safe and healthy working environment, which was reflected in Indonesian national legislation. The aftermath of COVID-19 effects had been ongoing, including hiring and labour issues, layoffs and furloughs. In addition, digitalization had fundamentally transformed the economy, diversifying and expanding job opportunities, resulting in the growth of MSMEs. Working conditions were regulated not only through national legislation but also through collective agreements between enterprises and trade unions.
78. The Government member of Algeria highlighted the efforts made by Algeria to strengthen the social security system, employ new talent from universities, extend social security for vulnerable groups, and increase maternity leave. The labour law had been revised to provide greater opportunities for workers to establish unions and to facilitate union registration and provide for "entrepreneurship leave" whereby workers could return to their former employment should a venture fail. The Government was taking steps to boost entrepreneurship through the establishment of micro enterprises and start-ups. Algeria aimed to strengthen its continental role in social security by becoming a central depository for social security knowledge for the continent.
79. The Government member of Peru said that coherence between national and international policies was needed to ensure that there were no conflicts between economic and labour rights objectives. Ratification of the core Conventions should be pushed forward, together with efforts to ensure their implementation. The Government reaffirmed its commitment to working with the international community by exchanging good practices, strengthening capacities and promoting technical cooperation.
80. The Government member of Chile invited the Office to support the exchange of practices within regions, and through Alliance 8.7 and related coalitions. It was important to maintain and integrate the gender perspective within normative instruments in a holistic approach. Chile also attached great importance to occupational safety and health within FPRW. Partnerships were key to increasing respect for and implementing FPRW: governments, the social partners and the Office could not work alone.
81. The Employer Vice-Chairperson stressed that the outcome of the Committee's work should be balanced and based on consensus. There were many points of convergence among

participants. Some speakers had called for the need to evaluate impact in order to assess good practices. Technical assistance should be demand driven and responsive to Member States' and constituents' needs. Thus, there was a need for high-quality data to allow informed decisions to be taken. The focus should be on capitalizing on ILO initiatives that worked well, which could be duplicated elsewhere. The Employers acknowledged the relationship between FPRW and the four pillars of the ILO strategic objectives, in line with the 2008 Social Justice Declaration. The group wished to be clear that the 2008 Declaration stated that FPRW were "rights and enabling conditions" for the pillars, rather than "enabling rights". The Employers also urged the Committee not to ignore the fact that digitalization could create opportunities for economic development and growth. The following priorities should inform the conclusions of the Committee: decisive action to eliminate the implementation gap, moving beyond ratification; strong political will and commitment to addressing root causes; the imperative of building constituents' core capabilities appropriate to national circumstances; creating an enabling environment for sustainable enterprises; and transitioning from informality to formality. ILO actions must support these imperatives, while being anchored in evidence-based research. These actions should be taken without losing sight of resource limitations and should be prioritized to ensure the greatest impact.

82. The Worker Vice-Chairperson referred to the Employer group's rejection of the terms "non-standard forms of work", made on the grounds that the term was not agreed ILO terminology, and that the term "diverse forms of work" should be used. There had in fact been no agreed terminology, and the language proposed by the Employers obscured the fact that certain forms of work came with less security and lower rights and protections for workers. The Workers also disagreed with the Employers' words "moving beyond ratification of core ILO instruments". Ratification was needed to ensure that national legislation was in line with international standards and to engage the ILO supervisory machinery. Many governments had stressed the importance of ratifying standards. The group had, however, heard constructive proposals, including calls for further technical support for labour inspection, calls to reinforce development cooperation and to integrate FPRW into decent work country programmes. The group was in favour of strengthened cooperation with international financial institutions to improve policy coherence at the international level and promote FPRW in international trade. The Global Coalition for Social Justice could serve as a crucial forum for promoting FPRW at the international level. The Africa group had highlighted that it was not only workers that profited from the fundamental Conventions, but also employers. The Workers held that governments also profited from those instruments. The group wholeheartedly concurred with the view that social dialogue was of critical importance and recalled that collective bargaining was a central element of social dialogue.

Discussion of the draft conclusions

83. The Chairperson introduced the draft conclusions prepared by the drafting group, noting that 160 [amendments](#) had been submitted for consideration. Amendments addressing points of the draft conclusions that remained in brackets would be dealt with in the same manner as non-bracketed text.

Draft conclusions concerning the third recurrent discussion on fundamental principles and rights at work

Title

84. The title “Draft conclusions concerning the third recurrent discussion on fundamental principles and rights at work” was adopted.

Subtitle

I. Fundamental principles and rights at work are more needed and relevant than ever

85. The subtitle of part I “I. Fundamental principles and rights at work are more needed and relevant than ever” was adopted without amendment.

Points 1 to 4

86. Points 1 to 4 were adopted.

Point 5

87. The Government member of Belgium, speaking on behalf of the EU Member States, introduced an amendment (A.96) to replace the words “per cent” with “percentage points”.
88. The Worker and Employer Vice-Chairpersons and Government members supported the amendment.
89. The amendment was adopted.
90. Point 5 was adopted as amended.

New point to be inserted after point 5

91. The Worker Vice-Chairperson introduced an amendment (A.167) to insert a new point after point 5, to read “Workers in all sectors and across the world continue to be exposed to unsafe and unhealthy working environments and new risks have emerged, including heat stress and psychosocial risks”. It would highlight the continued challenges of ensuring the right to a healthy and safe working environment and emerging occupational safety and health risks, as raised in paragraphs 17, 49 and 52 of the Office report.
92. The Government member of Belgium, speaking on behalf of the EU Member States, proposed a subamendment to replace “new risks have emerged” with “risks have intensified”, given that they were not new risks.
93. The Government member of Gabon, speaking on behalf of the Africa group, supported the amendment by the Workers’ group, as subamended by the EU Member States.
94. The Government member of China made a reservation to the wording “Workers in all sectors” in the new point proposed by the Workers’ group, considering the situation to have been exaggerated, particularly in his country.
95. The Government member of Norway, also speaking on behalf of the Government of Iceland, supported the Workers’ amendment as subamended by the Government member of Belgium.
96. The Employer Vice-Chairperson proposed a subamendment to insert the word “certain” before “risks have intensified”. He proposed a further subamendment to replace “Workers” with “While workers” at the start of the sentence, to replace the full stop after “psychosocial risks”

with a comma, and to then insert the wording “statistics for the period from 2000 to 2019 suggest an overall improvement in workplace safety, marked by a 10 per cent decrease in the work-related mortality rate”. He proposed another subamendment to insert a second sentence, to read “This calls for the promotion, respect and realization of a safe and healthy work environment to protect workers, enhance work performance and productivity, improve staff retention, and minimize tension and conflict”.

97. The Government member of Mexico, speaking on behalf of the group of Latin American and Caribbean countries (GRULAC), supported the amendment proposed as subamended.
98. The Government member of China, expressing appreciation for the efforts to reach consensus, proposed a subamendment to replace “all sectors” with “certain sectors”, and supported the other language proposed.
99. The Worker Vice-Chairperson, pointing out that point 4 noted that challenges remained, and that the subsequent points discussed the challenges while the previous points had discussed progress and positive developments, expressed a reservation about the location of the proposed new point as worded. He proposed a subamendment, to read “While statistics for the period from 2000 to 2019 suggest an overall improvement in workplace safety, including a 10 per cent decrease in the work-related mortality rate, workers in all sectors across the world continue to be exposed to unsafe and unhealthy working environments and certain risks have intensified, including heat stress and psychosocial risks”. The Office report addressed all sectors, not certain sectors, and there were certain risks that applied to all sectors.
100. The Employer Vice-Chairperson said that, in the interests of moving forward, the Employers would agree to inserting their proposed second sentence elsewhere, provided that the sentence was framed as it stood. The Employers supported the subamendment proposed by China for “certain sectors” to replace “all sectors”.
101. The Worker Vice-Chairperson, emphasizing that paragraph 49 of the Office report referred to “all sectors”, said that his group preferred to retain the term.
102. The Government member of the United States appreciated the reference to “heat stress” and “psychosocial risks”, which were of particular importance to her Government. She proposed a subamendment to delete “including a 10 per cent decrease in the work-related mortality rate,” from the additional sentence proposed in the Employers’ subamendments as, although that percentage was noted in the Office report, the latter also subsequently noted that the challenge had not diminished in absolute terms, and that as the global labour force had increased over the period, 0.33 million more work-related mortalities had been seen. She was therefore concerned that the context would not be clear in the draft conclusion. She supported the wording “all sectors”.
103. The Government member of Canada seconded the subamendment.
104. The Government member of China said that, while “all sectors” was indeed in the Office report, the latter was just the basis for discussion; the conclusions should accurately reflect the different realities of Member States.
105. The Government member of Canada proposed a further subamendment to delete “in all sectors”.
106. Several Governments seconded the subamendment proposed by Canada, including Belgium, speaking on behalf of the EU and its Member States, and Mexico, speaking on behalf of GRULAC.

107. The Government member of Algeria proposed a subamendment to replace “Workers in all sectors” with “Workers in sectors and regions around the world”.
108. The Government member of Tunisia seconded the subamendment proposed by Algeria.
109. The Government member of Türkiye supported the subamendment proposed by Canada but did not support the subamendment proposed by Algeria.
110. The Worker Vice-Chairperson did not support the subamendment proposed by Algeria but supported the subamendment proposed by Canada.
111. The Employer Vice-Chairperson said that he would not block the consensus to either of the proposed formulations.
112. The Government member of Ghana proposed a subamendment to the subamendment proposed by Canada to insert a comma after “safety” and to replace “and” before “certain risks” with “with” and to replace “have” with “being”. The sentence would therefore read “While statistics for the period 2000 to 2019 suggest an overall improvement in workplace safety, workers across the world continue to be exposed to unsafe and unhealthy working environments with certain risks being intensified, including heat stress and psychosocial risks.”
113. The Government member of Cameroon seconded the subamendment proposed by Ghana.
114. The Government member of Mexico, speaking on behalf of GRULAC, supported the subamendment proposed by Canada and expressed flexibility on the subamendments proposed by Ghana.
115. The Government member of Sierra Leone supported the subamendment proposed by Canada but did not support the subamendment proposed by Ghana.
116. The Government member of the United Kingdom supported the subamendment proposed by Canada and expressed flexibility on the subamendment proposed by Ghana.
117. The Government member of Algeria supported the subamendment proposed by Ghana.
118. The Government member of Mexico, speaking on behalf of GRULAC, supported the subamendment proposed by Canada but preferred to retain the word “and” rather than “with”, which had been proposed by Ghana, as “unsafe and unhealthy working environments” and “certain risks have intensified” were separate concepts.
119. The Government member of the United States supported the first part of the subamendment proposed by Ghana to insert a comma after “safety” but preferred to retain “and certain risks being intensified”.
120. The subamendment proposed by Algeria fell.
121. The amendment was adopted as subamended by Canada and Ghana.
122. The new point to be placed after point 5 was adopted as amended.

Point 6

123. Point 6 was adopted.

Point 7

124. The Government member of Gabon, speaking on behalf of the Africa group, introduced an amendment (A.169) to replace the draft as follows: “the prevalence and nature of certain forms of work pose special challenges for protecting and promoting these workers’ fundamental

rights.” His group was proposing that wording in the interests of conciseness and precision, highlighting the specific elements of the prevalence and nature of forms of work and the special challenges they posed for the protection of FPRW.

125. The Worker Vice-Chairperson proposed a subamendment to delete “certain forms of work” and to replace it with “insecure forms of work and misclassification of workers”. It was important to add the reference to insecure forms of work and misclassification of workers because it was an issue debated extensively, including in relation to platform workers. Moreover, the language “certain forms of work” obscured the fact that certain forms of work came with less security and lower rights and protection for workers. The last two recurrent discussions of the Conference, on employment policy and labour protection, had not shied away from the need to address insecure forms of work.
126. The Employer Vice-Chairperson proposed a subamendment to insert before “At the same time,” the wording “Diverse, new and emerging forms of work create both opportunities and risks. They can be an avenue for workers and their families to escape poverty and enter the formal economy”. The remainder of point 7 would continue as per the Africa group’s proposed amendment (A.169).
127. The Worker Vice-Chairperson did not support the Employers’ proposed subamendment, as it watered down the exact point that the Workers sought to make: the fact that there were more workers in insecure forms of work and misclassified and therefore excluded from labour legislation, labour rights protection and FPRW.
128. The Government member of Mexico, speaking on behalf of GRULAC, supported the subamendment; it was important to mention diverse, new and emerging forms of work. It was also important to note that there were risks and opportunities but that there was a need for a better understanding of them.
129. The Government member of China supported the subamendment.
130. The Government member of Belgium, speaking on behalf of the EU Member States, proposed a subamendment to replace “certain forms of work can pose certain challenges for protecting and promoting FPRW” with “insecure forms of work and misclassifying workers can exacerbate challenges and decent work deficits and pose challenges to the realization of FPRW”.
131. The Government member of Algeria sought clarification on the rationale for replacing “misclassification” with “misclassifying” workers.
132. The Government member of Belgium, speaking on behalf of the EU and its Member States, explained that “misclassification” implied the absence of legislation, whereas “misclassifying” referred to the lack of enforcement and application of existing legislation.
133. The Employer Vice-Chairperson said that the use of terms such as “insecure” and “precarious” would stigmatize a particular sector or contractual arrangement and impound a certain subjectivity, bias and ideology, which the Employers’ group could not support. He proposed a subamendment to replace “the prevalence and nature of insecure forms of work and misclassifying workers can exacerbate challenges and decent work deficits and pose challenges to the realization of FPRW” with “the prevalence and nature of certain forms of work can exacerbate challenges and decent work deficits and pose challenges to the realization of FPRW”.
134. The Worker Vice-Chairperson proposed a subamendment to replace the wording of point 7 with “Various emerging forms of work can offer both opportunities and risks. When adequately regulated to provide decent work, they can be an avenue for workers and their families to

escape poverty and enter the formal economy. At the same time, insecure forms of work and misclassifying workers can exacerbate decent work deficits and pose challenges to the realization of FPRW”.

135. The Employer Vice-Chairperson did not support the subamendment, as the text retained the inappropriate mention of “insecure forms of work”. In addition, decent work did not require adequate regulation and the Employers could therefore not agree to “when adequately regulated to provide decent work”. Furthermore, it was not just various emerging forms of work that could provide those opportunities; some so-called “emerging” forms of work had been around for a long time.
136. The Government member of Mexico, speaking on behalf of GRULAC, underlined the importance of addressing the issue of worker classification, as it related to certainty of the employment relationship and the ability of workers to better defend their working conditions.
137. The Worker Vice-Chairperson said that his group could agree to the deletion of the word “emerging”, to ensure the wording was more inclusive. He noted that there were many workers in insecure forms of work who were sometimes misclassified, and that forms of work needed to be more accurately regulated in order for workers to obtain their rights. Adequate regulation would be required for decent work.
138. The Employer Vice-Chairperson proposed a subamendment to delete “when adequately regulated to provide decent work”, “insecure” and “and misclassifying workers”. He remained open to discussing “misclassification” but, in lieu of misclassification, “failure to determine correct status to avoid employment relationship” could be accepted as more precise and factual. His proposed subamended text would therefore read “Various forms of work can offer both opportunities and risks. They can be an avenue for workers and their families to escape poverty and enter the formal economy. At the same time, certain forms of work and failing to establish the correct status of workers in order to avoid an employment relationship can exacerbate and pose challenges”.
139. The Worker Vice-Chairperson preferred to maintain “when adequately regulated”, as regulation was needed to ensure the clarity of worker status. He proposed a subamendment, to read “Various forms of work can offer both opportunities and risks. When providing decent work there can be an avenue for workers and their families to escape poverty and enter the formal economy. At the same time, insecure forms of work and misclassifying workers can exacerbate decent work deficits and pose challenges to the realization of FPRW”.
140. The Government member of Belgium, speaking on behalf of the EU and its Member States, supported the subamendment proposed by the Workers’ group.
141. The Government member of China preferred the language “new and emerging forms of work” but could support “various forms of work.” If the term “regulated” were not to be used, he would suggest instead “when appropriately regulated in accordance with the national context” after “providing decent work”, so as to ensure taking account of the diverse economic situations of different Member States. In most developing countries, job creation came before decent work; it would be difficult for all jobs created to be decent. In the interests of reaching consensus, he could be flexible on “insecure forms of work” and “misclassification of workers or “misclassifying workers”.
142. The Government member of Mexico, speaking on behalf of GRULAC, said that his group would prefer to keep “emerging” but supported the subamendment proposed by the Workers’ group.

143. The Government member of the United States appreciated the mention of addressing the priority area of misclassification of workers, as her Government had focused on that area recently. She also preferred to keep “new” or “emerging” forms of work but could be flexible.
144. The Government member of Canada said that she would like to see some reflection of emerging forms of work, but could be flexible, and supported retaining “When providing decent work”. The term “insecure forms of work” had been agreed in previous Conference discussions, and misclassification of workers remained a significant challenge for the platform and gig economy. She supported the text as subamended by the Workers’ group.
145. The Employer Vice-Chairperson, as a basis for moving forward, proposed a subamendment so that the point would read “Various emerging forms of work can offer both opportunities and risks. When providing decent work, they can be an avenue for workers and their families to escape poverty and enter the formal economy. When they do not provide decent work, or are misclassified, they can be insecure and pose challenges to the realization of FPRW”.
146. The Worker Vice-Chairperson requested a clarification on whether misclassification referred to the form of work or to the worker. It would be clearer to address the misclassification of workers than of work. The notion of insecurity was missing in the text, and he proposed a subamendment to replace “or are misclassified” with “or are insecure and are misclassified”.
147. The Employer Vice-Chairperson could not agree to including the reference to insecurity and deferred to the Office on how to deal with misclassification.
148. The Representative of the Secretary-General said that, in the ILO, misclassification was in relation to workers, not to work or a form of work.
149. The Worker Vice-Chairperson and the Employer Vice-Chairperson agreed to propose a subamendment, which read “Various emerging forms of work can offer both opportunities and risks. When providing decent work, they can be an avenue for workers and their families to escape poverty and enter the formal economy. When they do not provide decent work, or workers are misclassified, they can be insecure and pose challenges to the realization of FPRW”.
150. The Government member of China proposed a subamendment to delete “to escape poverty”, as decent work was not the only way to escape poverty, seconded by the Government members of Algeria and Sierra Leone.
151. The Government member of Gabon, on behalf of the Africa group, and the Government member of South Africa, supported the subamended text proposed by the Worker Vice-Chairperson and the Employer Vice-Chairperson, as subamended by the Government member of China.
152. The Government member of Belgium, on behalf of the EU and its Member States, wished to retain “to escape poverty”.
153. The Government member of Sierra Leone proposed a subamendment to replace “escape poverty” with “reduce poverty”, seconded by the Government members of Cameroon, Ghana and Morocco.
154. The Government member of Mexico, speaking in his national capacity, proposed a subamendment to replace “escape poverty” with “end poverty”, as it was the agreed language of the UN 2030 Agenda for Sustainable Development, seconded by the Government member of Brazil.

- 155. The Government member of China said that the issue was with decent work appearing as a precondition to escaping poverty, which was not the case in China. As a compromise, he could agree to “When creating jobs and providing decent work, they can be an avenue for workers and their families to escape poverty and enter the formal economy”. It should not be expected that emerging forms of work would be decent work in the first instance. In practice, new opportunities of work or informal forms of work could also help to lift workers out of poverty.
- 156. The Government member of the United Kingdom did not support the subamendment proposed by the Government member of Mexico, as ending poverty applied to national contexts rather than individual workers or their families. She preferred retaining “escape poverty”.
- 157. The Government member of Mexico withdrew his Government’s subamendment.
- 158. The Worker Vice-Chairperson also wished to retain the notion of escaping poverty. The Employer Vice-Chairperson noted that decent work could indeed be an avenue to escaping poverty, but that there were other pathways as well. They both reiterated their support for their agreed subamendment.
- 159. The Government member of China said that he could accept the language, on the understanding that it was not exclusive and that there were other avenues to escape poverty.
- 160. The amendment was adopted as subamended.
- 161. Point 7 was adopted as amended.
- 162. Amendments A.98, A.166, A.165, A.196, A.18, A.170, A.19, A.15 and A.197 fell as a consequence.

Point 8

- 163. The Government member of Sierra Leone, speaking on behalf of the Africa group, proposed an amendment (A.168), that would read “Lack of freedom of association, protection of the right to organize and collective bargaining increase vulnerability, especially for non-unionized workers and; those who are at risk of child labour, forced labour, discrimination and hazardous working conditions”. It highlighted the risks to non-unionized workers because only unionized workers, with an opportunity to exercise the enabling right to freely associate and bargain as a group, were able to improve their working lives and the lives of their families.
- 164. The Worker Vice-Chairperson proposed a subamendment to delete “non-unionized workers and”.
- 165. The Employer Vice-Chairperson proposed a subamendment to the text so that it would read “Those who are most at risk of child labour, forced labour, discrimination and hazardous working conditions may also lack voice and representation, which increases their vulnerability”.
- 166. The Government member of the United States welcomed that the amendment proposed by the Africa group supported the idea that a lack of freedom of association could create additional risks for workers. She proposed a subamendment to the text so that it would read “Lack of freedom of association and the protection of the right to organize and bargain collectively increases vulnerability, including the risk of child labour, forced labour, discrimination or hazardous working conditions”, seconded by the Government members of Canada and Türkiye.
- 167. The Government member of Algeria supported the Africa group’s amendment.
- 168. The Government member of Ghana proposed a subamendment to delete “child labour” from the subamendment proposed by the Government member of the United States. Child labour

in Ghana was linked to poverty, a lack of legal framework and poor law enforcement, not necessarily to a lack of collective bargaining and freedom of association.

169. The Government member of China seconded the subamendment.
170. The Government member of the United States said that a lack of freedom of association and collective bargaining often impacted parents' ability to obtain well-paid jobs, which could put children at risk of child labour.
171. The Employer Vice-Chairperson said that the proposed text was a very different statement from the original text and was no longer appropriately placed; it should be placed elsewhere in the draft conclusions. The original text prepared by the Office was a fair statement of a challenge faced by all but had morphed into a statement of ideology and universality that was not supported by solid evidence.
172. The Worker Vice-Chairperson disagreed; the text was well placed in the section on challenges to be addressed in the document. He supported the subamendment proposed by the Government member of the United States to retain the reference to child labour.
173. The Employer Vice-Chairperson reiterated that the Employers' group was comfortable with the original Office text, as reference to action was necessary to address the issues and the proposed text should therefore be moved to the section on actions.
174. The Government members of Mexico; Türkiye; Norway, also speaking on behalf of Iceland; Belgium speaking on behalf of the EU and its Member States; the United Republic of Tanzania; and Gabon supported the text as subamended by the Government member of the United States.
175. The Government member of Sierra Leone proposed a subamendment to insert "of workers" after "increases vulnerability", seconded by the Government members of Canada, Cameroon, Morocco and Ghana.
176. The Government member of Sierra Leone underlined that it was clear in the Minimum Age Convention, 1973 (No. 138), and the Worst Forms of Child Labour Convention, 1999 (No. 182), that children should not work and should be in school or engaged in light work. He supported the proposal of the Government member of Ghana to delete "child labour".
177. The Government member of Ghana reiterated that children should not be at the workplace nor imbued with right to freedom of association and collective bargaining. Furthermore, not all workers were parents, and the term "vulnerability of workers" should be sufficient.
178. The Government member of the United Kingdom agreed with the inclusion of the risk of child labour but considered that the wording implied that children were also workers. She proposed a subamendment to replace "including" with "and", to avoid confusion.
179. The Government members of Canada; Ghana; Belgium, on behalf of the EU and its Member States; Sierra Leone; Mexico; Norway, also speaking on behalf of Iceland; and Chile seconded the subamendment.
180. Point 8 as amended (A.168) by the Africa group and subamended was as follows "Lack of freedom of association and the protection of the right to organize and bargain collectively increases vulnerability of workers, and the risk of child labour, forced labour, discrimination or hazardous working conditions;".
181. The Employer Vice-Chairperson proposed a further subamendment to the amendment to replace the first words "Lack of" with "Threats to and impairment of"; replace the phrase "the protection of the right to collective bargaining" with "effective recognition of the right to

collective bargaining”; to delete the phrases “increases vulnerability of workers,” and “and the risk”; and instead insert “are exacerbating risks”; and to replace the word “or” with “and”.

- 182.** The Worker Vice-Chairperson supported the amendment as subamended.
- 183.** The Government members of Canada; Belgium on behalf of the EU and its member States; Barbados; Gabon; and the United States supported the amendment.
- 184.** The amendment (A.168) was adopted as subamended.
- 185.** Point 8 was adopted as amended.
- 186.** Amendments A.191, A.20, A.164, A.163, A.21, A.192, A.193 and A.175 fell as a consequence.

Point 9

- 187.** Point 9 was adopted.

New point after point 9

- 188.** The Worker Vice-Chairperson introduced an amendment (A.162) to insert a new point after point 9, to read “Major violations of FPRW continue to be observed within global supply chains due to an attenuated chain of responsibility. Disruptions of supply chains during recent crises, including the COVID-19 pandemic, have further challenged the enjoyment of FPRW in some countries”. Issues of violations of FPRW in supply chains were inadequately addressed in the draft conclusions, while it was clear that working conditions in supply chains had been affected.
- 189.** The Employer Vice-Chairperson did not support the amendment because it was singling out global supply chains, with no basis for doing so. Any statement of risk should be respectful of the ILO strategy on decent work in supply chains and there should not be a reopening of difficult discussions that had taken place in recent years, including in the general discussion of the 2016 session of the Conference on decent work in global supply chains. He suggested that the amendment be rejected.
- 190.** The Government member of Gabon requested a clarification of the term “attenuated chain of responsibility”.
- 191.** The Worker Vice-Chairperson said that it meant a “decreased chain of responsibility”. He would agree if the Employers’ group would like to delete “global” before “supply chains”.
- 192.** The Government member of Belgium on behalf of the EU Member States, supported the spirit of the new point and proposed a subamendment to delete “major,” replace “attenuated” with “weakened” and delete “the enjoyment of”.
- 193.** The Government member of Mexico asked for examples of how the disruption in global supply chains had created an obstacle to the enjoyment of FPRW.
- 194.** The Worker Vice-Chairperson said that it was discussed in paragraphs 5 and 22 of the Office report.
- 195.** The Government member of Norway, also speaking on behalf of Iceland, supported the subamendment proposed by the Government of Belgium, on behalf the EU Member States.
- 196.** The Employer Vice-Chairperson noted that nowhere in the Office report was the issue of supply chains and attenuated responsibilities in supply chains identified. The issue of COVID-19 and disruption in supply chains was mentioned. Moreover, there was nothing in ILO documents that had been agreed upon regarding attenuated or weakened responsibility in supply chains. He stressed that it was not the Committee’s purpose to discuss the issue; rather, it was to take

stock of the last seven years and to make recommendations on the way forward. That should be done within the context of authoritative documents, including the resolution concerning decent work in global supply chains (2016) and the ILO strategy on decent work in supply chains that addressed FPRW. The Employers' group was willing to find a statement that could address supply chains but not global supply chains.

- 197.** The Government member of China did not support including global supply chains in the conclusions, as there was already a clear global supply chain track being followed by the Office. He emphasized that if the focus was on how COVID-19 and other challenging situations had impacted FPRW, he could propose specific language, but could not support the Workers' proposed amendment.
- 198.** The Government member of Türkiye said that, although he supported the purpose of the new point proposed by the Workers' group, he could not support it as currently worded. He noted that paragraph 5 of the Office report not only underlined the negative impact of COVID-19, but also geopolitical tensions and several major armed conflicts.
- 199.** The Government member of Canada echoed the concerns of the Employers' group and proposed a subamendment to the Workers' amendment, to insert "including" before "due to" and after "global supply chains". She also proposed a subamendment to the subamendment proposed by the Government member of Belgium, speaking on behalf of the EU Member States, to replace "the enjoyment of FPRW" with "the realization of FPRW", to align the language. She supported the Workers' proposed amendment as subamended by the Government member of Belgium, speaking on behalf of the EU Member States, as there were gaps in the realization of FPRW in supply chains.
- 200.** The Government members of Japan, the United States, and Mexico seconded the subamendments.
- 201.** The Employer Vice-Chairperson said that there were a number of issues with the proposed language. The most fundamental issue was the attribution of violations of FPRW within supply chains to the chain of responsibility. The topic had already been discussed in depth in 2016, with the focus on the implementation gaps and failures in host countries to enforce their laws. Therefore, there was no reason to single out global supply chains, and the Committee was not the place for a policy discussion on the matter. He proposed a subamendment to delete the first sentence and to replace "further challenged" in the second sentence with "adversely affected" to acknowledge that disruption in supply chains during recent crises had adversely affected the full realization of FPRW in some countries.
- 202.** The Worker Vice-Chairperson could not accept the deletion of the first part of the first sentence, only deletion of the second part; he proposed a subamendment to the first sentence, to read "Violations of FPRW continue to be observed within global supply chains". He could accept "adversely affected" in the second sentence.
- 203.** The Employer Vice-Chairperson did not support the subamendment, as violations occurred in supply chains but not more so than outside supply chains, and likely more in the informal economy and in small and medium-sized enterprises where there were probably larger sources of risk. The issue should focus on the disruption and the broader impact beyond FPRW.
- 204.** The Worker Vice-Chairperson agreed to delete the word "global" from "global supply chains".
- 205.** The Government member of Canada recalled that the 2022 Recurrent Discussion on Employment, where specific language referring to violations of labour rights in global supply chains was used. Based on the agreed language and ongoing discussions beyond the ILO in

other international organizations, it was important that the Committee included that language, especially given the focus on FPRW.

- 206.** The Government member of China supported the subamendment to the second sentence of the point but did not support the subamendment to the first sentence, even if the word “global” was removed. As the Government member of Canada had noted, this was discussed in other forums, but it was an ILO topic, and the Committee was not the appropriate place to re-open the discussion on supply chains.
- 207.** The Government member of Gabon, speaking on behalf of the Africa group, supported the subamendment to remove “global” from “global supply chains”.
- 208.** The Employer Vice-Chairperson said that, although his group did not see the need to include the language proposed by the Workers in the first sentence, it recognized the United Nations Guiding Principles on Business and Human Rights, under which governments had a duty to protect workers, while employers had a duty to respect the principles. Accordingly, the group proposed a subamendment, to read “Failures to protect and respect fundamental principles and rights at work continue to be observed in supply chains. Disruptions of supply chains during recent crises have adversely affected the full realization of FPRW in some countries”.
- 209.** The Governments of Japan, Mexico on behalf of GRULAC, and the United Kingdom, supported the subamendment proposed by the Employers.
- 210.** The Government member of China accepted the subamendment, at the same time maintaining its position that the issue of supply chains should not be addressed.
- 211.** The Government member of Sierra Leone questioned the word “failure”, asking to whom that word applied.
- 212.** The Employer Vice-Chairperson clarified that under the United Nations Guiding Principles, failure to protect applied to the State, while failure to respect applied to enterprise.
- 213.** The Government member of Belgium, speaking on behalf of the EU and its Member States, and the Government member of the United States supported the subamendment.
- 214.** The amendment was adopted as subamended.
- 215.** The new point to be included after point 9 was adopted as amended.

Point 10

- 216.** The Government member of Mexico, speaking on behalf of GRULAC, introduced an amendment (A.176) that aimed at increasing the precision of point 10, to read “Failure to realize FPRW accentuates inequalities and poverty. This has been exacerbated by the COVID-19 pandemic, social and economic crises, conflicts and geopolitical instability, natural disasters and the adverse effects of climate change”.
- 217.** The Worker Vice-Chairperson, the Employer Vice-Chairperson, the Government member of Gabon, speaking on behalf of the Africa group, and the Government members of Ghana and the United Republic of Tanzania did not support the amendment.
- 218.** The Government member of Belgium, speaking on behalf of the EU and its Member States, said that they could accept either version.
- 219.** The Representative of the Secretary-General indicated that the issues of concern to GRULAC were covered under another point in the draft conclusions.

220. The Government member of Mexico, speaking on behalf of GRULAC, withdrew the proposed amendment, although was keen to keep the reference to the adverse effects of climate change.

221. Point 10 was adopted.

Point 11

222. The Government member of Mexico, speaking on behalf of GRULAC, proposed an amendment (A.177) to replace point 11 to read “Weak governance, erosion of the rule of law and civil liberties, restrictions on freedom of association and effective recognition of the right to collective bargaining, inadequate regulation, under-resourced labour administrations and inspectorates, and other relevant labour authorities, and ineffective migration governance, among other causes, have impeded progress”.

223. The Employer Vice-Chairperson said that his group could accept the inclusion of “freedom of association and effective recognition of the right to collective bargaining”, with the insertion of the words, following a comma placed after “collective bargaining,” “inadequate enabling environment for sustainable enterprise”.

224. The Worker Vice-Chairperson said that his group had supported deletion of the bracketed phrase concerning an enabling environment.

225. The Government member of Ghana proposed replacing the words “effective recognition” with the words “ineffective recognition”, and replacing the term “under-resourced” with “ineffective”.

226. The Government member of Japan seconded the proposal by the Government member of Ghana, and supported the proposal put forward by the Employers’ group.

227. The Government member of Belgium, speaking on behalf of the EU and its Member States, said that his group was flexible, but preferred “lack of an enabling environment”, wished to pluralize “environments”, and favoured “under-resourced labour administrations”.

228. The Government member of Sierra Leone, speaking on behalf of the Africa group, wished to maintain “under-resourced”. He queried what was meant by “other relevant authorities”.

229. The Government member of China supported “inadequate enabling environment” but was flexible.

230. The Government member of Canada said that in earlier texts, including the 2017 resolution, the issue of sustainable enterprises was addressed in a standalone paragraph. The point as it stood listed various elements required to ensure an enabling environment. She requested clarification from the Office regarding other elements to ensure an enabling environment that were not covered by the present text.

231. The Employer Vice-Chairperson stated that the issue of an enabling environment was very widely recognized in ILO texts, including in the 2017 resolution. It was also evoked in the ILO Centenary Declaration. Economic prosperity and a robust job market could not be taken for granted. Access to decent work was contingent on work being available. The ILO Centenary Declaration recognized the role of sustainable enterprises as generators of employment and promoters of innovation and decent work. By definition, sustainable enterprises operated with respect for FPRW.

232. The Representative of the Secretary-General said that other elements of an enabling environment for enterprise included physical infrastructure, information and communication technology, services and macroeconomic policies.

233. The Government member of Türkiye proposed a subamendment to replace “ineffective recognition” by “effective recognition”, seconded by the Government member of the United Kingdom.
234. The Government member of the United Republic of Tanzania supported the term “inadequate enabling environment”. He asked for clarification of the term “other labour authorities”.
235. The Worker Vice-Chairperson said that “other labour authorities” could apply to different concepts in different countries, depending on how the labour administrations were structured. He stated that the issue under discussion was that of FPRW, on which the Committee should concentrate. He proposed that the wording regarding labour authorities could read “under-resourced and/or ineffective”, since under-resourced labour inspectorates could be effective through great dedication, while others might still not work effectively despite adequate resourcing.
236. The Employer Vice-Chairperson was unable to agree with his Worker counterpart, whose argument was fundamentally flawed. Moreover, it was redundant, since sustainable enterprises by definition respected the FPRW. However, he agreed that the text should focus on FPRW but the Employers’ group held that the enabling business environment was a fundamental issue that required special mention and action from the ILO. The failure to provide such an environment was a root cause of lack of realization of FPRW.
237. The Worker Vice-Chairperson stated that the mention in point 2(b) of the 2017 resolution mentioned adopting policies to enable sustainable growth, but the context of the present discussion was different. The issue concerned sustainable enterprises as a vehicle for the promotion of FPRW. He proposed a further subamendment to add the words “to respect the FPRW” after “inadequate enabling environments for sustainable enterprises”.
238. The Employer Vice-Chairperson said that the language undermined the sense of the 2017 resolution and diminished the importance of sustainable enterprises as being engines of full employment, decent work and a robust economy, which evidence showed as being effective in the reduction of poverty, in combating informality and in advancing FPRW. His group could accept the insertion, in line with the 1998 Declaration, after “have impeded progress,” of the words “to respect, promote and realize FPRW”.
239. The Worker Vice-Chairperson supported the Employer Vice-Chairperson’s latter subamendment.
240. The Government member of Sierra Leone supported “inadequate enabling environments”. He reiterated his question, echoed by the Government member of the United Republic of Tanzania, regarding the meaning of “other relevant labour authorities”. He stressed the importance of the term “under-resourced”. In practice, labour administrations were ineffective because they lacked personnel, vehicles, equipment, office space, and so forth. With reference to the Labour Administration Convention, 1978 (No. 150), he proposed a subamendment to delete the term “and other relevant authorities”.
241. The Representative of the Secretary-General explained that under Article 1(b) of Convention No. 150, the term “system of labour administration covers all public administration bodies responsible for and/or engaged in labour administration – whether they are ministerial departments or public agencies, including parastatal and regional or local agencies or any other form of decentralised administration – and any institutional framework for the co-ordination of the activities of such bodies and for consultation with and participation by employers and workers and their organisations”.

- 242. The Government member of Sierra Leone withdrew his subamendment to delete the term: “other relevant authorities”.
- 243. The Government member of the United States proposed subamending the term “ineffective” to “effective” for the phrase to read “restrictions on freedom of association and the effective recognition of the right to collective bargaining”.
- 244. The Government member of Belgium, speaking on behalf of the EU Member States, seconded that subamendment. She suggested deletion of the words “and/or ineffective” after “under-resourced”, as they were not needed. She supported the inclusion of “to respect, promote and realize FPRW” at the end of the paragraph as subamended according to the proposal made by the Employers and agreed by the Workers. She also proposed a subamendment to insert “labour” before “migration governance”.
- 245. The Government member of Ghana supported keeping the term “and ineffective” after “under-resourced”. Labour administrations could be well-resourced, but abuse of those resources would make the administrations ineffective.
- 246. The Government member of Morocco seconded the proposal.
- 247. The amendment was adopted as subamended.
- 248. Amendments A.150, A.23, A.102, A.25 and A.104 fell as a consequence.
- 249. Point 11 was adopted as amended.

Point 12

- 250. The Employer Vice-Chairperson proposed an amendment (A.27) to delete the bracketed phrase “including the rise of artificial intelligence and algorithmic management”. While “algorithmic management” was currently a hot topic, there was no agreed definition of the term, and the subject would be covered in the discussion on the item on decent work in the platform economy to be held at the 113th Session (2025) of the International Labour Conference. The singling out of two concepts, of which one was subordinate to the other, in a document that would be guiding ILO action for the next seven years did not seem appropriate. It should be left to the general discussion to provide a definition of the two terms.
- 251. The Worker Vice-Chairperson did not support the proposed deletion. The terms “artificial intelligence” and “algorithmic management” had been subject to extensive discussion during the opening sittings of the Committee. Paragraph 21 of the Office report read “AI has the capacity to transform jobs by automating tasks, which could lead to either job displacement or a transformation of job roles... The integration of AI into the workplace could profoundly influence working conditions, autonomy, the pace and intensity of work, skill utilization and workers’ interactions with management and peers”. The inclusion of that one sentence did not pre-empt the 2025 Conference discussion. Platform work was only part of the group’s concern.
- 252. The Employer Vice-Chairperson observed that paragraph 21 of the Office report made no reference to FPRW violations, neither did it provide a definition of algorithmic management. The discussion constituted policy dialogue and was not appropriate to the discussion on FPRW. The Committee should concentrate on identifying opportunities to promote FPRW.
- 253. The Government member of Belgium, speaking on behalf of the EU and its Member States, said that the two elements in question were new developments that had, and would have, significant impact on the world of work. They should remain in the conclusions.

254. The Government member of Brazil supported the statement made by the Government member of Belgium, speaking on behalf of the EU and its Member States.
255. The Government member of Mexico, speaking in his national capacity and also on behalf of Chile, wished to maintain the reference to artificial intelligence, but not to “algorithmic management” since it had not been clearly defined. He proposed amending the reference to read “including the rise of artificial intelligence”.
256. The Government member of Japan said that the Government could support both proposals but did not wish to pre-empt the 2025 discussion.
257. The Government member of China supported mention of artificial intelligence, but not that of algorithmic management, the meaning of which was not clear.
258. The Government member of the United Kingdom wished to maintain reference to both terms.
259. The Government member of Cameroon agreed with the Employer Vice-Chairperson’s proposal to delete. The term “digital transition” already included artificial intelligence and algorithmic management.
260. The Government member of the United States said that the focus should be on analysing artificial intelligence and algorithmic bias in the world of work. The United States had previously issued a joint statement with Spain on those issues, highlighting their impact on discrimination, workers’ well-being and FPRW. The Government supported the original text.
261. The Worker Vice-Chairperson said that it was important to address algorithmic management and proposed bracketing the text for later discussion. Under no circumstances could his group accept the “adaptation” of the FPRW, which were enshrined in the 1998 Declaration and could not be altered. The term algorithmic management had already been used by the ILO in high-level discussions that had underscored the need for human control in management practices.
262. The Employer Vice-Chairperson underlined the importance of retaining or strengthening the phrase “seize new opportunities”. He cited an example, from an ILO study published in March 2024, where artificial intelligence had been used to assist the labour inspectorate detect undeclared labour in Albania. His group supported the “need for” option presented above and was flexible with regard to “and adapting”, although FPRW were referred to elsewhere in the document as “immutable”. The “adapting” certainly meant “adapting the use of FPRW”, not altering them in any way.
263. The Government member of Belgium, speaking on behalf of the EU and its Member States, agreed with the Workers’ group that the FPRW should not be adapted in any way. He supported the phrase “seize new opportunities”, as such opportunities would certainly be presented by artificial intelligence. He preferred the variant “urgency of” to “need for”.
264. The Government member of Türkiye was against including “and adapting” and favoured the words “urgency of” as against “need for”. He tabled a subamendment to the first five words of point 12, to read: “Demographic and environmental changes, and digital transitions, ...” to clearly separate the various elements of meaning, seconded by the Government member of Canada.
265. The Government member of Japan supported retaining the phrase “seize new opportunities”.
266. The Government member of China also supported “seize new opportunities” as well as the subamended first phrase tabled by the Government member of Türkiye. His Government could accept either variant, “urgency of” or “need for”. He agreed with the deletion of “and adapting”.

- 267.** The Government member of Canada, while noting the potential improvements that artificial intelligence could bring, also pointed to research showing that it could reinforce gender, race and class biases. With reference to the resolution concerning the second recurrent discussion on labour protection (111th Session of the International Labour Conference, 2023), and the High-level section of the 350th Session (March 2024) of the Governing Body of the ILO, she supported inclusion of the phrase “and algorithmic management” in point 12. Likewise, she supported “seize new opportunities” and deletion of “and adapting”.
- 268.** The Government member of Mexico, speaking on behalf of GRULAC, withdrew the group’s amendment “and adapting”, seeing it lacked support. Speaking in his national capacity and on behalf of Mexico, Chile and Peru, he expressed a preference for “the need for” over the “urgency of” option. The digital divide made it hard for some countries to respond urgently to rapid technological change.
- 269.** The Employer Vice-Chairperson recognized the substantial support for the notion of seizing new opportunities. His group retained its preference for the “need for” option. Algorithmic management was simply one aspect and an inherent part of artificial intelligence. The reference should refer to artificial intelligence only.
- 270.** The Worker Vice-Chairperson pointed to the earlier mention of the resolution concerning the second recurrent discussion on labour protection, 2023, where artificial intelligence and algorithmic management had been included in the same sentence. The phrase “and algorithmic management” should be included in point 12. He reiterated his group’s preference for the “urgency of” text option.
- 271.** The Employer Vice-Chairperson stressed the need not to pre-empt the discussion to be held at the 113th Session (2025) of the International Labour Conference on the platform economy. He repeated that algorithmic management was an inherent part of artificial intelligence.
- 272.** The Worker Vice-Chairperson reiterated that the two phenomena had been discussed during the negotiation for the resolution concerning the second recurrent discussion on labour protection. He proposed removing the strike through from the words “including the rise of artificial intelligence and algorithmic management” and from the words “seize new opportunities” but maintaining their brackets for further discussion later.
- 273.** The Government member of the United States suggested a re-phrasing to read: “artificial intelligence and the use of algorithms”.
- 274.** The Employer Vice-Chairperson subamended the amendment (A.27) to replace the phrase “the use of algorithms” with “related technologies” and to replace the phrase “seize new opportunities and address challenges” with “address challenges and seize opportunities”. The text had been discussed at length with the social partners, in the full understanding that the point would only be appropriate if it had full tripartite support. His group was trying to present a way forward.
- 275.** The Worker Vice-Chairperson supported the amendment as subamended, which presented a balanced approach. His group preferred the “urgency of” option, rather than “need for”.
- 276.** The Government member of Belgium, speaking on behalf of the EU and its Member States, supported the amendment as subamended and preferred the “urgency of” option. He queried the meaning of “related technologies”.
- 277.** The Employer Vice-Chairperson explained that “related technologies” referred to all the technologies for which artificial intelligence acted as an “umbrella term”: machine learning, algorithmic management and others. All presented both challenges and opportunities.

- 278. The Worker Vice-Chairperson supported the language.
- 279. The Government members of Barbados, Türkiye and the United States, supported the amendment as subamended and preferred the “urgency of” option.
- 280. The Government member of Sierra Leone supported the text, but questioned why it should not read “seize opportunities to address challenges”.
- 281. The Employer Vice-Chairperson said that the draft aimed at acknowledging that both challenges and opportunities would arise from new technologies and sought to keep the two separate.
- 282. The amendment (A.27) was adopted as subamended, including the “urgency of” option.
- 283. Point 12 was adopted as amended.
- 284. Amendments A.28, A.149, A.105, A.178 and A.148 fell as a consequence.

Point 13

- 285. The Government member of Belgium, speaking on behalf of the EU Member States, introduced an amendment (A.106), which proposed adding the words “policy and” between the words “stronger” and “action”.
- 286. The Employer and Worker Vice-Chairpersons supported the amendment.
- 287. The amendment was adopted.
- 288. Point 13 was adopted as amended.

Subtitle

II. Strengthening action for the effective respect, promotion and realization of fundamental principles and rights at work

- 289. The subtitle of part II “II. Strengthening action for the effective respect, promotion and realization of fundamental principles and rights at work” was adopted.

Point 14

Chapeau to point 14

- 290. Four amendments to the first line of the chapeau to point 14 submitted similar proposals for insertion between the terms “FPRW” and “be advanced”. Two amendments (A.194) (GRULAC) and (A.147) (Worker members) both proposed the insertion of “can only” between those terms. One amendment (A.1) (China) proposed the insertion of the word “will” between the two terms. Another amendment (A.93) (Canada, the EU Member States, Switzerland, Türkiye, the United Kingdom and the United States) proposed the insertion of the words “will only” between the two terms.
- 291. The Government member of China said that his amendment (A.1), seconded by Cameroon, was because the language should align with that of the 2017 resolution, which used the word “will”.
- 292. The Worker Vice-Chairperson withdrew his group’s amendment (A.147) in favour of “will only” (A.93).

- 293.** The Government member of Ghana proposed a subamendment to insert “can” between “FPRW” and “be advanced”, arguing that the use of the term “can only” suggested that the realization of FPRW could only be advanced where the elements included in the paragraph (an environment of respect for human rights, the rule of law and democratic freedoms) were present. Many other factors had an impact on the advancement of FPRW. The paragraph should not be restrictive.
- 294.** The Government member of China seconded the subamendment.
- 295.** The Government member of the United States stated that the aspects listed were necessary conditions for “full realization”, but their inclusion in the text did not mean they alone were sufficient.
- 296.** The Employer Vice-Chairperson maintained a position of flexibility.
- 297.** The Worker Vice-Chairperson reiterated his group’s support for “will only”.
- 298.** The Government member of the United Republic of Tanzania agreed that inclusion of the word “only” unnecessarily limited the scope of the text.
- 299.** The Government member of Mexico, speaking on behalf of GRULAC, said that it was fundamental to retain “can only”. If there were not an environment conducive to human rights, FPRW could not be realized. The group could consider the “will only” option, but its preferred position was “can only”.
- 300.** The Government member of China said that his Government could accept the word “only” because a majority of participants had agreed to that language. However, it diverged from the language of the 2017 resolution. In making the concession, he noted that his Government had already shown considerable flexibility, and hoped that others would do likewise in the coming discussions. He requested that his statement be clearly recorded in the record of proceedings.
- 301.** The Government member of Ghana stated that the three conditions listed in point 14 were not enough to achieve full realization of FPRW. Climate change and high levels of youth unemployment might negatively impact the realization of FPRW. His Government could not support inclusion of the word “only”. He requested that the record of proceedings should clearly show his point of view.
- 302.** The Government member of Sierra Leone said that the use of the word “only” was confusing, since it limited conditions for the realization of FPRW to those listed in point 14: an environment of respect for human rights, the rule of law and democratic freedoms.
- 303.** The Employer Vice-Chairperson was ready to accept either “can only” or “will only” in the sense that it was a necessary but not sufficient set of conditions.
- 304.** The Worker Vice-Chairperson indicated his group’s willingness to join the consensus.
- 305.** The Government member of Sierra Leone said that his Government’s position was for either “can” or “will”, but he would agree to keeping the word “only”, provided his position was clearly recorded in the record of proceedings.
- 306.** The Government member of Ghana proposed a subamendment to delete the words from “The full realization” to “advanced by”, to insert the word “An” before “environment”, and to insert the phrase “is necessary for the realization of FPRW” after the word “freedom”. The full sentence would read “An environment of respect for human rights, the rule of law and democratic freedoms is necessary for the realization of FPRW”. The Government member of Gabon, speaking on behalf of the Africa group, seconded the subamendment.

- 307.** The Worker Vice-Chairperson did not support the subamendment, as point 14 was concerned specifically with the “full” realization of FPRW, and that could not occur in an environment lacking the elements listed.
- 308.** The Government member of the United Kingdom and the Government member of Mexico, speaking on behalf of GRULAC, supported “will only”.
- 309.** The Government member of the United States, observing that there had been broad consensus for “will only”, said that the word “only” was not synonymous with “solely” and did not exclude other necessary conditions. It simply meant that the conditions listed in point 14 were essential to the “full” realization of FPRW.
- 310.** The Government member of Belgium, speaking on behalf of the EU Member States, in the interests of breaking the impasse over the term “will only”, proposed a subamendment to replace the first sentence of the chapeau to point 14, to read “The respect for human rights, the rule of law and democratic freedoms are prerequisites for the full realization of FPRW”.
- 311.** The Government member of Ghana, the Government member of Gabon, speaking on behalf of the Africa group, the Employer Vice-Chairperson and the Worker Vice-Chairperson supported the subamendment.
- 312.** The Government member of China said that he could accept the proposal on the understanding that the prerequisites listed did not preclude other elements.
- 313.** The Government member of Mexico, speaking on behalf of GRULAC, could agree to the subamendment with an additional subamendment to replace “democratic” freedoms with “fundamental” freedoms to align with the wording of the Universal Declaration of Human Rights.
- 314.** The Government members of China, Switzerland and Gabon, in its national capacity, supported the subamendment.
- 315.** The Worker Vice-Chairperson sought clarification from the Office on why “democratic” and not “fundamental” had been used in the initial draft text.
- 316.** The Representative of the Secretary-General clarified that “democratic” had been used in the 2017 resolution. The term “democratic freedoms” referred to the environment that could enable FPRW, whereas “fundamental freedoms” referred to freedoms embedded in the Universal Declaration of Human Rights. Both types of freedoms were relevant, therefore the word choice should be selected based on the context.
- 317.** The Worker Vice-Chairperson preferred to keep the term “democratic” to be consistent with what had been agreed in the previous recurrent discussion on FPRW.
- 318.** The Employer Vice-Chairperson supported being consistent and aligning with prior approved texts to ensure no misunderstanding; however, he was willing to support the prevailing view among the governments.
- 319.** The Government member of Belgium, speaking on behalf of the EU Member States, noted that the two concepts of freedom were different but both relevant in the context and proposed a subamendment to include “fundamental” and “democratic” freedoms in the text.
- 320.** The Government member of Switzerland supported the subamendment.
- 321.** The Government member of the United States would prefer a focus on democratic freedoms but could be flexible with keeping both terms in the interests of consensus.

- 322. The Government member of Mexico, speaking on behalf of GRULAC, proposed a subamendment to switch the order of the terms “fundamental” and “democratic”, to read “The respect for human rights, the rule of law, democratic and fundamental freedoms are prerequisites for the full realization of FPRW”.
- 323. The Government member of China said that “fundamental freedoms” was more appropriate in the context, but for the sake of consensus he could accept “democratic and fundamental”.
- 324. The Worker Vice-Chairperson and Employer Vice-Chairperson supported the subamendment.
- 325. The chapeau to Point 14 was adopted as subamended by the Government member of Belgium.
- 326. Amendments A.194, A.1, and A.93 all fell as a consequence.

Point 14(a)

- 327. Point 14(a) was adopted.

Point 14(b)

- 328. Point 14(b) was adopted.

Point 14(c)

- 329. The Employer Vice-Chairperson proposed an amendment (A.29) to delete point 14(c), expressing concern about the placement of the text in the draft conclusions. By definition freedom of association and the effective recognition of the right to collective bargaining were of equal importance to the other categories of FPRW. It had been agreed that FPRW were equal, interrelated and mutually reinforcing without hierarchy or causation. He called on the Committee not to adopt a text that would change the notion of FPRW as being equally important rights.
- 330. The Worker Vice-Chairperson said that the placement of the paragraph was correct in part II on strengthening action on FPRW and would not agree to its deletion. Particular attention to freedom of association and the effective recognition of the right to collective bargaining was needed as compared to the other FPRW, given the persistent deficits in many countries and their underpromotion. Since the last discussion, there had been threats to trade union rights and civil liberties, a lack of protection against anti-union discrimination, and the violation of collective bargaining rights, with interference being the most frequent issue. As per the Office report, more focus on freedom of association and the right to collective bargaining was needed.
- 331. The Employer Vice-Chairperson noted that the Office report identified similar deficits with other FPRW. As the five categories of FPRW were of equal importance, there should be no hierarchy and having a balance was of critical importance.
- 332. The Government member of the United States strongly agreed with the Workers’ group on the placement. She underscored that the text was seeking to highlight gaps, not only in the Office engagement, but also within the actions taken by governments. Freedom of association and the effective recognition of the right to collective bargaining were also enablers and key rights for social dialogue. In order to be effective, social dialogue required strong social partners, and it was useful to note the importance of freedom of association and the effective recognition of the right to collective bargaining for social dialogue. Moreover, in the ILO Declaration concerning the aims and purposes of the International Labour Organization (Declaration of

Philadelphia) one of the key aspects highlighted was the right to freedom of expression and association to achieve sustained progress.

333. The Government member of China said that the text should convey a clear and coherent message to the international community that the five categories of FPRW should be treated equally. He strongly supported the wording “ensuring balanced attention to all categories”. He could be flexible regarding the Employers’ group’s proposed deletion of the paragraph, provided a clear message was conveyed to the governments, as they were responsible for ensuring the realization of all five categories of FPRW.
334. The Government members of Gabon, speaking on behalf of the Africa group, Belgium, speaking on behalf of the EU and its Members States, Norway, Türkiye and Iceland supported keeping point 14(c).
335. The Government member of Japan agreed that FPRW should be treated equally and was concerned that the first sentence excluded other FPRW. He supported the wording of China’s proposed amendment (A.2).
336. The Government member of Canada did not support the removal of the point. She recalled the decline in the unionization rate, which could have broader implications for civic life, political participation and social welfare in the respective countries. Freedom of association and the effective recognition of the right to collective bargaining were at the core of FPRW.
337. The Worker Vice-Chairperson said that his group was not of the view that there was a hierarchy between the different categories of FPRW. He recalled the binding decisions recognizing freedom of association and the right to collective bargaining as an enabling right in the ILO Centenary Declaration and Social Justice Declaration, which were adopted by the International Labour Conference. Likewise, in the high-level evaluation of the ILO’s strategies and actions to promote fundamental principles and rights at work 2018–23 (high-level evaluation) and the Office report, one of the key lessons learned was that the Office had neglected to prioritize freedom of association and collective bargaining as a critical enabling right and that the ILO should expedite its ongoing efforts to strengthen its strategy and action in those areas. The text should align and reflect what had previously been agreed.
338. The Employer Vice-Chairperson, while acknowledging the desire to maintain a reference to freedom of association and collective bargaining in part II, reiterated that the text might be more appropriate elsewhere. He withdrew his amendment.
339. The Government member of China introduced an amendment (A.2), so that the point would read “Ensure balanced attention to all five categories”. Retaining the last part of the sentence would convey the message to the international community that all five categories of rights should be treated equally.
340. The Employer Vice-Chairperson seconded the amendment. He proposed a subamendment to insert after “categories” “of fundamental principles and rights at work to enable the attainment of the four strategic objectives”.
341. The Worker Vice-Chairperson emphasized that his group wished to retain the wording of the first part of the original text but was open to discussing the amendment proposed by the Government member of China and the subamendment thereto proposed by the Employers’ group.
342. The representative of the Government of Norway supported the Workers’ group in retaining the first part of the paragraph. She proposed a subamendment to insert “of the Decent Work Agenda” after “the four strategic objectives”.

- 343.** The representative of the Government of Türkiye also supported retaining the first part of the paragraph and seconded the subamendment proposed by Norway.
- 344.** The Government member of Mexico, speaking in his national capacity and also on behalf of Brazil and Chile, proposed a subamendment to delete the words “particular” in both instances in the text, as it would make the text less prescriptive and more neutral.
- 345.** The Government members of the United States and Argentina did not support the subamendment.
- 346.** The Government member of Ghana agreed with the Worker Vice-Chairperson, as freedom of association and the effective recognition of the right to collective bargaining were key vehicles for ensuring safety and health in the workplace, for providing a platform to engage the social partners, and to ensure that if there were any infractions or issues at the workplace there was an opportunity for dialogue. To ensure that the interests of workers, employers and governments were all catered for, he proposed a subamendment, so that the paragraph would read “While recognizing the importance of all the five categories of FPRW, there is a need to ensure particular attention to freedom of association and effective recognition of the right to collective bargaining, noting their particular importance to enabling the attainment of the four strategic objectives of the Decent Work Agenda”.
- 347.** The subamendment was seconded by the Government member of Gabon.
- 348.** The Employer Vice-Chairperson proposed reverting to the original text of point 14(c) of the draft conclusions.
- 349.** The Worker Vice-Chairperson, the Government members of Belgium, speaking on behalf of the EU and its Member States, the United States, Gabon, speaking on behalf of the Africa group, Mexico, speaking on behalf of GRULAC, Indonesia, Japan and China supported the suggestion of the Employer Vice-Chairperson.
- 350.** The subamendment was withdrawn.
- 351.** Amendments A.29 and A.2 were withdrawn.
- 352.** Point 14(c) was adopted.

Point 14(d)

- 353.** Point 14 (d) was adopted.

Point 14(e)

- 354.** Point 14(e) was adopted.

Point 14(f)

- 355.** The Worker Vice-Chairperson introduced an amendment (A.146) to delete the point.
- 356.** The Employer Vice-Chairperson did not support the amendment, as it was a critically important part of any programme to realize FPRW.
- 357.** The Government member of Belgium, speaking on behalf of the EU Member States, introduced an amendment (A.107) to retain the original paragraph but to end it after “sustainable enterprises”, as the rest of the sentence was a statement of fact that did not directly relate to FPRW.

- 358. The Government member of China did not support either amendment and preferred to retain the whole paragraph.
- 359. The Worker Vice-Chairperson withdrew his group's amendment (A.146) to delete the point and agreed to the original text of point 14(f) of the draft conclusions.
- 360. The Employer Vice-Chairperson agreed.
- 361. The Government member of Belgium, speaking on behalf of the EU Member States, also agreed to the original text and withdrew their amendment (A.107).
- 362. The Government members of Switzerland, China, the United Kingdom, Indonesia, Mexico, speaking on behalf of GRULAC, Barbados, and Gabon, speaking on behalf of the Africa group, supported the original text.
- 363. Point 14(f) was adopted.

Point 14(g)

- 364. Point 14 (g) was adopted.
- 365. Point 14 was adopted in its entirety as amended.

Point 15

- 366. The Government member of Gabon, speaking on behalf the Africa group, introduced an amendment (A.172) to delete "policy" and "and fostering synergies", as synergy would normally apply to actions taken by institutions and not to legal frameworks, while coherence would be better applied to legal frameworks.
- 367. The Employer Vice-Chairperson did not have any material objection to the language proposed.
- 368. The Worker Vice-Chairperson did not support the amendment.
- 369. The Government member of Ghana and the Government member of Barbados supported the amendment.
- 370. The Government member of Algeria supported the amendment but a small adjustment to the text might be needed with regard to coherence, as it was public policy that set the general framework, which was then be implemented by the legal framework.
- 371. The Employer Vice-Chairperson noted a preference for the original text but would not object to the amendment should there be majority support for it.
- 372. The Worker Vice-Chairperson concurred with the Employer Vice-Chairperson and would go with the majority.
- 373. The Government member of Belgium, speaking on behalf of the EU and its Member States, preferred the original text but would not stand in the way of consensus.
- 374. The Government member of the United States proposed a subamendment to the second sentence of point 15, so that it would read "This would entail coherence between legal frameworks, policies, strategies and programmes, and to develop synergies aimed at realizing FPRW", which was seconded by the Government member of Gabon.
- 375. The Government members of Japan, Argentina and Switzerland supported the proposal from the United States.

- 376. The Government member of the United Kingdom supported the amendment but proposed a further subamendment to replace “to develop” with “development of”, which was seconded by several Government members.
- 377. The Government member of Ghana proposed an additional subamendment to replace “between” with “among”, to be grammatically correct, which was seconded by the Government member of Barbados.
- 378. The Government members of Belgium, speaking on behalf of the EU and its Member States, and Mexico, speaking on behalf of GRULAC, as well as the Worker Vice-Chairperson and the Employer Vice-Chairperson supported the subamendment.
- 379. The amendment was adopted as subamended.
- 380. Point 15 was adopted as amended.

Point 16

Heading

- 381. The heading “Areas of focus” before point 16 was adopted.

Chapeau to point 16

- 382. The Worker Vice-Chairperson introduced an amendment (A.145) to delete “, with consideration to national circumstances”, which was identical to an amendment (A.89) tabled by the Governments of Canada, Switzerland, Türkiye, the United Kingdom, the United States and the EU Member States. Reference to the consideration of national circumstances was redundant, as point 14 referred to taking account of national circumstances.
- 383. The Employer Vice-Chairperson preferred the original text of the draft conclusions and did not agree to the amendment.
- 384. The Government member of China did not support the amendment, as the wording of point 14 did not cover what was being discussed in point 16. For the whole section to be workable for every government, to some extent the national circumstances or context should be taken into consideration, otherwise it would be difficult to implement the list of actions.
- 385. The Government members of Malaysia, Indonesia, Gabon, speaking on behalf of the Africa group, and Saudi Arabia, speaking on behalf of the GCC, supported China’s position.
- 386. The Government member of Canada agreed with the importance of considering national circumstances. That being said, it was by virtue of ILO membership that all had to commit to respecting, promoting and realizing FPRW. For that reason, she supported the amendment.
- 387. The Government member of the United Kingdom supported the amendment for the reasons set out by the Government member of Canada.
- 388. The Government member of China emphasized the importance of including the phrase to ensure that the actions listed were put into practice. He agreed with Canada that governments had to respect, promote and realize FPRW; however, the issue was how to put that into action. It was of crucial importance to respect the diversity of ILO membership in order to realize FPRW.
- 389. The Worker Vice-Chairperson reiterated that point 14 included taking into account national circumstances as a frame to the whole section. If it was also mentioned in point 16, it would narrow the scope and exclude consultation and dialogue.

- 390. The Employer Vice-Chairperson noted that it would be necessary for certain governments to buy into the actions and that the inclusion of the language would be harmless.
- 391. The Government member of Belgium, speaking on behalf of the EU and its Member States, pointed to the fact that implementing the actions would involve many actors, not just national governments, and it was self-evident that none would act without taking into account their own national contexts or circumstances. The additional text was not needed.
- 392. The Government member of Canada submitted an amendment (A.89), which was identical to an amendment submitted by the worker members (A.145), to the chapeau of point 16, deleting the wording: "Action should be taken in the following areas" and replacing it with the wording "Areas of focus should include". She also subamended the amendment to propose moving the entire point 16 up the numerical order to place it under point 14(g), thus exchanging places with point 15.
- 393. The Worker Vice-Chairperson and the Employer Vice-Chairperson fully supported the amendment as subamended.
- 394. The Government members of Indonesia and the United Republic of Tanzania supported the amendment as subamended.
- 395. The amendments (A.89 and A.145) were adopted as subamended.
- 396. The chapeau to point 16 was adopted as amended.

Point 16, first subheading

- 397. The first subheading "Strengthening governance" was adopted.

Point 16(a)

- 398. Point 16(a) was adopted.

Point 16(b)

- 399. The Government member of Mexico, speaking on behalf of GRULAC, submitted an amendment (A.180) which replaced the words "of and respect for civil liberties" with "and promotion of human rights", to give broader meaning to the point and to connect with the United Nations Universal Declaration of Human Rights.
- 400. The Worker Vice-Chairperson and the Employer Vice-Chairperson supported the amendment, since human rights included civil liberties.
- 401. The Government members of Barbados, Belgium, speaking on behalf of the EU and its Member States, supported the amendment.
- 402. The amendment was adopted.
- 403. Point 16(b) was adopted as amended.

Point 16(c)

- 404. The Government member of Mexico, speaking on behalf of GRULAC, presented an amendment (A.181) to insert the words "and strengthen" between the words "build" and "the capacity" at the beginning of point 16(c).
- 405. The Employer Vice-Chairperson and the Worker Vice-Chairperson supported the amendment.

- 406. The Government member of the United Republic of Tanzania put forward a subamendment to insert the words “and the institutions dealing with dispute resolution systems” after the words “labour inspection systems”.
- 407. The Government member of China seconded the amendment.
- 408. The Worker Vice-Chairperson proposed a subamendment reformulating that insertion to read “build and strengthen the capacity of labour administration, labour dispute and labour inspection systems, and provide [...]”
- 409. The Employer Vice-Chairperson supported the subamendment.
- 410. The Government member of Gabon, speaking on behalf of the Africa group, and the Government members of Japan and the United Republic of Tanzania supported the amendment as subamended.
- 411. The amendment (A.181) was adopted as subamended.
- 412. Point 16(c) was adopted as amended.

Point 16(d)

- 413. Point 16(d) was adopted.

New subheading after point 16(d)

- 414. The Worker Vice-Chairperson tabled an amendment (A.159) to introduce a new subheading after point 16(d). However, his group wished to subamend its amendment by adding the words “and social dialogue” after “freedom of association”, deleting “promoting” and adding “including” before “collective bargaining”. The proposed subheading would therefore read “Freedom of association and social dialogue, including collective bargaining”.
- 415. The Employer Vice-Chairperson supported the amendment as subamended.
- 416. The Government members of Norway, Türkiye, Switzerland and Canada supported the amendment as subamended.
- 417. The amendment was adopted as subamended.
- 418. The new subheading after point 16(d) was adopted as amended.

Point 16(e)

- 419. The Employer Vice-Chairperson withdrew his group’s amendments (A.32 and A.33) to point 16(e).
- 420. The Worker Vice-Chairperson withdrew his group’s amendment (A.144) to point 16(e) and wished to return to the original text.
- 421. The Government members of Belgium, speaking on behalf of the EU and its Member States, and of China, withdrew their amendments to point 16(e) (A.108 and A.3, respectively).
- 422. The Worker Vice-Chairperson withdrew his group’s remaining amendments (A.143 and A.142) to point 16(e).
- 423. Point 16(e) was adopted.

Point 16(f)

- 424. The Government member of Belgium, speaking on behalf of the EU Member States, presented an amendment (A.109) to insert the words “employers’ and workers’ organizations and of” between the words “capacity of” and “mechanisms and” in the first line of draft point 16(f). It was important to strengthen the capacity of employers’ and workers’ organizations.
- 425. The Employer Vice-Chairperson and the Worker Vice-Chairperson supported the original draft text.
- 426. The Government member of Türkiye supported the original draft text.
- 427. The Government member of Belgium, speaking on behalf of the EU Member States, withdrew the amendment (A.109).
- 428. The Government member of China submitted an amendment (A.4) to point 16(f) to delete the words “in all its forms and at all levels”. He argued that “social dialogue” was already a broad enough concept, and that the phrase he proposed to delete was redundant.
- 429. The amendment was seconded by the Government member of Cameroon.
- 430. The Employer Vice-Chairperson and the Worker Vice-Chairperson stated that they preferred the original draft text.
- 431. The Government member of China withdrew his amendment (A.4).
- 432. The Worker Vice-Chairperson withdrew his group’s amendment (A.141) to point 16(f).
- 433. Point 16(f) was adopted.

Point 16(g)

- 434. The Worker Vice-Chairperson presented an amendment (A.161) to move point 16(g) up the list under point 16(d).
- 435. The Employer Vice-Chairperson supported the amendment.
- 436. The Government members of Switzerland, the United Kingdom, Canada and Türkiye endorsed the amendment.
- 437. The amendment (A.161) was adopted.
- 438. Point 16(g) was adopted as amended.

Point 16(h)

- 439. The Government member of the United Kingdom submitted an amendment (A.90), seconded by the Governments of Canada, Switzerland, the United Kingdom and the United States, to insert the words “and risk” between the words “evidence” and “based approach. The aim was to ensure that existing resources were better focused.
- 440. The Worker Vice-Chairperson recalled that the Drafting Group had discussed this issue at length, and his group preferred the original text.
- 441. The Government member of the United Kingdom withdrew the amendment (A.90).
- 442. The Worker Vice-Chairperson presented his group’s amendment (A.160) to move point 16(h) higher up the list to come after point 16(d).
- 443. The Employer Vice-Chairperson supported the amendment.

444. The Government members of Türkiye, Mexico and Belgium, speaking on behalf of the EU and its Member States, supported the amendment.

445. The amendment (A.160) was adopted.

446. Point 16(h) was adopted as amended.

Subheading after point 16(h)

447. The Worker Vice-Chairperson withdrew his group's amendment (A.158) to the subheading under point 16(h).

448. The subheading under 16(h): "Formalization and sustainable enterprises", was adopted.

Point 16(i)

449. The Worker Vice-Chairperson withdrew his group's amendment (A.157) to point 16(i).

450. Point 16(i) was adopted.

Point 16(j)

451. The Worker Vice-Chairperson presented his group's amendment (A.156) to point 16(j). The group wished to subamend the amendment, which had been to delete the entire point, by reverting to the original text, but to replace the words "essential for" with "conducive to".

452. The Employer Vice-Chairperson supported the proposed subamendment.

453. There was broad support for the subamendment from the government benches.

454. The amendment (A.156) was adopted as subamended.

455. Point 16(j) was adopted as amended.

456. Amendments A.151, A.155, A.154, A.38, A.153, A.39, and A.152 all fell as a consequence.

Point 16(k)

457. The Worker Vice-Chairperson withdrew his group's amendment (A.140) to delete point 16(k).

458. The Government member of China tabled an amendment (A.5) to delete point 16(k) due to doubts as to whether FPRW really played a central role in productivity improvement, inclusive growth and job creation.

459. The Government member of Indonesia seconded the amendment.

460. The Employer Vice-Chairperson opposed the amendment and wished to revert to the original text.

461. The Worker Vice-Chairperson supported the original text.

462. The Government members of Belgium, speaking on behalf of the EU and its Member States, Mexico, speaking on behalf of GRULAC, Türkiye and the United States opposed the amendment and supported the original text.

463. The Government member of China withdrew his amendment (A.5).

464. The Employer Vice-Chairperson withdrew his group's amendments (A.41, A.42 and A.43).

465. Point 16(k) was adopted.

New point after 16(k)

- 466. The Employer Vice-Chairperson withdrew his group's amendment (A.44) to insert a new point after point 16(k).
- 467. The Worker Vice-Chairperson withdrew his group's amendment (A.139) to insert a new point after 16(k).

Point 16(l)

- 468. The Employer Vice-Chairperson withdrew his group's amendment (A.45) to delete paragraph 16(l).
- 469. The amendment submitted by the Government member of Argentina to delete paragraph 16(l) was not seconded and fell.
- 470. Point 16(l) was adopted.

Subheading after point 16(l)

- 471. The subheading under 16(l): "Equality and inclusion", was adopted.

Point 16(m)

- 472. The Government member of Gabon, speaking on behalf of the Africa group, submitted an amendment (A.171) to delete the words "and on all grounds," from point 16(m). His group wished the conclusions to remain within the context of the FPRW. The fundamental text in this case was the Discrimination (Employment and Occupation) Convention, 1958 (No. 111). The words "and on all grounds" did not feature in that instrument. As a result, the phrase did not add value to point 16(m).
- 473. The Employer Vice-Chairperson and the Worker Vice-Chairperson said that they would align with the majority.
- 474. The Government member of China supported the amendment.
- 475. The Government members of Belgium, speaking on behalf of the EU and its Member States, Canada, Mexico, speaking on behalf of GRULAC, Norway, also speaking on behalf of Iceland, the United Kingdom, and the United States supported the original wording.
- 476. The Employer Vice-Chairperson and the Worker Vice-Chairperson, noting an apparent majority in favour of the original wording, said that their groups supported that wording.
- 477. The Government member of Sierra Leone said that this issue should be governed specifically by Article 1 of Convention No. 111. The current wording was vague.
- 478. The Government member of Indonesia supported the deletion of the phrase "and on all grounds".
- 479. The Government member of Cameroon said that inclusion of the words "and on all grounds" might be used by persons engaging in terrorist or political activity seeking impunity through invoking the protection accorded to workers. It was therefore preferable from the perspective of the protection of the State to delete the phrase.
- 480. The Government member of Senegal said that the Committee should bolster the legal framework of protection of workers from discrimination. Point 16(m) referred to eliminating "discrimination in employment and occupation for all workers". The phrase "and on all

grounds” was superfluous. The Africa group sought support on this issue, which was important to the group. The group unanimously supported deletion.

481. The Government member of Belgium, speaking on behalf of the EU and its Member States, said that it did not seem possible that frameworks to protect workers from discrimination in employment and occupation would ever lead to terrorism.
482. The Government member of the United States noted that the wording had been included in the tentative conclusions prepared by the Office. The United States found the phrase useful. She requested further explanation of the wording from the Secretariat.
483. The Representative of the Secretary-General said that under Convention No. 111, the term “discrimination” referred to differential treatment, consisting of a given preference, exclusion or different treatment of someone, relative to someone else. To restrict the point to eliminating discrimination in employment and occupation for all workers was not sufficient because discrimination occurred due to various unlawful distinctions. Article 1 of Convention No. 111 listed seven grounds of discrimination. However, grounds for discrimination evolved over time. Behaviour considered acceptable in the past might not be considered so in the present. New causes of discrimination might arise. Thus, Article 1(b) of Convention No. 111 allowed Member States, after consulting with employers’ and workers’ organizations, to determine additional grounds of discrimination, if they so decided. The ILO had responded to this, issuing Recommendations for example on disability, HIV/AIDS, health status and age. International humanitarian law likewise took account of the shifting nature of discrimination.
484. The Government member of Sierra Leone, speaking on behalf of the Africa group, proposed a subamendment to the group’s amendment, to replace the phrase “and on all grounds” with “in accordance with ILO Convention No. 111, based on national circumstances”.
485. The Government members of Cameroon, Gabon, Ghana and Indonesia supported the subamendment.
486. The Government member of Mexico, speaking on behalf of GRULAC, rejected the subamendment, stating that it did not cover the meaning of “and on all grounds”, as the Secretariat had explained it.
487. The Employer Vice-Chairperson recognized the importance accorded by various governments to the issues under consideration, and the genuine concern felt by parties. His group had therefore looked for guidance where the issues had been discussed in a tripartite setting. The resolution concerning inequalities and the world of work, adopted by the 109th Session (December 2021) of the International Labour Conference contained a possible solution. He proposed a subamendment to point 16(m), to read “Continue strengthening legal and policy frameworks to eliminate discrimination in employment and occupation for all workers and on all grounds protected by international law and human rights standards, and ensure that their application is effective, regularly monitored and evaluated;”.
488. The Worker Vice-Chairperson supported the proposed subamendment.
489. The Government member of Gabon, speaking on behalf of the Africa group, supported the subamended text.
490. The Government members of Belgium, speaking on behalf of the EU and its Member States, and of Norway said that they could join the consensus.
491. The Government member of Mexico, speaking on behalf of GRULAC, said that his group could join the consensus.

- 492. The Government member of Canada asked for clarification as to whether the proposed formulation would include interpretations by the Committee of Experts and by UN treaty bodies.
- 493. The Representative of the Secretary-General said that in the ILO the term “standards” referred to the Organization’s Conventions, Protocols and Recommendations. In the United Nations, the term was used to refer to the standards laid down in the UN human rights treaties and the work of the treaty bodies often helped to clarify them. Human rights standards are also contained in non-binding instruments such as the Universal Declaration of Human Rights and may take the form of customary international law or general principles of law.
- 494. The Government member of Canada said that her Government could join the consensus.
- 495. The amendment (A.171) proposed by the Africa group was adopted as subamended.
- 496. The Employer Vice-Chairperson withdrew his group’s amendment (A.48) to point 16(m).
- 497. Point 16(m) was adopted as amended.

Point 16(n)

- 498. The Government member of Japan presented an amendment (A.97) submitted jointly with the Government member of Türkiye to insert the word “equal” between the words “women for” and “work”, and “or work” before the words “of equal value”, to read “for equal work or work of equal value”. That wording was in line with agreed wording in labour ministerial meetings such as the Group of 20 (G20) Labour and Employment Ministers’ Meeting Declaration of 2020.
- 499. The Employer Vice-Chairperson and the Worker Vice-Chairperson said that their groups supported the original language but would join the consensus.
- 500. The Government members of Gabon, speaking on behalf of the Africa group, and the United States joined the consensus.
- 501. The amendment (A.97) was adopted.
- 502. The Employer Vice-Chairperson withdrew his group’s amendment (A.50) to point 16(n).
- 503. Point 16(n) was adopted as amended.

Point 16(o)

- 504. The Government member of Belgium, speaking on behalf of the EU Member States and Türkiye, submitted an amendment (A.110) to delete the words “domestic workers, workers in the rural and informal economy, and migrant workers, as well as other groups” and replace them with the phrase “persons belonging to one or more vulnerable groups or groups in situations of vulnerability”, language that was in line with the resolution concerning a just transition towards environmentally sustainable economies and societies for all, adopted by the 111th Session (June 2023) of the International Labour Conference and which took account of the variety of vulnerable groups as well as national contexts.
- 505. The Worker Vice-Chairperson said that the Worker group preferred the original language.
- 506. The Government members of Canada, China, Indonesia, the United Kingdom and the United States supported the amendment, which used agreed language and reflected an inclusive approach.
- 507. The Government member of Mexico, speaking on behalf of GRULAC, stressed the importance for the governments of his group of adopting a progressive approach to this issue. The fact

was that the three groups historically at risk of exclusion and discrimination were so on grounds of race, gender, or ethnicity. With that statement reflected in the record of proceedings, GRULAC could support the amendment proposed by the EU Member States.

- 508.** The Worker Vice-Chairperson and the Employer Vice-Chairperson said that their groups would join the consensus around the amendment.
- 509.** The amendment (A.110) was adopted.
- 510.** The Government member of Belgium, speaking on behalf of the EU Member States, and Türkiye tabled an amendment (A.111) to replace the term “compounding” with “intersecting”.
- 511.** The Worker Vice-Chairperson and the Employer Vice-Chairperson supported the amendment.
- 512.** The Government members of Canada, Gabon, speaking on behalf of the Africa group, Mexico, speaking on behalf of GRULAC, the United Kingdom, and the United States, supported the amendment.
- 513.** The Government member of Indonesia said he would prefer the original text but could join the consensus. He requested that his preference be reflected in the record of proceedings.
- 514.** The amendment (A.111) was adopted. Amendments A.52 and A.6 fell as a consequence.
- 515.** Point 16(o) was adopted as amended.

New point after point 16(o)

- 516.** The Worker Vice-Chairperson introduced an amendment (A.138). His group wished to make a subamendment to that text, by placing a full stop after the words “fundamental rights”, and deleting the remaining phrases.
- 517.** The Employer Vice-Chairperson supported the amendment as subamended.
- 518.** The Government members of Belgium, speaking on behalf of the EU and its Member States, Switzerland and Türkiye supported the amendment as subamended.
- 519.** The amendment (A.138) was adopted as subamended.
- 520.** The new point to be placed after point 16(o) was adopted as amended.

Point 16(p)

- 521.** The Worker Vice-Chairperson presented an amendment (A.137) to insert the words “and inequalities”, delete the following word “a”, and pluralize the word “driver” to “drivers”.
- 522.** The Employer Vice-Chairperson supported the amendment.
- 523.** There was broad support from the government benches for the amendment.
- 524.** The amendment (A.137) was adopted.
- 525.** The Employer Vice-Chairperson withdrew his group’s two remaining amendments (A.54 and A.55) to point 16(p).
- 526.** The Worker Vice-Chairperson withdrew his group’s two remaining amendments (A.135 and A.136) to point 16(p).
- 527.** Point 16(p) was adopted as amended.

New point after point 16(p)

- 528.** The Worker Vice-Chairperson withdrew his group's amendment (A.134) to insert a new point after point 16(p).
- 529.** Point 16 was adopted in its entirety. The Committee noted that point 16 would be moved to become point 15.

Subtitle**III. Priorities for ILO action**

- 530.** The subtitle of part III "III. Priorities for ILO Action" was adopted.

Heading

- 531.** The heading before point 17 "Thematic priorities" was adopted.

Point 17**Chapeau to point 17**

- 532.** The Employer Vice-Chairperson introduced an amendment (A.56) to delete "promote FPRW as a stand-alone objective as well as" which was discussed together with two other identical amendments (A.112 and A.7) submitted by the EU Member States and China, respectively, and two amendments (A.133 and A.113) to delete "continue to" submitted by the Workers and the EU Member States, respectively. The Employer Vice-Chairperson argued that promotion of FPRW as a stand-alone objective did not add to the substance of the sentence and almost inferred a siloed approach and strategy that was not consistent with the Office's integrated strategy on FPRW.
- 533.** The Worker Vice-Chairperson did not support the Employers' amendment, referring to the Office report, which highlighted the need to promote FPRW as a stand-alone objective.
- 534.** The Government member of Belgium, speaking on behalf of the EU and its Member States, supported the deletion of both phrases, as the EU Member States were in favour of adding two additional priorities to the list of thematic priorities.
- 535.** The Worker Vice-Chairperson, the Government members of the United States, Mexico, speaking on behalf of GRULAC, Gabon, speaking on behalf of the Africa group, and Türkiye said that they could be flexible and could go with the consensus.
- 536.** The Employer Vice-Chairperson clarified that there were two distinct amendments and that the "continue to" amendment depended on the outcome of the discussion on the thematic priorities; in other words, "continue to" would apply if the same three priorities were retained but should be removed if there were more than three priorities agreed or if there was a change in the designation of the priorities. Thus, the only issue at the current juncture before the Committee was whether to include "promote FPRW as a stand-alone objective as well as".
- 537.** The amendments (A.56, A.112 and A.7, A.133 and A.113) were adopted.
- 538.** The chapeau to point 17 was adopted as amended.

Point 17(a)

- 539.** Point 17(a) was adopted.

Point 17(b)

- 540.** The Government member of Belgium, speaking on behalf of the EU Member States, introduced an amendment (A.114) to delete the word “sustainable” before “supply chains”, noting that it was important for all enterprises to be sustainable.
- 541.** The Employer Vice-Chairperson did not object to the amendment.
- 542.** The Government member of Argentina and the Worker Vice-Chairperson supported the amendment.
- 543.** The amendment was adopted.
- 544.** Point 17(b) was adopted as amended.

Point 17(c)

- 545.** Point 17(c) was adopted.

Points 17(d) and 17(e)

- 546.** The Employer Vice-Chairperson introduced an amendment (A.59) to delete point 17(d), arguing that, even though the first three priorities had been in place for three years, they still required much work; it was thus inappropriate to add to the thematic priorities, which would use up limited ILO budget resources.
- 547.** The Worker Vice-Chairperson did not support deleting the point, noting that just transition linked to FPRW had been mentioned in paragraph 129 of the Office report in terms of endangering jobs and livelihoods across the world, and in Part II(A) of the ILO Centenary Declaration, which stated that “In discharging its constitutional mandate, [...] the ILO must direct its efforts to: ensuring a just transition to a future of work that contributes to sustainable development [...]”. It was an urgent issue being addressed worldwide and must be included.
- 548.** The Employer Vice-Chairperson said that the topic had been discussed at the International Labour Conference in 2023 and that the conclusions had not requested the Office to create a nexus between just transition and FPRW, rather the resolution had simply asked the Office to strengthen the capacity of the constituents.
- 549.** The Government member of China supported the Employers’ position.
- 550.** The Government members of Belgium, speaking on behalf of the EU and its Member States, Canada, Türkiye, Switzerland, the United States, and Mexico, speaking in his national capacity and on behalf of Brazil and Argentina, supported retaining point 17(d).
- 551.** The Government member of Gabon, speaking on behalf of the Africa group, said that he could be flexible on the amendment.
- 552.** The Employer Vice-Chairperson said that the Employers recognized that there was a majority of support for maintaining the text, but insisted the same principle could not apply to the subsequent thematic priorities on the list, so it was difficult to reach a decision on the two amendments in isolation.
- 553.** The Worker Vice-Chairperson disagreed, noting that it was important to address both issues, and the Committee had not yet heard the governments’ views on digitalization and the platform economy. As the overwhelming majority supported keeping the addition on just transition, it would not be prudent to discuss it on basis of programme and budget, which was a separate topic.

- 554.** The Employer Vice-Chairperson withdrew his group's amendment (A.59).
- 555.** The Employer Vice-Chairperson introduced amendment (A.60) to delete point 17(e), arguing that unlike just transition, the subject of the digital economy was a topic in a state of flux, with emerging work arrangements due to be discussed in the standard-setting discussion on decent work in the platform economy in the International Labour Conference in 2025. The Employers opposed the addition of both themes to the list of thematic priorities.
- 556.** The Worker Vice-Chairperson did not support deleting point 17(e), considering that the work on the first three thematic priorities would never be completed and emerging trends relevant to FPRW needed to be addressed. Paragraph 129 of the Office report referred to digital platforms, which were providing work for workers but with critical challenges to addressing their rights. The Office must be equipped with the requisite competencies to advise Member States on the issues in question.
- 557.** The Government member of Belgium, speaking on behalf of the EU and its Member States, agreed that it was important not to pre-empt the normative work of the Office. On behalf of the EU Member States, he proposed a subamendment to delete the reference to emerging work arrangements, while maintaining the reference to the digital economy.
- 558.** The Government member of the United Kingdom noted that both a just transition and the digital economy were key changes affecting the world of work.
- 559.** The Government member of Türkiye supported maintaining both point 17(d) on a just transition and point 17(e) on emerging work arrangements in its future work but could be flexible concerning the subamendment proposed by the EU Member States.
- 560.** The Government member of Indonesia supported retaining point 17(d) on a just transition and expressed flexibility on point 17(e), suggesting it was inclined to support the subamendment proposed by Belgium, to remove the reference to emerging work arrangements.
- 561.** The Government member of the United States said that she could be flexible regarding the digital economy.
- 562.** The Government member of Mexico, speaking in his national capacity and on behalf Brazil, supported both concepts in point 17(e) and did not support the subamendment proposed by the EU Member States.
- 563.** The Government member of Canada saw the need to keep both phrases under point 17(e) but indicated she would be open to accepting the subamendment proposed by the EU Member States if it helped reach consensus.
- 564.** The Government member of Barbados expressed flexibility in accepting the subamendment proposed by the EU Member States but noted that, if consensus could not be achieved, it would be important to include a statement indicating the importance of looking at emerging work arrangements as part of the process of examining FPRW.
- 565.** The Government member of Gabon, speaking on behalf of the Africa group, said that if the ILO supported a just transition and the digital economy it would benefit African countries; it therefore supported the subamendment proposed by the EU Member States.
- 566.** The Employer Vice-Chairperson appreciated the constructive discussion, but reiterated his group's concerns, noting that taking stock and making recommendations required practical advice and sufficient resources at a time of zero budget growth in the ILO. With great reluctance, he indicated that the Employers would not block consensus and would accept the

subamendment proposed by the EU Member States. He withdrew his group's amendment (A.60).

- 567.** The Worker Vice-Chairperson agreed to the subamendment proposed by the EU Member States.
- 568.** The subamendments proposed to point 17(e) by the Government member of Belgium, on behalf of the EU Member States, were adopted.
- 569.** Point 17(d) was adopted.
- 570.** Point 17(e) was adopted as amended.
- 571.** The Government member of Kiribati introduced an amendment (A.187) to add a new clause, to read "labour mobility to enhance and promote fair and inclusive employment opportunities for all".
- 572.** The amendment was not seconded and therefore fell.
- 573.** Point 17 was adopted in its entirety as amended.

Point 18

- 574.** Amendments (A.182, A.115 and A.61) to delete point 18 had been submitted by GRULAC, the EU Member States and the Employers, respectively. An amendment (A.188) to replace the text of point 18 with "Just transition towards environmentally sustainable economies and societies for all, with special consideration for small island developing States, least-developed countries and migrant workers" had been proposed by Kiribati.
- 575.** The Employer Vice-Chairperson said that, given the discussion that had just taken place, the language was superfluous and point 18 should be deleted.
- 576.** Amendments A.182, A.115 and A.61 were adopted.
- 577.** Amendment A.188 fell as a consequence.
- 578.** Point 18 was deleted.

Heading

- 579.** The heading before point 19 "Means of action" was adopted.

Point 19

Chapeau to point 19

- 580.** The Government member of the United States introduced an amendment (A.99) tabled by the Government members of Canada, Switzerland and the United States, arguing that since the current strategy on integrating FPRW ended in 2023, it was important to ask the Office to develop and implement a new strategy on FPRW.
- 581.** The Worker Vice-Chairperson said that his group's amendment (A.132) was similar and indicated that the Workers would consider withdrawing their amendment in favour of A.99 if it facilitated consensus.
- 582.** The Employer Vice-Chairperson said that the Employers preferred the original chapeau text, but they could propose subamendments if there was support for the amendment.

- 583.** The Government members of Norway, speaking also on behalf of Iceland, Belgium, speaking on behalf of the EU and its Member States, and the United Kingdom supported the amendment.
- 584.** The Government member of China said it was important to take into account the national context of Member States, and proposed a subamendment to insert “, taking into account the national contexts of Member States,” at the end of the amendment.
- 585.** The Chairperson noted that China had submitted an amendment (A.8) to the same effect but agreed to accept their amendment as a subamendment to facilitate the discussion.
- 586.** The Government members of Japan, Indonesia and Senegal seconded China’s subamendment.
- 587.** The Employer Vice-Chairperson proposed subamendments to delete the reference to the high-level evaluation, as it was neither a tripartite document, nor adopted by the Governing Body; to replace “develop and implement a new integrated strategy on FPRW” with “include in its integrated strategy on FPRW”; to delete “, paying”; and to insert “, while remaining responsive to needs of constituents”, after “categories”. The subamended text would read “The Office should include in its integrated strategy on FPRW particular attention to promoting a balance in Office action across the five FPRW categories, while remaining responsive to needs of constituents, and focus its work on the following areas:”.
- 588.** The Worker Vice-Chairperson did not support the subamendments proposed by the Employers, as it was important to emphasize “develop and implement”, given that the document was intended to guide the Office. It would also be difficult for the Office to take into account FPRW across the Office while taking into account national circumstances. The Workers agreed to delete the reference to the high-level evaluation, but not the other subamendments, given that the imbalances in FPRW were referenced in the Office report.
- 589.** The Employer Vice-Chairperson further explained the rationale behind each proposed subamendment, noting that any strategy was adapted towards the perspective of the future, so it was appropriate to allow for flexibility, whether developing a new strategy or adjusting an existing one. Addressing imbalances seemed not to be a strategy statement but a remedial statement. The Employers’ intention was to be positive in the approach, while recognizing that technical assistance was often driven by the demand perceived from the constituents.
- 590.** The Worker Vice-Chairperson recalled that the main purpose of the recurrent discussion was to take stock of the past and address what could be done better. Citing paragraph 124 of the Office report, where it was indicated that, with some exceptions, the Office had pursued more singular focus efforts and not an integrated approach, he emphasized the need to say what needed to be done better.
- 591.** The Government member of China agreed to the Employers’ subamendment to delete mention of the high-level evaluation, but insisted on the importance of maintaining the reference to the national context of Member States.
- 592.** The Government member of Gabon, speaking on behalf of the Africa group, supported the subamendments proposed by the Employers and the Government member of China.
- 593.** The Government member of Türkiye supported the text as subamended by the Employers and expressed flexibility on the subamendment proposed by the Government member of China.
- 594.** The Government member of Ghana supported the subamendment proposed by the Government member of China.

- 595.** The Government member of the United States proposed a subamendment to provide new wording, to read “The Office should update its integrated strategy on FPRW, including addressing the imbalances in Office action across the five FPRW categories, and focus its work on the following areas, while remaining responsive to the needs of constituents:”.
- 596.** The Government members of Japan, Belgium, speaking on behalf of the EU Member States, the United Kingdom and Norway seconded the subamendment.
- 597.** The Employer Vice-Chairperson agreed to the subamendment but made a further subamendment to replace “addressing the imbalances” with “promoting balance”, given that the language was more constructive.
- 598.** The Government member of Cameroon supported the subamendment but proposed an additional subamendment to insert “taking into account the national context of Member States”.
- 599.** The Government members of Ghana and Senegal seconded the subamendment.
- 600.** The Worker Vice-Chairperson noted that a reference to national circumstances was included under point 17 and it was therefore unnecessary to repeat it. His group supported the subamended text proposed by the Government member of the United States, as subamended by Employers, but did not support the subamendment proposed by the Government member of Cameroon. He proposed a subamendment to replace “addressing the imbalances in Office action” with “ensuring balance in Office action”.
- 601.** The Government member of Mexico, speaking in his national capacity, proposed a subamendment to insert “taking into account the context of constituents”.
- 602.** The Government member of Indonesia supported the subamendment.
- 603.** The Government member of China said that “ensuring balance” was too strong a term. She proposed a subamendment to place greater emphasis on the phrase “taking into account the national context” by moving it before the reference to “the five categories of FPRW”.
- 604.** The Government member of Cameroon seconded the subamendment proposed by the Government member of China.
- 605.** The Government member of Türkiye supported the text as subamended by the Workers’ group.
- 606.** The Employer Vice-Chairperson, sharing the Government member of China’s view that the word “ensuring” was too strong and prescriptive, proposed a subamended text, to read “The Office should update its integrated strategy on FPRW to balance Office action across five FPRW categories, address gaps in implementation, and respond effectively to the needs of constituents, while taking into account the national contexts of Member States and focusing its work on the following areas:”.
- 607.** The Worker Vice-Chairperson expressed a concern regarding the role of the Office, which did not get involved in national-level support unless requested, and proposed a subamendment to maintain “while being responsive to the needs of constituents” but delete “taking into account the national contexts of Member States”.
- 608.** The Government member of Ghana did not support the Workers’ subamendment and proposed a subamendment to replace “balance Office action” with “balance its action”.
- 609.** The Governments of Cameroon, Indonesia, Malaysia and the United Republic of Tanzania seconded the subamendment.

- 610.** The Employer Vice-Chairperson said that the phrase “taking into account their national contexts” implied that the national context of tripartite constituents was considered, but proposed a subamendment to replace the comma after “categories” with “and”. It would then be a strong sentence that would address all interests.
- 611.** The Worker Vice-Chairperson supported the subamendment, providing it was the majority view.
- 612.** The Government member of the United States agreed that the Office needed to respond to national needs but given the global-level nature of some of the actions, she sought advice from the Office as to whether the Employers’ proposal would address the context of global and national level actions.
- 613.** The Representative of the Secretary-General confirmed that the ILO did indeed support activities and actions of constituents at different levels, such as support to the International Organization of Employers at the global level or the capacity-building needs of workers’ organizations at regional, intra-regional and local levels. Actions appearing under the chapeau of point 19 included references to national institutions, where support was provided only upon request and support would necessarily be tailored. But the draft means of action also included global-level activities such as producing global estimates on child labour or forced labour, encouraging peer learning and information-sharing across regions and within regions. Thus, a combination of different activities was foreseen, some of which would need to be conducted at the national level.
- 614.** The Government member of Canada agreed that the needs of constituents would encompass the national context, as well as intra-regional and global activities. Canada proposed a subamendment to delete “taking into account their national contexts”, which was seconded by the Government member of the United States.
- 615.** The Government members of Belgium, speaking on behalf of the EU and its Member States, Japan and Iceland, also speaking on behalf of Norway, as well as the Worker and Employer Vice-Chairpersons, supported the subamendment proposed by the Government member of Canada.
- 616.** The amendment (A.99) was adopted as subamended.
- 617.** Amendments A.132 and A.8 fell as a consequence.
- 618.** The chapeau to point 19 was adopted as amended.

Subheading

- 619.** The subheading “Standards-related action” before point 19(a) was adopted.

Point 19(a)

- 620.** The Government member of Canada introduced an amendment (A.91), submitted by the Governments of Canada, the EU Member States, Switzerland, the United Kingdom, and the United States. The amendment deleted “, including the Protocol of 2014 to Convention No. 29”, and inserted, following “the ten fundamental Conventions”, “and the Protocol of 2014 to the Convention No. 29”. It was a technical amendment and aimed at acknowledging the fact that the Protocol constituted the eleventh fundamental Convention.
- 621.** The Government member of the United Kingdom said that the amendment made it clearer that the Protocol was indeed one of the fundamental Conventions.

622. The Worker Vice-Chairperson supported the amendment but sought the guidance of the Office regarding the status of the Protocol.
623. The Representative of the Secretary-General said that the Protocol of 2014 could only be ratified by Member States that had already ratified the Forced Labour Convention, 1930 (No. 29), after which it became part and parcel of Convention No. 29.
624. The Employer Vice-Chairperson, while habitually against singling out individual instruments, supported the amendment, given that the Protocol of 2014 had a separate ratification process before becoming part of Convention No. 29.
625. The Government members of Argentina, Gabon, speaking on behalf of the Africa group, Iceland, Mexico, speaking on behalf of GRULAC, and Norway supported the amendment.
626. The amendment was adopted.
627. The Worker Vice-Chairperson introduced an amendment (A.130) which inserted, between “specific campaigns” and “and providing technical advisory services”, the phrase “to promote the Occupational Safety and Health Convention, 1981 (No. 155) and the Promotional Framework for Occupational Safety and Health Convention, 2006 (No. 187)”. The intention was to highlight that a safe and healthy working environment had become a new FPRW, and therefore to advocate for specific campaigns to promote the Conventions, building on the momentum.
628. The Employer Vice-Chairperson said that the intention was already covered by the wording encouraging ratification campaigns “in particular for those [Conventions] that are least ratified”. The Conclusions had a seven-year time span to cover. Over that period, priorities might change, and overly specific guidance could become obsolete.
629. The Government member of Ghana did not support singling out individual Conventions.
630. The Government member of the United Kingdom, noting that the Workers had tabled a further amendment (A.131) to point 19(a), singling out another two fundamental Conventions, queried whether a list of Conventions was in the making.
631. The Government member of Mexico, speaking on behalf of GRULAC, said that the first part of the point covered all ten fundamental Conventions.
632. The Government member of Türkiye said that the proposed amendment limited the scope of the point.
633. The Worker Vice-Chairperson withdrew amendment A.130 and introduced his group’s other amendment (A.131), which inserted the words “to promote the Freedom of Association and Protection of the Right to Organise Convention, 1948 (No.87) and the Right to Organise and Collective Bargaining Convention, 1949 (No. 98)” between “specific campaigns” and “and providing technical advisory services”. Those two instruments were acknowledged in many ILO texts as being the most important of the fundamental Conventions. They were critical enabling rights. The independent high-level evaluation of the ILO’s strategies and actions to promote fundamental principles and rights at work, 2018–23 had underlined that freedom of association and collective bargaining were inadequately addressed.
634. The Employer Vice-Chairperson did not support the amendment. The high-level evaluation report was not a document that had tripartite consensus. Each of the FPRW was an enabling condition, supporting the strategic objectives of the ILO. Individual areas should not be highlighted.
635. The Government member of Argentina supported the proposed amendment.

- 636.** The Government member of Belgium, speaking on behalf of the EU and its Member States, acknowledged the importance of Conventions Nos 87 and 98, but could not support an amendment that singled them out.
- 637.** The Government members of China, Türkiye and the United Kingdom aligned themselves with the statement made by the Government member of Belgium on behalf of the EU and its Member States.
- 638.** The Government member of Ghana pointed out that amendment A.91 had been adopted, already highlighting the Protocol of 2014. Which fundamental Convention was more important than another could depend on the situation in individual countries – one fundamental Convention might be more important to one country than another.
- 639.** The Worker Vice-Chairperson said that the language of the amendment was based on agreed language from the Social Justice Declaration, which spoke of “respecting, promoting and realizing the fundamental principles and rights at work, which are of particular significance, as both rights and enabling conditions that are necessary for the full realization of all of the strategic objectives [...] freedom of association and the effective recognition of the right to collective bargaining are particularly important to enable the attainment of the four strategic objectives”. The ILO Centenary Declaration placed “a focus on freedom of association and the effective recognition of the right to collective bargaining as enabling rights”. The proposed amendment was required in order to set guidelines for future work and address existing shortcomings.
- 640.** The Employer Vice-Chairperson disagreed that Conventions Nos 87 and 98 should be elevated above the other fundamental Conventions, such as the instruments on child labour and forced labour.
- 641.** The Worker Vice-Chairperson said that the purpose of the ILO at its establishment in 1919 had been to attain social peace. That could only be secured through freedom of association and the effective recognition of the right to collective bargaining. Certainly, combating child labour was crucial, but one of the most effective ways to address it was through promotion of freedom of association and collective bargaining.
- 642.** The Government member of Cuba, speaking also for Mexico and Brazil, supported the statement made on behalf of the EU and its Member States and the Employer group’s position. In his national capacity, he believed that it was important to retain a balance, and not highlight individual instruments.
- 643.** The Government member of Canada agreed with the statement made by the Government member of Belgium on behalf of the EU and its Member States, observing that Conventions Nos 87 and 98 already figured among the least ratified Conventions. However, it was true that the two fundamental Conventions were the foundation of social dialogue, and as such the cornerstone of democracy in the workplace. The Government of Canada was therefore open to the inclusion of those Conventions but would not block consensus.
- 644.** The Government member of Ghana agreed with the importance of Conventions Nos 87 and 98 but thought it important to take heed of the needs of all constituents, which might vary by country and region. The text already called for intensified efforts to increase ratification of the two instruments, as they were included in the category of “least ratified Conventions”.
- 645.** The Representative of the Secretary-General, at the request of the Worker Vice-Chairperson, informed the Committee that the Governing Body of the ILO had recently adopted two strategies on collective bargaining and occupational safety and health, respectively; the latter

strategy following the elevation of occupational safety and health as an FPRW. Both strategies included ratification campaigns for the fundamental Conventions concerned, and both were funded under the Programme and Budget for 2024–25.

646. The Worker Vice-Chairperson, in light of the information concerning ongoing ILO action to promote the least ratified fundamental Conventions, withdrew his group's amendment (A.131).

647. Point 19(a) was adopted as amended.

Point 19(b)

648. Point 19(b) was adopted.

Point 19(c)

649. The Government member of Mexico, speaking on behalf of GRULAC, introduced an amendment (A.183) to delete point 19(c). The implications of the point were unclear and might place too great a burden on Member States. He asked for clarification of the phrase "to enhance the potential of the annual follow-up to the 1998 Declaration".

650. The Representative of the Secretary-General explained that the annual follow-up included the preparation of reports containing information from all Member States on ratification of the fundamental Conventions, identifying obstacles to such ratification. The Employers' group had suggested that the questionnaires sent to Member States for that purpose might be improved and consequently allow the Office to offer better services, more closely targeted countries' needs, where requested to do so by Member States. The aim would be to tighten the link between the Office and Member States. Better information from Member States would enable the Office to align its actions more closely to needs, creating a virtuous circle.

651. The Employer Vice-Chairperson and the Worker Vice-Chairperson opposed the amendment.

652. The Government member of Mexico, speaking on behalf of GRULAC, withdrew the amendment.

653. The Worker Vice-Chairperson tabled another amendment (A.129) to point 19(c), which proposed deleting the first three words: "Explore avenues to".

654. The Employer Vice-Chairperson and the Government member of Ghana supported the amendment.

655. The amendment was adopted.

656. The Chairperson asked the Committee to turn its attention to a further amendment (A.9), submitted by China.

657. The Government member of China withdrew the amendment.

658. The Government member of the United States introduced an amendment (A.101), tabled by the Governments of Canada, Switzerland, the United Kingdom and the United States, to insert "to better inform technical assistance in response to requests" between "use of the information" and "gathered therein". The purpose was to make clearer the use of the additional information gathered.

659. The Employer Vice-Chairperson said that his group preferred the original language, which allowed the information to be used in any number of ways. The wording made the text restrictive.

- 660. The Worker Vice-Chairperson said that his group supported the amendment but would join a contrary consensus if necessary.
- 661. The Government member of Ghana did not support the amendment, which limited the scope of point 19(c).
- 662. The Government member of Argentina and the Government member of Belgium, speaking on behalf of the EU and its Member States, supported the amendment.
- 663. The Government member of Senegal proposed a subamendment to insert “specifically” after “information”, to read “through an improved use of information specifically to better inform technical assistance in response to requests gathered therein”, which was seconded by the Government Members of Cameroon and Morocco.
- 664. The Employer Vice-Chairperson found the text even more restrictive in that it directed use of the information specifically to technical assistance, stifling the full potential of gathering information in that way.
- 665. The Government member of the United States agreed that the follow-up to the 1998 Declaration was a useful source of information. The amendment was aimed specifically at the question “what are your technical assistance needs?” She asked for clarification regarding the Office’s views on an “improved use of information”.
- 666. The Representative of the Secretary-General said that currently the Office made the information gathered available through the baseline reports. The Office made other use of the information, but not exclusively for technical assistance. The follow-up to the 1998 Declaration was potentially a rich mine of information for the ILO, useful for multiple purposes. She suggested wording to read “including through an improved use of the information gathered therein to, among other purposes, better inform technical assistance in response to requests” to be considered by the Committee.
- 667. The Employer Vice-Chairperson proposed a subamendment to place a full stop after “technical assistance” and delete the remaining four words.
- 668. The Worker Vice-Chairperson supported the subamendment.
- 669. The Government member of China did not support the proposed wording, as “among other purposes” could be ambiguous.
- 670. The Government member of Ghana proposed reverting to the original text, which avoided placing the accent on informing technical assistance.
- 671. The Government member of the United States withdrew the amendment.
- 672. Point 19(c) was adopted as amended.

Point 19(d)

- 673. The Worker Vice-Chairperson introduced an amendment (A.128), the purpose of which was to allow the supervisory bodies to better guide development cooperation, technical assistance and research. The amendment replaced the first three words of the draft text “Ensure synergies between” by “Ensure that the outcomes of”, and inserted “guide” between “supervisory bodies” and “development cooperation”. However, the group withdrew the amendment in favour of an amendment (A.103) submitted by the Governments of Canada, Switzerland, the United Kingdom and the United States.

- 674. The Government member of the United States introduced an amendment (A.103), which inserted “, including by enhancing efforts to mainstream understanding of the functioning and outputs of the ILO supervisory mechanisms across the Organization, both in the field and in headquarters” after “technical assistance and research”. The aim was to connect the work of the supervisory bodies with technical cooperation and research.
- 675. The Employer Vice-Chairperson, the Worker Vice-Chairperson and the Government member of Mexico, speaking on behalf of GRULAC, supported the amendment.
- 676. The Government member of the United States explained that her Government, and the other governments tabling the amendment, believed there was room to build bridges between development cooperation and technical assistance and the supervisory mechanisms.
- 677. The Government member of Ghana proposed a subamendment to replace “between” with “among”, which was seconded by the Government members of Cameroon and Morocco.
- 678. The Employer Vice-Chairperson, the Worker Vice-Chairperson and the Government member of Senegal supported the subamendment but requested clarification of the meaning of “in the field”.
- 679. The Representative of the Secretary-General explained that the text should say “Office” rather than “Organization”. The meaning was to ensure that all ILO employees, in field offices, but also those not attached to field offices and at headquarters, should be fully conversant with the functioning of the supervisory machinery.
- 680. The amendment was adopted as subamended.
- 681. Point 19(d) was adopted as amended.

Subheading

- 682. The subheading before point 19(d) “Enhance research and capacity” was adopted.

Point 19(e)

- 683. The Employer Vice-Chairperson introduced an amendment (A.65) to insert before “develop” the words “continue to”, and to insert after “develop” the words “for all constituents”. It was a technical rather than a substantive amendment.
- 684. The Worker Vice-Chairperson said that it was self-evident that the ILO worked for all constituents and therefore the phrase was redundant. He proposed a subamendment to delete the words.
- 685. The Government member of Türkiye supported the amendment as subamended.
- 686. The Worker Vice-Chairperson, responding to a request for clarification from the Government member of Canada on the rationale behind the deletion of “for all constituents”, said that the phrase could create an obligation for the Office to respond to requests from one group of constituents for tools specific to their group. By definition the ILO promoted and conducted activities for all constituents.
- 687. The Employer Vice-Chairperson withdrew the phrase “for all constituents” from his group’s amendment.
- 688. The Government member of Ghana agreed with the withdrawal. He proposed a subamendment to insert the words “promote and conduct” before “research”, given that research was conducted, rather than developed, so that it would read “promote and conduct

research, develop tools, guidelines, statistical measurement methodologies, and associated training resources, for qualitative and quantitative data collection and research on FPRW". The Government members of Sierra Leone and Senegal seconded the subamendment.

- 689.** The Worker Vice-Chairperson supported the subamendment.
- 690.** The Employer Vice-Chairperson supported the subamendment and proposed a further subamendment to insert the word "and" before "develop tools".
- 691.** The amendment was adopted as subamended.
- 692.** The Government of Canada introduced an amendment (A.92), tabled by the Governments of Canada, Switzerland, the United Kingdom and the United States, to insert "; including disaggregated data on discrimination and other under-addressed FPRW categories," after "data collection". The high-level evaluation had highlighted the uneven distribution of development cooperation funding for freedom of association and collective bargaining and for discrimination, while the Office report referred to the lack of disaggregated data to assess progress and gaps in the area of discrimination.
- 693.** The Employer Vice-Chairperson, the Worker Vice-Chairperson, the Government members of Belgium, speaking on behalf of the EU and its Member States, and of Mexico, speaking on behalf of GRULAC and in his national capacity, supported the amendment.
- 694.** The Government member of Gabon questioned why discrimination was being highlighted in the amendment.
- 695.** The Government member of Canada explained that non-discrimination at work was one of the FPRW where disaggregated data was lacking. Without data, it was not possible to identify gaps, and thus the Office could not assess progress made. The high-level evaluation noted that freedom of association and collective bargaining and discrimination were allocated the smallest share of development cooperation funding.
- 696.** The Government member of Sierra Leone said that the basic definition of research involved systematic collection and analysis, including disaggregation. If the data was not analysed, it was not complete. Therefore, the phrase "including disaggregated data" was redundant. He did not support the amendment.
- 697.** The Government member of China submitted a subamendment to delete the words "and other under-addressed FPRW categories", which was seconded by the Government member of Cameroon.
- 698.** The Government member of the United Kingdom, the Worker Vice-Chairperson, the Employer Vice-Chairperson and the Government member of Gabon supported the original amendment as submitted.
- 699.** The Government member of China withdrew her subamendment.
- 700.** The Government member of Ghana preferred the original text from the Drafting Group. Research should focus on all FPRW categories, and not be concentrated in one area.
- 701.** The Government member of the United States saw value in specifically pointing to the need for more disaggregated data, a shortcoming nonetheless highlighted in paragraph 108 of the Office report.
- 702.** The Government of Gabon expressed support for amendment A.92.
- 703.** The amendment was adopted.

704. Point 19(e) was adopted as amended.

Point 19(f)

- 705.** The Employer Vice-Chairperson introduced his group's amendment (A.67), which was technical and aimed at improving clarity. It replaced the word "institutions" with "capacities".
- 706.** The Worker Vice-Chairperson said that his group could be flexible regarding the amendment, although the word "institutions" was more precise.
- 707.** The Government member of Belgium, speaking on behalf of the EU and its Member States, said that when talking of research bodies, the term "institutions" was more common.
- 708.** The Government member of Mexico, speaking in his national capacity, proposed subamending to "institutional capacities". The subamendment was seconded by the Government member of the United Republic of Tanzania.
- 709.** The Government member of Norway supported the statement made by the Government member of Belgium on behalf of the EU and its Member States.
- 710.** The Employer Vice-Chairperson withdrew the amendment.
- 711.** The Government member of Mexico, speaking in his national capacity, withdrew his subamendment.
- 712.** The Employer Vice-Chairperson introduced a second amendment (A.68) to point 19(f) to replace the words "prevalence of deficits" with the less negative term "status".
- 713.** The Worker Vice-Chairperson supported the amendment.
- 714.** The Government members of Argentina; Belgium, on behalf of the EU and its Member States; Cameroon, also speaking for Morocco; Canada; Gabon, speaking on behalf of the Africa group; Ghana; Mexico; Norway; and the United States supported the amendment.
- 715.** The amendment was adopted.
- 716.** Point 19(f) was adopted as amended.

Point 19(g)

- 717.** The Government member of Belgium, speaking on behalf of the EU Member States, introduced an amendment (A.116) to delete the words "if data permit".
- 718.** The Worker Vice-Chairperson supported the amendment.
- 719.** The Employer Vice-Chairperson explained that if the amendment was adopted, then a subsequent amendment (A.70) affecting the deleted words and tabled by the Employers, would necessarily fall. He therefore proposed submitting amendment A.70 as a subamendment to amendment A.116, with the wording to read ", as data permit". It recognized that perfect data often did not exist, but there was a threshold of data which, while not perfect, might allow valid work to go ahead.
- 720.** The Worker Vice-Chairperson supported the subamendment.
- 721.** The Government member of Mexico, speaking in his national capacity, preferred the amendment without the subamendment.
- 722.** The Government member of Belgium, speaking on behalf of the EU Member States, proposed a subamendment to remove the comma between "issues" and "as data permit".

- 723.** The Worker Vice-Chairperson supported the subamendment.
- 724.** The Government member of the United States proposed a subamendment to insert the word “on” between “and” and “other”, to read “and on other FPRW issues”, which was seconded by the Government members of Canada and the United Kingdom.
- 725.** The Employer Vice-Chairperson submitted a further subamendment to allow the phrase “as data permit” to qualify each of the areas of research listed, so that the text would read “continue to produce, in collaboration with Member States, global estimates on child labour, forced labour and on other FPRW issues, as data permit;”.
- 726.** The Worker Vice-Chairperson and the Government member of the United Republic of Tanzania agreed with the text as subamended.
- 727.** The Government member of the United States said that, given the consensus on the matter, she could be flexible. It would be important to ensure that what was being conveyed to the Office was clear. It was anticipated that the Office would continue to collect data and produce global estimates on child labour and forced labour, and the question around other FPRW issues had been well discussed.
- 728.** The Representative of the Secretary-General clarified that the Office currently produced global estimates on child labour and forced labour, where the minimum data necessary existed. However, in other areas of the FPRW, where data collection was difficult, that was not the case. There were, for example, challenges to forming estimates on data on disability-based discrimination. On the other hand, data on gender inequalities and participation were available, albeit unevenly. It might therefore be preferable to revert to the previous formulation.
- 729.** The Employer Vice-Chairperson withdrew his group’s subamendment.
- 730.** The Government member of Ghana proposed a subamendment to delete the second “on”, between “and” and “other”, which was seconded by the Government member of Senegal.
- 731.** The Government member of the United States said that she found the word “on” useful but could withdraw her subamendment if necessary.
- 732.** The Government member of China asked whether the Office had already produced global estimates for other FPRWs and, if not, why the phrase “continue to produce” might be thought appropriate.
- 733.** The Representative of the Secretary-General said that the Office produced global estimates for forced labour and child labour on a regular basis. In collaboration with the World Health Organization (WHO), it also produced global estimates on some aspects of occupational safety and health. Regarding migrant workers vis-à-vis their treatment compared to nationals, the ILO produced global estimates on migrant workers, although not on a regular basis. In the past, the ILO had run a survey on indigenous peoples’ labour market participation as compared to non-indigenous populations’ labour market participation. There were, moreover, several FPRW for which estimates had never been produced.
- 734.** The Government member of China said that, in light of the response, the phrase “continue to produce” was questionable, given that the Office was not producing certain global FPRW estimates.
- 735.** The Representative of the Secretary-General also clarified that surveys were produced with Gallup on violence and harassment. Possibly the text should be amended to distinguish between the different types of data produced.

- 736.** The Government member of China presented an amendment (A.190), to insert the words “based on reliable evidence, facts and data” between the terms “FPRW issues” and “[if data permit];”. She explained that the amendment sought to express an understanding that, while data was imperfect, it should nevertheless reflect reality. The Government member of Senegal seconded the amendment.
- 737.** On request, the Secretariat provided an alternative formulation to the amendment (A.116) submitted by the Government members of the EU to point 19(g), to read: “Produce, in collaboration with Member States, global estimates on child labour and forced labour, and other FPRW issues as data permit, and based on international statistical standards and measurement practices;”
- 738.** The Employer Vice-Chairperson and the Worker Vice-Chairperson supported the alternative formulation.
- 739.** The Government member of China supported the alternative formulation but requested clarification regarding international statistical standards and measurement practices.
- 740.** The Deputy Representative of the Secretary-General said that the ILO had been producing global estimates for over 20 years. The estimates were an approximation in terms of numbers and were not intended to provide a basis for policy guidance at the national level. The Global estimates on child labour and forced labour had been more and more robust based on an increased number of national statistical data. On the other hand, the statistical definition of child labour had evolved over the years and had been adopted by the International Conference of Labour Statisticians (ICLS). The methodology used for the publication of global estimates on child labour and forced labour was transparent and was annexed to the respective reports issued.
- 741.** The Government member of China said that his Government was actively involved in the ICLS and proposed to subamend point 19(g) by adding, after the words “international statistical standards”, the words “adopted by the ICLS”.
- 742.** The Deputy Representative of the Secretary-General said that the phrase was redundant to the extent that international statistical standards were necessarily adopted by the ICLS, just as international labour standards were necessarily adopted by the International Labour Conference.
- 743.** The Government members of China and Gabon, on behalf of the Africa group, supported the draft text provided by the Secretariat.
- 744.** The alternative formulation was adopted.
- 745.** The Government member of China withdrew his amendment (A.190) to point 19(g).
- 746.** Point 19(g) was adopted as amended.

Point 19(h)

- 747.** The Worker Vice-Chairperson withdrew his group’s amendment (A.126), in preference for the original text submitted by the Drafting Group.
- 748.** The Government member of China introduced an amendment (A.11), explaining that the wording was similar to the previous one his Government had proposed.
- 749.** The amendment was not seconded and therefore fell.
- 750.** Point 19(h) was adopted.

New point after point 19(h)

- 751.** The Worker Vice-Chairperson introduced an amendment (A.123) to insert a new clause after point 19(h), to read “continue to undertake research and analysis on the intersection of FPRW and trade and investment, including in relation to labour rights clauses in trade and investment agreements, the use of forced labour import bans, and the use of public procurement to support FPRW;”. The 2023 recurrent discussion on labour protection had identified a need for further knowledge development on capacity-building around labour provisions in trade and investment agreements, including in public procurement, and that the ILO should undertake research into public procurement to foster adherence to labour rights. The Workers were proposing that such research should give a central place to FPRW and were incorporating a new element of forced labour import bans, given that many countries had introduced, or were discussing introducing, import bans on goods produced with forced labour. Hence more research was warranted, as the consequences were serious.
- 752.** The Employer Vice-Chairperson noted that there was agreement elsewhere in the draft conclusions on priority research topics but, for the sake of consensus, proposed a subamendment to delete “, the use of forced labour import bans, and the use of procurement to support FPRW” so that the work of the Office would not be limited.
- 753.** The Government member of Canada supported the Workers’ amendment, but not the Employers’ subamendment, noting that it was important to uphold FPRW benefits to all constituents.
- 754.** The Government member of China supported the Employers’ subamendment, expressing strong concern about the language “labour rights clauses in trade and investment agreements, the use of forced labour import bans, and the use of public procurement to support FPRW”. It was up to the negotiating parties to decide on the scope of trade and investment agreements and for governments to decide on their procurement policies. Some countries were using forced labour import bans as a way to introduce protectionist policies, which had severe consequences for the countries subjected to unfair, unilateral sanctions.
- 755.** The Government member of Malaysia aligned with China and supported the Employers’ subamendment.
- 756.** The Government members of Switzerland, the United Kingdom and the United States supported the Workers’ amendment.
- 757.** The Government member of Belgium, speaking on behalf of the EU Member States, preferred to retain the Workers’ original amendment, but proposed a subamendment to replace the two instances in the text of the word “use” with “impact”, noting that it was important for the ILO and its constituents to learn about the impact of such measures, not to promote their use. As for the comment about using protectionist policies, the Social Justice Declaration explicitly stated that labour standards should not be used for protectionist trade purposes; thus, the risk should be non-existent.
- 758.** The Employer Vice-Chairperson said that there was nothing in the language of the clause before “, including” that would prevent the Office from engaging specifically in those areas of research.
- 759.** The Worker Vice-Chairperson said that his group would go with the consensus.
- 760.** The Government member of Canada supported the subamendment proposed by the EU Member States.

- 761.** The Government member of Türkiye supported the subamendment but proposed a further subamendment to reference child labour bans, in addition to forced labour bans.
- 762.** The subamendment from Türkiye fell, as it was not seconded.
- 763.** The Employer Vice-Chairperson proposed further subamendments to replace “including in relation to” with “including the impact of”, to delete the two instances of “the impact”, and to insert after FPRW the wording “which are matters of disagreement among Member States”, so that the point would read “continue to undertake research and analysis on the intersection of FPRW and trade and investment, including the impact of labour rights clauses in trade and investment agreements, of forced labour import bans, and of public procurement to support FPRW, which are matters of disagreement among Member States;”.
- 764.** The Worker Vice-Chairperson said that, while he agreed to the Employers’ subamendments, with the exception of the wording at the end “which are matters of disagreement among Member States”, what was being suggested was already included in the text. He proposed a subamendment to end the point after “investment”, so that it would read “continue to undertake research and analysis on the intersection of FPRW and trade and investment;”.
- 765.** The Employer Vice-Chairperson agreed and withdrew those subamendments.
- 766.** The Government member of Belgium, speaking on behalf of the EU Member States, agreed and withdrew their subamendment.
- 767.** Amendment A.123 was adopted as subamended.
- 768.** The Worker Vice-Chairperson introduced another amendment (A.125) to insert a new clause after point 19(h), to read “continue to undertake research and data collection on workplace-related injuries, accidents, illnesses and deaths, and undertake research on new occupational health and safety risks, including psychosocial risks;”. In light of the recent recognition of occupational safety and health as one of the FPRW, it was important to reflect it as an additional action point under the research agenda. The Office report referred to a lack of reliable data in relation to national recording and notification systems on workplace-related injuries, accidents, illnesses and deaths in many countries, and the 2023 recurrent discussion on labour protection had also called for more data on emerging occupational safety and health risks linked to digitalization. Moreover, there were new exacerbated risks due to climate, heat stress and mental health at work.
- 769.** The Employer Vice-Chairperson agreed with the concept but questioned the need to include “continue to undertake” on research that was already being carried out. Moreover, he did not see the value in calling out psychosocial risks and proposed a subamendment to delete “including psychosocial risks”.
- 770.** The Government member of Belgium, speaking on behalf of the EU Member States, proposed a subamendment to replace “illnesses” with “diseases”, as it was the more usual wording, and to delete the word “new” before “occupational health and safety”, as many risks had been around for a long time, including psychosocial risks. He echoed the Employers’ question over the need to call out “psychosocial risks”.
- 771.** The Employer Vice-Chairperson sought the Office’s clarification as to whether research was already under way on occupational safety and health risks and, if so, he proposed a subamendment to delete the second “undertake research”, so that the text would read “continue to undertake research and data collection on workplace-related injuries, accidents, diseases and deaths, and on occupational health and safety risks”.

- 772.** The Representative of the Secretary-General said that research on occupational safety and health risks was under way, including in cooperation with the WHO. There were significant changes in the way work was organized, including use of new technology, which created new occupational hazards and risks; it was a constant process of learning and adjustment. Using a qualifier such as “emerging” or similar could be useful to refer to the fact that there were new risks or risks that were acquiring growing visibility in light of constant adjustments occurring in the organization of production and the implications for the organization of work arising from the increased use of technology, heat stress and climate change.
- 773.** The Employer Vice-Chairperson said that he was flexible on including a qualifier for occupational safety and health risks, if there was support to do so, and suggested “evolving”, for example. He proposed a further subamendment to replace “deaths” with “fatalities”.
- 774.** The Worker Vice-Chairperson agreed to the subamendment proposed by the EU Member States to replace “illnesses” with “diseases” and to the subamendment proposed by the Employers to replace “deaths” with “fatalities”. He also agreed to delete the second “undertake research”, given that the research was already under way. He wished to retain “new” and “including psychosocial risks” because the issue should be specifically addressed in the context of FPRW.
- 775.** The Government member of Sierra Leone supported the subamendments to replace “illnesses” with “diseases” and “deaths” with “fatalities”, and to delete the second “undertake research”, as well as to delete “including” before “psychosocial risks”. He agreed with the Workers that it was important to reference newly emerging workplace risks but proposed a subamendment to replace “new” with “emerging” and to replace “risks” with “hazards and their associated risks”. The Government member of Senegal seconded the subamendment.
- 776.** The Representative of the Secretary-General suggested that it was better not to replace “risks” with “hazards and risks”, as hazards were not emerging; rather, were defined within four categories (biological, economic, physical and chemical).
- 777.** The Government member of Sierra Leone agreed to remove from his subamendment the replacement of “risks” with “hazards and their associated risks”.
- 778.** The Government member of Mexico, speaking in his national capacity and also on behalf of Brazil, supported the subamendment to replace “illnesses” with “diseases” but did not support the subamendment to replace “deaths” with “fatalities”, arguing that the term fatality was associated only with accidents. He also preferred to retain the reference to psychosocial risks, as the COVID-19 pandemic had generated an increase in those risks.
- 779.** The Worker Vice-Chairperson said that the Workers were flexible on the terms “deaths” or “fatalities” but wished to retain “including psychosocial risks”, given that work-related diseases were increasing and psychosocial risks played a significant role in that trend.
- 780.** The Employer Vice-Chairperson reiterated that the Employers preferred “fatalities” to “deaths”, as it was the term normally used in the context of occupational safety and health risks, and that there was no added value in including psychosocial risks. However, in the interests of reaching consensus, the Employers could agree to the language.
- 781.** The Government member of Sierra Leone agreed with the Employers that “fatalities” was the most appropriate term in the context of occupational safety and health.
- 782.** The Government member of Mexico, speaking in his national capacity and also on behalf of Brazil, said that, for the sake of consensus, they could accept “fatalities”.
- 783.** Amendment A.125 was adopted as subamended.

- 784.** The Worker Vice-Chairperson introduced an additional amendment (A.124) to insert a new clause after point 19(h), to read “in the context of the ILO Social Dialogue Flagship Report, undertake research and collect good practices on the role of social dialogue, including collective bargaining, and on addressing challenges related to the enjoyment of FPRW, including on just transition and transnational social dialogue;”. Given the value added of the ILO’s Social Dialogue Flagship Report series, coupled with the importance of social dialogue, and especially of collective bargaining, highlighted in the 2023 resolution concerning a just transition towards environmentally sustainable economies and societies for all, the proposed new point would be helpful in identifying how the social partners could address new and emerging phenomena in the world of work related to the enjoyment of FRPW.
- 785.** The Employer Vice-Chairperson said that, in his view, the point was a superfluous call for research. As a compromise, he proposed a subamendment to delete the last clause of the sentence “, including on just transition and transnational social dialogue”, especially given the divergent established viewpoints between the social partners on transnational social dialogue.
- 786.** The Government member of Belgium, speaking on behalf of the EU and its Member States, and the Government member of the United States supported the amendment proposed by the Workers and were flexible regarding the Employers’ subamendment.
- 787.** The Government member of the United States supported the ILO Social Dialogue Flagship Report and appreciated the additional focus on collective bargaining. Her Government could be flexible on the wording.
- 788.** The Worker Vice-Chairperson noted that some of the issues related to a just transition were transnational, not just national. Moreover, he cited the 2018 conclusions concerning the second recurrent discussion on social dialogue and tripartism, in which Members had been called on “to provide an enabling environment for and promote, where appropriate, cross-border social dialogue to foster decent work, including for vulnerable groups of workers in global supply chains”, and to “play a stronger role in an international context, in particular through cross-border social dialogue based on knowledge and research provided by the ILO”. Thus, there had been a direct request for research to be provided by the ILO.
- 789.** The Employer Vice-Chairperson insisted that the Employers would not support the language on transnational social dialogue in the text.
- 790.** The Worker Vice-Chairperson tabled a subamendment to his group’s amendment (A.124) for a new point following point 19(h), to insert the word “effective” before “social dialogue” and to replace the phrase “including collective bargaining, and on addressing challenges related to the enjoyment of FPRW, including on just transition and transnational social dialogue” with “in addressing challenges related to FPRW in support to the five thematic priorities.” Social dialogue had many aspects, of which only one was collective bargaining.
- 791.** The Employer Vice-Chairperson proposed a subamendment to replace “support to” with “support of”.
- 792.** The Chairperson noted the broad support of the government benches for the amendment as subamended.
- 793.** The amendment (A.124) was adopted as subamended.
- 794.** The new point to be inserted after point 19(h) was adopted.

Point 19(i)

- 795.** Point 19(i) was adopted.

First new point after point 19(i)

- 796.** The Employer Vice-Chairperson introduced an amendment (A.72) to insert a new clause after point 19(i), to read “undertake peer-reviewed and scientifically rigorous research on the economic and social impact of informality, and in particular its impact on the realization of fundamental principles and rights at work;”. Informality played a significant role in impeding progress on realization of FPRW, thus the Employers’ proposal was for the ILO to undertake peer-reviewed research on the role of informality and link it to FPRW.
- 797.** The Worker Vice-Chairperson supported the Employers’ amendment but proposed a subamendment to replace “fundamental principles and rights at work” with the acronym “FPRW”.
- 798.** The Government member of Belgium, speaking on behalf of the EU Member States, supported the amendment as subamended by the Workers, and proposed a further subamendment to remove “peer-reviewed and scientifically rigorous research”; it was recognized that the Office undertook quality research and the phrase was not used in the other parts of the research agenda, thus it was not needed.
- 799.** The Government members of the United States and Gabon supported the subamendment.
- 800.** The Employer Vice-Chairperson agreed to the subamendments proposed by the Workers and the EU Member States.
- 801.** Amendment A.72 was adopted as subamended.
- 802.** The first new point after point 19(i) was adopted.

Second new point after point 19(i)

- 803.** The Employer Vice-Chairperson introduced an amendment (A.74) to insert a new point after point 19(i), to read “action-oriented research on best practices to integrate respect for FPRW into the business of MSMEs and newly formalized enterprises, including through greater synergies between the work on FPRW and the SCORE programme;”. Noting the extent of the FPRW implementation gap, particularly with enterprises, including MSMEs, transitioning to the formal economy, he highlighted the need to identify good practices, in addition to academic research, with a focus on how to integrate respect for FPRW, including through greater synergies between the ILO SCORE Programme and the Fundamental Principles and Rights at Work Branch.
- 804.** The Worker Vice-Chairperson supported the amendment.
- 805.** The Government member of the United Kingdom supported the amendment but proposed a subamendment to insert the word “undertake” before “action-oriented research”, which was seconded by the Government member of Canada.
- 806.** The Government members of Belgium, speaking on behalf of the EU and its Member States, Sierra Leone and Mexico supported the amendment as subamended by the United Kingdom.
- 807.** Amendment A.74 was adopted as subamended.
- 808.** The second new point after point 19(i) was adopted.

Third new point after point 19(i)

- 809.** The Worker Vice-Chairperson introduced an amendment (A.122) to insert a new point after point 19(i), to read “undertake research and impact assessments on the challenges and

opportunities of digitalization, including artificial intelligence and algorithmic management, in relation to FPRW, in line with the 2023 Conclusions on labour protection;”. Referring to paragraph 21 of the Office report on digitalization of work and its impact on FPRW, he argued that it would be appropriate to request the Office to carry out specific research into the challenges and opportunities posed by digitalization in order to inform constituent choices. Algorithmic management had been included as it was related the new FPRW on occupational safety and health.

- 810.** The Employer Vice-Chairperson agreed that digitalization and the digital economy would be a new priority and was clearly linked to FPRW but proposed a subamendment to delete “including artificial intelligence and algorithmic management” and “, in line with the 2023 Conclusions on labour protection”, as they were superfluous. Research was already under way in that area. Moreover, there was no reference to “algorithmic management” in the Office report and the Worker Vice-Chairperson had not explained what it meant; it was likely to be a term more appropriate for the standard-setting discussion in 2025.
- 811.** The Worker Vice-Chairperson clarified that “algorithmic management” was the strategic tracking, evaluating and managing of workers through algorithms. It was not something the Workers could accept without having more research and knowledge; humans must always be in control of human resources and management.
- 812.** The Employer Vice-Chairperson said that his Worker counterpart had confirmed the Employers’ point that before using such terms there was a need to defer to the work to be undertaken in the standard-setting discussion in 2025.
- 813.** The Government member of the United States supported the Workers’ amendment but did not support the Employers’ subamendment. It would be helpful to specify the particular research, but not limit it to that, and to highlight those two areas as being of specific interest. The research would be useful in the field of labour protection, and it would be helpful in the broader context of FPRW to make the cross-linkages between the two recurrent discussions.
- 814.** The Government members of Belgium, speaking on behalf of the EU and its Member States, and China supported the amendment and expressed flexibility on the wording.
- 815.** The Government member of Mexico, speaking on behalf of GRULAC, stressed the importance of retaining the reference to artificial intelligence, given the rapid technological changes worldwide, but could be flexible on the wording of the rest of the sentence.
- 816.** The Government member of the United Kingdom supported the amendment, as subamended by the Employers, but could be flexible on the final wording.
- 817.** The Government member of Canada preferred the original text of the Workers’ amendment, as her Government deemed algorithmic management to be a key element of labour protection.
- 818.** The Employer Vice-Chairperson said that the Employers could support language referencing artificial intelligence in relation to FPRW.
- 819.** The Worker Vice-Chairperson said that the Workers could agree to deleting the reference to algorithmic management but would like to maintain “, in line with the 2023 Conclusions on labour protection”.
- 820.** The Employer Vice-Chairperson sought clarification on the value added of including the reference.

- 821. The Worker Vice-Chairperson cited paragraph 24(g) of the 2023 Conclusions on labour protection, in which the Organization was called on to “intensify knowledge development and capacity-building activities, particularly in relation to an impact assessment and awareness on the challenges and opportunities of digitalization, including artificial intelligence and algorithmic management”. Thus, it was a document already agreed on, in which artificial intelligence and algorithmic management were specifically addressed.
- 822. The Employer Vice-Chairperson said that, in view of the clarification, he would not object to the reference to the 2023 Conclusions on labour protection.
- 823. Amendment A.122 was adopted as subamended.
- 824. The third new point to be inserted after point 19(i) was adopted.

Point 19(j)

- 825. The Worker Vice-Chairperson proposed a subamendment to his group’s amendment (A.121) to replace the text, to read “conduct targeted capacity-building for workers’ and employers’ organizations with regard to all five FPRW, with a focus on retaining and expanding membership, providing services and engaging in effective social dialogue”.
- 826. The Employer Vice-Chairperson and the Government member of Türkiye supported the amendment as subamended.
- 827. The Government member of Belgium, speaking on behalf of the EU Member States, also supported the Workers’ amendment as subamended and withdrew their amendment (A.117), on the understanding that “expanding membership” included specific attention to vulnerable workers.
- 828. The Worker Vice-Chairperson confirmed that expansion of membership particularly aimed at covering vulnerable workers.
- 829. The Government member of Cuba also supported the amendment as subamended. He sought clarification from the Office as to whether the language of the original amendment was more neutral, and that the amendment could be interpreted as an interference; he therefore sought clarification from the Office.
- 830. The Representative of the Secretary-General explained that the point was partly linked to the regular Office activities to ensure the promotion and respect of fundamental rights. In the point in question, it referred to the training activities provided by the Office aimed at ensuring the promotion and respect of FPRW for workers’ and employers’ organizations and could not be construed as government or State interference. The International Training Centre of the ILO (ITC-ILO) organized the training activities, including capacity-building for trade union organizations and other programmes for employers’ organizations.
- 831. The Government member of the United States, noting that the Office could play an important role in strengthening the capacity of independent employers’ and workers’ organizations, deferred to the Workers and Employers the decision on the best wording.
- 832. The Government member of Sierra Leone said that workers and employers had a right to join, or not join, unions, which had an obligation to serve their memberships. Growth in membership would depend on the quality and effectiveness of the services provided. It therefore might be better for a focus on service provision and engaging in effective dialogue, rather than on retaining and expanding membership.

- 833.** The Employer Vice-Chairperson said that quality services and social dialogue, and the overall demonstration of effectiveness and capacity were the best way to attract and retain membership but, with an increase in membership and the associated systemic and organizational challenges, Office support for capacity-building was needed to help member organizations to adapt to changes in membership.
- 834.** The Government member of Gabon, speaking on behalf of the Africa group, supported the amendment as subamended.
- 835.** Amendment A.121 was adopted as subamended.
- 836.** Amendments A.87, A.184, A.117 and A.76 fell as a consequence.
- 837.** Point 19(j) was adopted as amended.

Subheading

- 838.** The subheading “Strengthening capacity and knowledge-sharing” before point 19(k) was adopted.

Point 19(k)

- 839.** The Government member of Mexico, speaking on behalf of GRULAC, proposed an amendment (A.185) to delete “and all other national authorities” and to insert “tripartite” before “constituents”, to reflect the structure of the Organization. Since all constituents were tripartite, there was no need to mention specifically “all other national authorities”.
- 840.** The Worker Vice-Chairperson requested clarification from the Office on whether national authorities were considered part of Member States.
- 841.** The Representative of the Secretary-General clarified that the reference to “all other national authorities” was to reflect that it was not only labour administrations that could deal with issues, such as some of the structural causes, impeding the realization of FPRW but that there was a need for other entities and a whole-of-government approach. The term “constituents” covered the tripartite constituents of governments and employers’ and workers’ organizations, and national authorities (namely the governments) were part of the constituents.
- 842.** The Worker Vice-Chairperson, in light of the clarification, proposed a subamendment to replace “constituents, and all other national authorities,” with “the tripartite constituents and relevant national authorities”.
- 843.** The Employer Vice-Chairperson noted that any relevant national authority would be within a tripartite constituent as part of the government. He questioned how authorities that were not part of the government, and thus not part of the constituents, would fall within the ILO's purview.
- 844.** The Representative of the Secretary-General said that, for the ILO to deal with the structural issues and to ensure policy coherence and that the different streams of work converged and did not neutralize each other, it must deal with the whole range of ministries and national authorities that belonged to the various powers covering different areas, such as industrial policies, technological development, economic matters and planning, and whose action had a major bearing on the respect and realization of FPRW.
- 845.** The Worker Vice-Chairperson proposed a subamendment to delete the word “other” because employers’ and workers’ organizations were not national authorities.

- 846.** The Government member of Mexico, speaking on behalf of GRULAC, withdrew their amendment (A.185) in light of the discussion.
- 847.** The Government member of Switzerland proposed an amendment (A.88) tabled by Canada and Switzerland to insert the word “relevant” before “national authorities”, as the original phrase “all other national authorities” was too broad. He proposed a further subamendment to delete the word “other”.
- 848.** The Worker Vice-Chairperson seconded the subamendment to delete “other” and supported the amendment as subamended.
- 849.** The Employer Vice-Chairperson indicated his flexibility with regard to the language used.
- 850.** The Government member of the United States preferred the word “other” to be included, otherwise it would imply that labour administrations were not relevant national authorities. She proposed a subamendment to read “and other relevant national authorities”, which was seconded by the Government member of Gabon, speaking on behalf of the Africa group and several other governments.
- 851.** Amendment A.88 was adopted as subamended.
- 852.** Point 19(k) was adopted as amended.

Move point 19(j) after point 19(k)

- 853.** The Employer Vice-Chairperson proposed an amendment (A.73) to move point 19(j) after point 19(k) to bring the text regarding strengthening the capacity of organizations under the subheading “Strengthening capacity and knowledge-sharing” rather than under “Enhanced research and capacity”.
- 854.** The Worker Vice-Chairperson and the governments agreed.
- 855.** The amendment was adopted.

Insert a new point after point 19(k)

- 856.** The Employer Vice-Chairperson, in view of the agreements reached on the capacity-building clauses, withdrew an amendment (A.77) to insert a new point after point 19(k), to read “conduct capacity-building to support policy, legal and institutional frameworks to address root causes of FPRW deficits at the country level, with due attention to measures to tackle informality and build the capacity of labour inspectorates for that purpose;”.

Point 19(l)

- 857.** The Employer Vice-Chairperson proposed an amendment (A.79) to include “and constituents” between the words “enterprises” and “in their efforts”. Workers’ organizations were the second largest users of the ILO Helpdesk for Business on International Labour Standards and it was too limiting to say that it was “an important vehicle for assisting enterprises”.
- 858.** The Worker Vice-Chairperson, the Government members of Belgium, speaking on behalf of the EU and its Member States, the United States and numerous other government members supported the amendment.
- 859.** The Government member of Gabon, speaking on behalf of the Africa group, proposed a subamendment to insert “tripartite” before “constituents”.
- 860.** The Employer Vice-Chairperson and the Worker Vice-Chairperson agreed to the subamendment.

- 861. Amendment A.79 was adopted as subamended.
- 862. The Employer Vice-Chairperson proposed an amendment (A.80) to include “principles of the” before “ILO Tripartite Declaration of Principles concerning Multinational Enterprises and Social Policy and the United Nations Guiding Principles on Business and Human Rights” to reflect that it was the principles being promoted through the work of the Helpdesk for Business.
- 863. The Worker Vice-Chairperson preferred to retain the original wording of the Office text because the MNE Declaration was much broader in scope than some of the principles.
- 864. The Government member of Belgium, speaking on behalf of the EU and its Member States, and the United States preferred the original text, without the amendment in question.
- 865. The Employer Vice-Chairperson withdrew amendment A.80.
- 866. Point 19(I) was adopted as amended.

Insert a new point after point 19(I)

- 867. The Employer Vice-Chairperson proposed an amendment (A.81) to insert a new point after point 19(I), to read “strengthen the ILO Global Business Network on Forced Labour, the ILO Global Business and Disability Network and the Child Labour Platform and seek new ways to streamline funding channels;”. They were ongoing initiatives under the Fundamental Principles and Rights at Work Branch that had experienced bureaucratic challenges to enable funding from outside sources to support their work.
- 868. The Worker Vice-Chairperson considered the amendment to be redundant, as the activities had already been addressed under the subheading “Policy coherence and partnerships”.
- 869. The Employer Vice-Chairperson said that the paragraph actually dealt with synergies and interactions between the entities within the Organization, referring to the benefits to strengthening them by streamlining their funding to make them more effective. There could be benefits to seeking to strengthen the networks and platform and in particular through streamlining funding to make the initiatives more effective, which came primarily under extrabudgetary funding.
- 870. The Worker Vice-Chairperson could not support the amendment as there were many other business initiatives for which the Workers would like to streamline funding.
- 871. The Employer Vice-Chairperson clarified that the Child Labour Platform was not a business initiative and involved workers and employers; it had experienced the same funding challenges as the other networks.
- 872. The Government member of the United States requested clarification on the meaning of “streamline funding channels”.
- 873. The Deputy Representative of the Secretary-General said that the Child Labour Platform and the ILO Global Business Network on Forced Labour had a different type of governance mechanism but the same type of funding mechanism, created to provide a platform for the exchange of experiences between businesses. One challenge was the increasing number of requests from enterprises and multinationals and the need to ensure the sustainability of the services provided by both platforms, given their funding based on annual membership fees. Another issue was the way the funding needed to be managed by the Office.
- 874. The Employer Vice-Chairperson added that there were often significant steps to complete that could take several months or more to allow an interested party seeking to fund activities to be able to do so. There were also challenges with some government funding mechanisms that

applied to those initiatives. The amendment sought to address procedural barriers to enabling the networks to be funded robustly.

- 875.** The Worker Vice-Chairperson disagreed on calling out specific issues of funding; they should be taken up in the programme and budget.
- 876.** The Employer Vice-Chairperson had not expected resistance to proposing minor steps to make existing initiatives more sustainable and effective. The three initiatives in question were encountering particular funding issues but had the potential to have impact with very little effort. He proposed a subamendment to his group's amendment (A.81), to read "Strengthen the ILO Global Business Network on Forced Labour, the ILO Global Business and Disability Network and the Child Labour Platform and seek ways to ensure their sustainability;".
- 877.** The Worker Vice-Chairperson supported the amendment as subamended.
- 878.** The Government member of Belgium, speaking on behalf of the EU and its Member States, as well as the Government members of Cuba, Mexico and the United States supported the amendment as subamended.
- 879.** Amendment A.81 was adopted as subamended.
- 880.** The new point to be inserted after point 19(l) was adopted.

Point 19(m)

- 881.** Point 19(m) was adopted.

Point 19(n)

- 882.** Point 19(n) was adopted.

Subheading

- 883.** The subheading before point 19(o) "Policy coherence and partnerships" was adopted.

Point 19(o)

Chapeau to point 19(o)

- 884.** The chapeau of point 19(o) was adopted.

Point 19(o)(i)

- 885.** Point 19 (o)(i) was adopted.

Point 19(o)(ii)

- 886.** The Government member of China submitted an amendment (A.12) to delete point 19(o)(ii). While he could accept the Office undertaking research on the intersection between trade and FPRW, the proposal had serious implications. He noted that there were divergent views within the Committee regarding linkages between FPRW and trade and investment policy agreements.
- 887.** The amendment was seconded by the Government member of Cuba.
- 888.** The Worker Vice-Chairperson said that the impact of trade on FPRW had been highlighted during the discussion. There was a need to create safeguards to prevent such practices as

social dumping. Increasing numbers of trade agreements included labour clauses. Further engagement by the Office to bring FPRW into trade agreements would be useful.

- 889.** The Employer Vice-Chairperson said that his group was aligned with the Workers' group on this issue.
- 890.** The Government members of Belgium, speaking on behalf of the EU and its Member States, Canada, the United Kingdom and the United States supported the position taken by the Workers and Employers.
- 891.** The Government member of China withdrew amendment A.12.
- 892.** The Worker Vice-Chairperson introduced an amendment (A.120) to add the words ", including through strengthened engagement with the World Trade Organization and other relevant institutions;" after the words "policies and agreements". Labour rights were already integrated into the work of the WTO, in that the 1998 Declaration applied to ILO Member States that were members of the WTO. The Workers' group felt that the ILO should reinforce its relationship with the WTO in order to promote FPRW. The two organizations should work together to ensure countries abided by their obligations under ILO standards.
- 893.** The Employer Vice-Chairperson supported the text as subamended by the Workers.
- 894.** The Government member of China considered the wording "and other relevant institutions" to be ambiguous and put forward a subamendment to delete it.
- 895.** The subamendment was seconded by Cameroon.
- 896.** The Worker Vice-Chairperson and the Employer Vice-Chairperson agreed to that deletion.
- 897.** The Government member of the United Republic of Tanzania supported the text as subamended.
- 898.** The amendment (A.120) was adopted as subamended.
- 899.** Point 19(o)(ii) was adopted as amended.

Point 19(o)(iii)

- 900.** Point 19(o)(iii) was adopted.

New point to be inserted after point 19(o)(iii)

- 901.** The Worker Vice-Chairperson withdrew his group's amendment (A.119) to insert a new point after point 19(o)(iii).

Point 19(p)

Chapeau to point 19(p)

- 902.** The Government member of Belgium, speaking on behalf of the EU Member States, tabled an amendment (A.118) to add a comma between the words "Social Justice" and "and leverage". Without that comma, the clause centred the proposed action solely on the work carried out through the Global Coalition for Social Justice, and not through other possible channels.
- 903.** The Employer Vice-Chairperson and the Worker Vice-Chairperson supported the amendment.
- 904.** Amendment A.118 was adopted.
- 905.** Point 19(p) was adopted as amended.

Point 19(p)(i)

906. Point 19(p)(i) was adopted.

Point 19(p)(ii)

907. Point 19(p)(ii) was adopted.

Point 19(p)(iii)

908. Point 19(p)(iii) was adopted.

Point 19(p)(iv)

909. Point 19(p)(iv) was adopted.

Subheading

910. The subheading "Planning, mobilization and allocation of resources and development cooperation" before point 19(q) was adopted.

Point 19(q)

911. Point 19(q) was adopted.

Point 19(r)

912. The Government member of China tabled an amendment (A.13) to remove the words "and guidance" from point 19(r). He did not feel that the ILO could provide guidance to Member States in relation to mobilizing domestic resources.

913. The Government member of Cameroon seconded the amendment.

914. The Worker Vice-Chairperson said that there had been extensive discussion in the Drafting Group on this point. His group wished to maintain the original wording.

915. The Employer Vice-Chairperson said that "guidance" was not synonymous with "direction". He proposed a subamendment to replace "capacity and guidance" with "support".

916. The Worker Vice-Chairperson said that there could be instances where guidance was needed and requested by Member States. It would therefore be prudent to retain the original wording. However, he understood that "support" could encompass both guidance and support.

917. The Government member of China asked the Secretariat to clarify what guidance from the Office might entail.

918. The Representative of the Secretary-General said that the Office could provide comprehensive guidance, information on how other countries had implemented domestic resource mobilization strategies, support in developing such strategies, comparative analysis, and identification of the most effective strategies to assist governments. It did not imply imposition.

919. The Government member of China agreed with the Employers' subamendment.

920. The amendment (A.13) was adopted as subamended.

921. Point 19(r) was adopted as amended.

Point 19(s)

922. Point 19(s) was adopted.

Point 19(t)

923. Point 19(t) was adopted.

Point 19(u)

924. Point 19(u) was adopted.

New point to be inserted after point 19(u)

925. The Employer Vice-Chairperson withdrew his group's amendments (A.86 and A.85) to insert a new point after point 19(u).

Point 19(v)

926. The Employer Vice-Chairperson introduced his group's amendment (A.84) to point 19(v). While the original amendment had been to delete point 19(v), the group wished to table a subamendment to replace the original text, to read "Follow through on the 2017 direction to develop a plan of action for resource mobilization to support projects around target 8.8 of the Sustainable Development Goals to protect labour rights with a focus on freedom of association and the effective recognition of the right of collective bargaining".

927. The Worker Vice-Chairperson proposed a subamendment replacing the word "direction" with "FPRW conclusions".

928. The Employer Vice-Chairperson suggested that a more correct wording would be "follow through on the 2017 FPRW resolution's direction to [...]".

929. The Government members of Belgium, speaking on behalf of the EU and its Member States, China, the United Kingdom and the United States supported the subamendment.

930. The amendment (A.84) was adopted as subamended.

931. The Government members of China and Mexico, speaking on behalf of GRULAC, withdrew their identical amendments (A.14 and A.186 respectively) to point 19(v), as they supported the wording provided by the previous amendment to that point.

932. Point 19(v) was adopted as amended.

933. Point 19 in its entirety was adopted as amended.

Adoption of the Committee's draft conclusions

934. The draft conclusions of the Committee on the third recurrent discussion on fundamental principles and rights at work were adopted in their entirety.

Consideration of the draft resolution

935. The Committee considered the text of the draft resolution that would operationalize its conclusions.

936. The Employer Vice-Chairperson proposed an amendment to the draft resolution to insert a comma after the words "for their attention" in point 3(b), followed by the words "including in the context of the Second World Summit for Social Development;".

- 937.** The Worker Vice-Chairperson supported that amendment, which replaced missing wording that had been in a previous draft.
- 938.** There was broad support for the amendment from the government benches.
- 939.** The draft resolution concerning the third recurrent discussion on fundamental principles and rights at work was adopted as amended.