



Governing Body

355th Session, Geneva, 17–27 November 2025

Legal Issues and International Labour Standards Section

LILS

Minutes of the Legal Issues and International Labour Standards Section

Contents

	Page
International Labour Standards and Human Rights Segment	3
1. Proposal for the streamlining of reporting on ratified Conventions under article 22 of the ILO Constitution through the progressive roll-out of thematic implementation reports (GB.355/LILS/1)	3
Decision.....	8
2. Report of the fifth meeting of the Special Tripartite Committee established under the Maritime Labour Convention, 2006 (Geneva, 7–11 April 2025) (GB.355/LILS/2).....	9
Decision.....	14
3. Choice of Conventions and Recommendations on which reports should be requested under article 19 of the ILO Constitution in 2027 (GB.355/LILS/3)	15
Decision.....	20

International Labour Standards and Human Rights Segment

1. Proposal for the streamlining of reporting on ratified Conventions under article 22 of the ILO Constitution through the progressive roll-out of thematic implementation reports (GB.355/LILS/1)

1. **The Worker spokesperson** said that the streamlining of regular reporting under article 22 had been a major component of the Standards Initiative since its launch in 2013. His group supported the proposed modernization. A concern remained that streamlining and simplification could have a serious impact on the quality of reports and on the effective supervision of international labour standards. Regarding the thematic implementation reports (TIRs), he asked about the way social partners would submit their comments in the new system. A close review and further work were needed on the draft TIR templates to align them with the report forms. His group would provide their comments on those drafts. Resources would be needed for ILO technical assistance to support the proposed modernization. He asked whether prefilling of the TIRs would be an ongoing service. His group supported maintaining the current reporting cycle for groups that contain fundamental Conventions and adopting a unified reporting cycle of three years for the labour administration and labour inspection group. Regarding the transitional measures, his group supported option 2. Regarding the accessibility of information, his group supported option 2. Article 23 reports needed to remain confidential, as workers could be at risk in some cases. The use of AI for the supervision of international labour standards should be discouraged.
2. **The Employer spokesperson** said that streamlining reporting by modernizing the system would facilitate ILO constituents' engagement with the supervisory bodies, ease the reporting burden on Member States, ensure effective and meaningful supervision of international labour standards and promote greater consistency and transparency across the ILO supervisory system. The proposed thematic grouping would allow governments to provide a holistic overview of how related instruments are applied in practice, enhancing the legibility and coherence of reports while promoting a more strategic understanding of implementation challenges and good practices in each thematic area. Regarding the preliminary draft of the 15 TIR templates, his group would provide practical comments and suggestions. His group agreed that the initial evaluation after the first year of implementation would provide a valuable opportunity to draw lessons from the first round of TIRs. He requested clarity on the scale of resources required, the envisaged funding source and the contingency measures in place if the necessary funds did not materialize. Targeted technical assistance would be essential to ensure an effective transition. The reference in paragraph 23 to support being provided upon the availability of sufficient resources was a concern. His group supported a five-year cycle for all the Conventions, including the labour inspection and labour administration group. With regard to accessibility of the information, his group supported option 1. The purpose of the system was to encourage transparency and peer learning. If there was any information to be regarded as confidential, that should be based on clear pre-established criteria.
3. **Speaking on behalf of the Africa group** a Government representative of Ethiopia said that his group recognized the importance of modernizing and improving the reporting system to ensure that the ILO supervisory mechanisms remained efficient and effective. Any change must reduce the reporting burden, encourage ratification, strengthen compliance and reinforce national reporting capacities particularly for countries with limited human and

technical resources. His group supported subparagraphs (a) to (c) of the draft decision, as well as the proposed unified five-year cycle for groups containing fundamental Conventions and four-year cycle for labour inspection and labour administration. Regarding the transitional measures for 2026, his group supported option 1 to reduce the workload for both Member States and the Office and ensure adequate time for preparation and training for the new reporting system. Regarding accessibility of information, while confidentiality remained essential, there was value in promoting peer-learning through the publication of the TIRs. His group supported option 2 where information would initially be accessible only to governments following examination by the Committee of Experts (CEACR). Continued reflection on how the ILO can progressively enhance openness while respecting confidentiality requirements, in line with practices applied by other UN agencies, was encouraged. He requested clarifications from the Office on how the outcomes of national tripartite consultations conducted in accordance with the Tripartite Consultation (International Labour Standards) Convention, 1976 (No. 144), would be reflected in the new online reporting system. He also requested clarifications on the format and accessibility of the planned training and technical assistance to Member States.

4. **Speaking on behalf of the Asia and Pacific group (ASPAG)**, a Government representative of the Islamic Republic of Iran welcomed the progressive roll-out approach, balanced reporting schedule and transitional measures for 2026. His group supported the overall direction of the reform, with several critical implementation matters needing to be addressed. His group's support for subparagraph (a) of the draft decision was conditional on the Office's commitment to work with the CEACR to develop guidelines promoting clearer and more action-oriented observations to facilitate Government's responses. It was also conditional on the understanding that the Office would prefill the TIRs based on previously submitted reports, with priority to countries with limited administrative capacity. That technical assistance had to be adequately resourced through the regular budget. A specific resource allocation plan should be presented as part of the Programme and Budget proposals for 2028–29. In relation to accessibility of information, his group supported option 2, as a more cautious first step, and requested the Office to develop, in consultation with the constituents for approval at the March 2027 session of the Governing Body, detailed guidelines covering criteria for determining what information may be designated as restricted. Any expansion to public access would require approval by the Governing Body following comprehensive evaluation. An alternative would be for the ILO to conduct research to draw lessons learned and produce anonymized analytical reports which could be published. The Office should explore the feasibility of this complementary approach for consideration as part of the 2028 evaluation. The reform's evaluation framework should include specific quantitative and quality indicators, such as measurable reduction in reporting burden, completeness and coherence of reports, user experience, technical performance, impact on the workload and outputs of the CEACR and peer learning benefits. Funding for the platform development should be secured from Part I of the Programme and Budget for 2026–27. His group welcomed the opportunity to engage in the implementation phase, including in the platform development. His group supported maintaining the current reporting cycle and strongly supported limiting 2026 reports (option 1).
5. **Speaking on behalf of the group of Latin American and Caribbean countries (GRULAC)**, a Government representative of Paraguay said the proposed modernization was a positive step. The new system would ensure greater coherence and facilitate peer-learning. The new web application would be a valuable tool to automate the compilation of information. It was important to promote greater transparency and accessibility of information and to disseminate good practices, bearing in mind national particularities and confidentiality requirements. She requested clarification on the cost of development of the IT tools and on

the resources that would be necessary to provide technical assistance to governments. In relation to the draft decision, her group supported maintaining the current reporting cycle for the groups containing fundamental Conventions and adopting a four-year unified cycle for the labour inspection and labour administration group. Regarding subparagraph (f), her group supported option 1. Regarding subparagraph (g), her group supported the first option under which TIRs would become publicly accessible through the new online application, after examination by the CEACR, with the possibility that governments would have the option of designating specific information as restricted.

6. **Speaking on behalf of the group of industrialized market economy countries (IMEC)**, a Government representative of Canada welcomed the ILO's continued efforts to streamline the reporting system under article 22. This was an essential course of action to boost the ratification of Conventions and ensure compliance with the resulting obligations. The reporting workload remained high and unevenly distributed across the years. It was therefore essential to identify solutions promptly, while ensuring that the reforms were implemented in an appropriate, structured and gradual manner. IMEC would like to be consulted in an inclusive process before the TIR templates would be finalized. The templates should be as simple and functional as possible, ensuring that the content is concise. While supporting the proposed progressive roll-out for 2027 to 2034 as set out in Appendix III, table 1, IMEC remained concerned about the high number of Conventions in the thematic group on occupational safety and health. It may be worth considering whether the technical Convention in this group could be divided. The title of the group with non-discrimination Conventions should be revised to elimination of discrimination and of violence and harassment. The Office should continue to prioritize simplicity, reliability and accessibility in the design of the online application and ensure inclusive consultations. Regarding the cost of developing that tool, IMEC remained concerned by the scale of the amount foreseen and requested clarification on whether expected efficiency gains had been estimated and whether the amount of US\$700,000 was available. IMEC requested information on the form of the planned training activities and suggested that they include practical examples and best practices to support governments in completing the new forms. IMEC was particularly concerned about the scale of work for governments associated with the initial TIRs and that the Office would only provide prefilled reports upon request and subject to available resources. IMEC urged the Office to dedicate all available resources to help governments complete the initial TIR templates. IMEC preferred maintaining the current reporting cycle for the five groups containing fundamental Conventions, while being open to learning more about the potential benefits and drawbacks of a unified five-year cycle. The primary consideration was that the chosen approach should reduce the reporting burden on governments and facilitate a more balanced distribution of reporting obligations while ensuring effective and meaningful supervision. Concerning the labour inspection and labour administration group, IMEC would prefer to maintain the existing reporting cycle of three and six years. Concerning the transitional measures, IMEC strongly supported option 1 as it would ease the workload linked to completing the new TIRs while still ensuring the preparation of essential reports including first reports. Finally, regarding accessibility of information submitted in the reports, IMEC welcomed the opportunity to enhance peer learning and preferred option 2. IMEC requested clarification on whether comments made by the social partners as well as the government's responses would be published and whether governments may freely determine what information should be considered restricted.
7. **Speaking on behalf of the Association of Southeast Asian Nations (ASEAN)**, a Government representative of Brunei Darussalam welcomed the introduction of TIRs and an online platform, while supporting the suggested gradual implementation and sensitivity to differing

national capacities. His group supported the progressive roll-out of the new system beginning in 2027. The transition to thematic reporting represented a significant shift, calling for strong, timely, and practical technical assistance to accompany governments, including tailored training to constituents, updated guidance materials and prefilling of the first TIR based on previously submitted information. ASEAN supported maintaining the current reporting cycle to ensure continuity and safeguard the prominent status of fundamental and governance Conventions. ASEAN supported option 1 which limits reporting in 2026 to urgent mandatory and priority reports. ASEAN also recognized the concerns raised regarding the complexity and length of the CEACR observations. As the reporting system would become more streamlined, it would be equally important for supervisory feedback to be clear, focused and practical. This would support Member States in engaging meaningfully with the supervisory process and strengthening compliance.

8. **Speaking on behalf of the countries of the Cooperation Council for the Arab States of the Gulf (GCC)**, a Government representative of Qatar said his group agreed with the proposal to modernize and streamline the reporting system through the adoption of thematic reports. This would improve the quality of the reports and contribute to promoting decent work. Having an overall view of the situation would be more helpful than getting too focused on details. His group supported the proposed unified cycles under subparagraphs (d) and (e) of the draft decision, as well as option 2 under subparagraph (g). Technical assistance was essential to support governments in the implementation of the new system.
9. **A Government representative of India** welcomed the proposal to reduce duplication and reporting fatigue, thereby strengthening engagement and effectiveness. The streamlined approach would enhance clarity, minimize duplication and provide a holistic view of national implementation. This would foster an integrated understanding of national policy frameworks and enable cross-cutting analysis of progress across related Conventions. India supported the progressive rollout of the TIRs, allowing adequate time for preparation and adaptation to the modernized reporting mechanism. This phased approach would also facilitate experience sharing and encourage broader participation among Member States. While being flexible on that point, India preferred a unified five-year cycle for the thematic groups containing fundamental Conventions. The reform needed to be complemented by strong capacity-building, targeted technical assistance and sustained peer learning. Regarding accessibility of information, combining accountability with respect for national sensitivities would best address the shared goal of strengthening compliances and mutual trust.
10. **A Government representative of Malaysia** welcomed the reform as a significant step towards reinforcing the supervisory system while modernizing the reporting framework to enhance Member State engagement, promote peer learning and improve access to information and compliant national laws, regulations and policies. Malaysia supported maintaining the current reporting cycle to ensure continuity and predictability for Member States. With regard to accessibility, Malaysia agreed that as an initial step, information submitted through the TIR should be accessible only to other governments after examination by the CEACR. That approach provided necessary safeguards for sensitive national information while allowing Member States adequate time to adapt to the new system with the option to designate specific information as restricted. While supporting the overall direction of the reform, Malaysia considered it timely for the ILO to re-examine the situation of countries that had inherited Conventions ratified during the colonial period or prior to independence. Some obligations arising from those instruments no longer reflected present-day realities. Although the TIR prototype was a positive development, it also created substantial administrative

constraints and ILO technical assistance would be essential to ensure a smooth transition to the new system.

11. **A Government representative of China** said his country had concerns regarding the accessibility of information provided by governments in the TIRs beyond the CEACR. That information is not intended for public disclosure. It is solely for the use of the ILO supervisory bodies. Making the TIRs public could lead to interference and potentially affect objective and impartial assessment of Member States' compliance. Information provided in the TIRs would be interconnected and form a logical whole. Processing parts of it separately could compromise integrity and coherence leading to ambiguities and misunderstandings. The proposal for the Office to summarize and publicly share the good practices identified in the TIRs of various Member States to facilitate mutual understanding was interesting. China proposed to postpone the decision on subparagraph (g) to March 2026.
12. **A Government representative of Cuba** supported the proposed modernized system based on thematic reporting. Given the country's high number of ratifications, implementing the new system would mean there would have to be greater internal consultations and more detailed reports. At the same time, the number of reports would be reduced. Cuba supported maintaining the current reporting cycle for groups with fundamental Conventions and adopting a unified four-year cycle for the labour inspection and labour administration group. Accessibility of information in the TIRs should be based on an option that would guarantee responsible handling of information and strengthen the credibility of the ILO supervisory system.
13. **A Government representative of Uruguay** supported the processes to make reporting under article 22 more flexible. Uruguay supported maintaining the current reporting cycle for groups with fundamental Conventions. Increasing the cycle on the fundamental principles and rights at work could lead to more complaints being raised in the intervals. Uruguay supported a four-year cycle for the labour inspection and labour administration group, as well as option 1 for the 2026 reporting obligations.
14. **A Government representative of Bangladesh** supported gradual transformation of the reporting system with enhanced ILO technical assistance for countries in need. Prefilling the initial TIRs was essential. Simplification of reports should be accompanied by simplification of the CEACR comments. The confidentiality of the information and updates provided by the Member States was of great importance as such information could be misinterpreted when presented out of the context. Bangladesh remained flexible on the reporting cycle. The capacity constraints in some countries needed to be taken into account and technical assistance had to be available. Bangladesh supported very limited reporting in 2026 as a transition year.
15. **A Government representative of Jordan** supported the general approach to increase effectiveness and move to thematic reports. There was need for technical assistance to attain the reform's objectives. Option 2 under subparagraph (g) reflects a balanced approach, making it easier to get access to information while guaranteeing confidentiality. An assessment should be done in 2028.
16. **A representative of the Director-General** (Director, International Labour Standards Department) welcomed the strong support for the proposed modernization at a time when the ILO is asked to be more efficient and impactful. Regarding the question on estimated efficiency gains, there were many to be expected, including administrative efficiency gains through simplified and streamlined reporting, notably for those Member States that have a high number of ratifications, or efficiency gained related to the improved quality of the

dialogue between Member States and the supervisory system. A broader efficiency gain is to ensure that the supervisory system delivers impactful recommendations to Member States. Regarding the ability of the social partners to submit their comments directly to the CEACR, there would be no changes. If information related to the outcome of the national social dialogue on the preparation of the reports is contained in the TIR, it would be fully taken into account by the Committee of Experts as was currently the case. Regarding the draft TIR templates which had been made available online, suggestions and comments should be provided to the Office by mid-January if possible. Regarding resources, the modernization would be receiving top priority within the Office. The budget to cover the new platform was a one-off investment, required to reach the efficiency gains expected. This was in line with the strong demand for increased efficiency of this normative organization. Regarding technical assistance, support for the implementation of the reform would be a cross-Office effort, both from headquarters and from the field. At the same time, the Office was not in position to commit to prefilling all TIRs for all governments. Beyond prefilling the TIRs, the technical assistance envisaged would include preparing relevant training material and guidelines on how to fill the TIRs and organizing regional, subregional or individual webinars for interested governments and the social partners where required, in cooperation with the International Training Centre of the ILO. Upon request, the Office would also help governments retrieve previous reports. The possibility of having regional/subregional focal points within governments who could provide peer-to-peer support to other governments with less experience or capacity had also been mentioned. It was also important to note that in many cases information was already readily available, such as that compiled during the baselines project over 2019–2023, regarding Conventions on occupational safety and health, wages and working time, and that contained in reports on the more recent Conventions which have a modern report form (for example, the Maritime Labour Convention, 2006, as amended (MLC, 2006)). Some governments will have the capacity and/or will prefer to prepare the TIR without support by the Office. The Office would also engage with the CEACR to convey comments made on the need to simplify their comments. Governments were also invited to join the annual information session with the CEACR to convey their views directly to the Experts. On the development of detailed implementation guidance, the Office would ensure the necessary consultations, but did not consider that coming back to the Governing Body would be required. The Office would also engage with interested delegations in the development of the IT platform.

Decision

17. The Governing Body:

- (a) **approved the implementation and progressive roll-out of the thematic reporting system as described in paragraphs 5–23 of document GB.355/LILS/1;**
- (b) **approved the thematic implementation report prototype presented in Appendix II of document GB.355/LILS/1;**
- (c) **decided that the corresponding IT costs, as presented in paragraph 19 of document GB.355/LILS/1, which are estimated at US\$700,000, would be financed in the first instance from Part I of the Programme and Budget for 2026–27 or, failing that, through the use of the provision for unforeseen expenditure, in Part II;**
- (d) **regarding the reporting cycle for the five groups containing fundamental Conventions (paragraph 25 of document GB.355/LILS/1), decided to maintain the**

current reporting cycle, with a system of partial reporting (every three years) alternating with full reporting (every six years);

- (e) in relation to the labour inspection and labour administration group, decided to adopt a unified cycle of four years;
- (f) regarding the transitional measures in 2026, decided to implement option 1, as detailed in paragraph 29 of document GB.355/LILS/1;
- (g) regarding accessibility of information submitted in the TIR (paragraph 34 of document GB.355/LILS/1), decided that, as a first step, subject to future evaluation and review by the Governing Body, information submitted by governments in the TIR would only be accessible to other governments, after examination by the CEACR (via the new online application). Governments would have the possibility of designating specific information as “restricted”, in which case it would not be made accessible to other governments.

(GB.355/LILS/1, paragraph 37)

2. Report of the fifth meeting of the Special Tripartite Committee established under the Maritime Labour Convention, 2006 (Geneva, 7–11 April 2025) (GB.355/LILS/2)

18. The Governing Body had before it an amendment to subparagraph (g) of the draft decision proposed by the Employers’ group that had been circulated by the Office and read:
 - (g) adopted the amendments related to the addition of a new Article 3 bis; Article 4, paragraph 4; Article 6, paragraphs 2 and 4, in the Standing Orders of the STC as proposed in the appendix to document GB.355/LILS/2, and referred the amendments proposed to paragraph 10 of the Introductory Note to the STC for further consideration;
19. **The Employer spokesperson** took note of the report of the Chairperson of the fifth Meeting of the Special Tripartite Committee (STC) of the MLC, 2006, as well as the resolutions adopted. His group supported the resolution extending the mandate of the Joint ILO/IMO Tripartite Working Group (JTWG) and the amendment to paragraph 19 of its terms of reference. It also endorsed the convening of the JTWG meetings to address seafarers’ issues, particularly hours of work, stressing they needed to fully take into account the organizations’ financial constraints. In this regard, they supported that meeting costs in 2026 and 2027 be covered first through budgetary savings or, if necessary, alternative financial proposals. His group welcomed continued ILO/IMO cooperation and supported paragraph (f) of the draft decision, since communicating tripartite decisions to non-tripartite international organizations was essential to preserving the integrity of tripartism and balanced representation. His group also supported the reappointment of Mr Martin Marini as Chairperson of the STC, the convening of the sixth meeting of the STC in April 2028 and the corresponding budget provision. Such planning should remain aligned with the Governing Body’s overall approach, taking into account current financial constraints and decisions affecting the scheduling and prioritization of meetings
20. Concerning the proposed amendments to the Standing Orders of the STC, his group supported the amendments related to the addition of the new article 3 *bis*, article 4, paragraph 4, article 6, paragraphs 2 and 4 of the Standing Orders of the STC. Following constructive discussion with the Workers’ group and having reached a common understanding of its scope and implications, his group had proposed to refer the proposed amendment of paragraph 10 of the introductory note back to the STC for further consideration. That related to the employers’

and workers' secretariats and sought to avoid inconsistency with the Standing Orders of the Governing Body or any limitation on the autonomy of his group. As it concerned only social partner arrangements, he trusted that the proposed amendment to the draft decision would receive the support of the Government group.

21. **The Worker spokesperson** took note of the report of the Chairperson of the STC and the decisions adopted. The STC had considered 16 amendment proposals to the Code of the MLC, 2006, and, after constructive discussion, had adopted seven amendments by majority. Such amendments addressed key issues for seafarers, such as repatriation, the right to shore leave and access to welfare facilities, the recognition of seafarers as key workers, medical care and protection against violence and harassment. Five issues had been withdrawn, and no consensus was achieved regarding the maximum period of service on board. The amendments had been adopted by broad majority at the International Labour Conference in June of the current year and were expected to enter into force on 23 December 2027. The STC had also appointed its officials for 2025–28 and confirmed the re-election of Mr Martin Marini as Chairperson. The sixth meeting of the STC was scheduled on 3–7 April 2028. Therefore, an appropriate provision should be included in the draft Programme and Budget for 2028–29.
22. The STC had also adopted four resolutions that the workers fully supported. The first recommended the Governing Body to approve the extension of the duration of the JTWG, as well as to liaise with the IMO in order to convene meetings of the JTWG to conduct a final review of the report of the Task Force to review and update the ILO/IMO Joint Database on Abandonment of Seafarers. The second resolution recommends that the Governing Body support the request of the STC to convene a meeting on hours of work and rest in line with the terms of reference included in the resolution, and that the Director-General coordinate with the IMO Secretary-General to submit the resolution to the IMO Maritime Safety Committee. The third resolution relates to recognition of seafarers as key workers, and the fourth recommends that the Governing Body instructs the Director-General to coordinate with the Secretary-General of the IMO to submit the resolution to the IMO Facilitation Committee for consideration and action, as appropriate.
23. The Workers' group supported the proposed amendment of the STC Standing Orders in relation to the addition of new article 3 *bis*, article 4, paragraph 4, article 6, paragraphs 2 and 4; they agreed that the proposed amendment to paragraph 10 of the introductory note required further examination by the STC. In conclusion, the group supported the decision point together with the amendment proposed by the employers in paragraph 35(g).
24. **Speaking on behalf of the Africa group**, a Government representative of South Africa expressed profound appreciation for the outstanding work of the STC at its fifth meeting, which was a powerful testament to the enduring strength and relevance of the MLC, 2006, as the cornerstone of seafarers' rights and an essential instrument for ensuring a level playing field in the global shipping industry. His group commended the constructive, high-level tripartite discussions that characterized the meeting which led to the adoption of seven significant and substantive amendments to the Code of the Convention, which addressed critical and timely issues. They welcomed the amendments that strengthened provisions on repatriation, ensuring it was free from discrimination and clearly defining the costs to be borne by shipowners. His group strongly supported the explicit formal recognition of seafarers as key workers, especially in the wake of the COVID-19 pandemic, which was a crucial step to safeguard their mobility and access to medical care. Furthermore, they applauded the landmark amendments aimed at the prevention and elimination of violence and harassment, including sexual harassment and bullying on board ships. By mandating laws and measures in line with the Violence and Harassment Convention, 2019 (No. 190), the MLC, 2006,

demonstrated its capacity to evolve and confront the most pressing challenges in the world of work, ensuring a safe and dignified environment for all seafarers. Beyond setting minimum working and living standards for all seafarers, the MLC, 2006, remained the most adaptable instrument within the Organization. In a changing ILO and an evolving world of work, it served as a dynamic model for the future and could help reconcile differences in the standards review process, ensuring that the ILO maintained a clear, robust and up-to-date body of international labour standards that both protected workers and supported sustainable enterprises. His group looked forward to the effective implementation of the new provisions and pledged its continued collaboration in that tripartite process.

25. He further indicated that his group fully supported the extension of the mandate of the JTWG and the decision to convene a meeting on hours of work and rest. The continued collaboration between the ILO and the IMO was essential for a coherent and effective regulatory framework for the maritime sector. His group also took note of the proposed amendments to the Standing Orders of the STC. The establishment of a clear procedure for filling vacancies and most importantly, the mechanism to convene extraordinary meetings to address urgent matters were wise and necessary reforms to ensure the Convention remained responsive in times of global crisis. Finally, his group supported the reappointment of the Chairperson, Mr Martin Marini, and endorsed the draft decision without reservation.
26. **Speaking on behalf of GRULAC**, a Government representative of Peru commended the report presented by the STC and recognized the technical and rigorous tripartite work carried out during the fifth meeting held in April 2025, as well as the effective conduct of the discussions reaching significant consensus on international labour standards in the maritime sector. It was important to emphasize that the STC meeting had been attended by more than 400 delegates, of which 36 per cent were women, which demonstrated the inclusive and representative nature of this normative process. Seven amendments to the Code of the Maritime Labour Convention, 2006, as amended (MLC, 2006, had been approved by the International Labour Conference at its last session in June. Such amendments substantially strengthened seafarers' protection through provisions, inter alia, on non-discrimination, facilitation of repatriation and shore leave, welfare, medical care, and prevention of violence and harassment. There was support for the four resolutions adopted by the STC, which include: the extension of the mandate of the JTWG; the convening of a meeting of the JTWG to identify and address seafarers' issues and the human element on hours of work and hours of rest; the recognition of seafarers as key workers; and the review of the amendments to the IMO Convention on the Facilitation of International Marine Traffic, 1965, as amended, to reflect amendments on shore leave to the MLC, 2006. Amendments to the Standing Orders of the STC were also acknowledged. Such changes modernized the functioning of the STC and reflected lessons learned from the COVID-19 pandemic. GRULAC supported the reappointment of Mr Marini as Chairperson of the STC recognizing his technical leadership and his commitment to tripartism. Considering that the sixth meeting of the STC was scheduled in April 2028, adequate resources were required for that meeting. In this context, GRULAC reaffirmed its commitment to the effective implementation of the MLC, 2006, and to improved standards for maritime workers. It encouraged the STC and the Office to continue their work and reiterated its commitment to the well-being of seafarers, whose work is essential for world trade and economic stability.
27. **Speaking on behalf of the European Union (EU) and its Member States**, a Government representative of Denmark said that North Macedonia, Montenegro, Serbia, Albania, Ukraine and the Republic of Moldova, aligned themselves with the statement. She commended the work of the STC, which had an ambitious agenda with 16 proposed amendments to consider in relation to the MLC, 2006, which remained the cornerstone of the protection of seafarers'

rights. The meeting had once again demonstrated the quality of tripartite dialogue in the maritime sector. She welcomed that following the STC, the ILC had approved seven amendments to the Code of the MLC, 2006, by an overwhelming majority. She welcomed in particular the seventh set of amendments, which aimed to ensure that seafarers were effectively protected against violence and harassment on board, including sexual harassment, bullying and sexual assault. Those amendments were of great importance for improving the living and working conditions of seafarers on board ships. She regretted that the amendment proposed by the EU and its Member States on the maximum period of service on board had not achieved sufficient support to be adopted. They continued to believe that the issue was of great importance and should be duly reflected in the text of the MLC, 2006. She also welcomed the adoption by the STC of four resolutions, in particular on the recognition of seafarers as key workers and their indispensable contribution to global commerce and on requesting that the issue of hours of work and hours of rest be considered by the JTWG. While supporting the decisions made by the STC, she expressed concern regarding the financial implications of the extension of the mandate and the convening of two meetings of the JTWG and requested clarifications from the Office on how the current financial situation would be taken into account in this regard. Concerning the proposals to amend the Standing orders of the STC, while understanding the need for more flexibility to ensure the STC could carry on its work properly if Officers leave their positions between meetings, as well as in case extraordinary meetings had to be convened to address urgent matters, she recalled that any extraordinary meeting should be held in full respect of the principle of multilingualism, which underpinned multilateralism. With that, they supported the decision point as amended by the Employers' group.

28. **A Government representative of the United States of America** considered that the work of the STC was important and noted the report of the chairperson. More information on some of the amendments to the Standing Orders of the STC was needed, and he was concerned that the proposed process for organizing extraordinary meetings of the STC would not require Governing Body approval. He welcomed clarification from the Office on whether other ILO meetings could be organized through a similar process, on the financial implications of such extraordinary meetings and on the measures the Office could take to minimize those implications.
29. **A Government representative of the United Republic of Tanzania** aligned himself with the statement delivered by South Africa on behalf of the Africa Group and commended the Office for the preparation of the comprehensive Document GB.355/LILS/2, containing the report of the fifth meeting of the STC. He welcomed the proposed amendments to the Standing Orders of the STC, recognizing that enabling the STC to fill vacancies between formal sessions was vital for ensuring continuity, operational efficiency and legal certainty in the Committee's mandate and functioning. His country was actively implementing the MLC, 2006, and underscored the importance of stable, predictable, and well-structured governance mechanisms within the STC. He acknowledged the merit of the proposal to empower the STC to convene extraordinary meetings in response to urgent global developments. Establishing a formal framework for such exceptional sessions aimed at providing timely guidance and coordinated responses, without amending the Code, would significantly strengthen the capacity of all tripartite constituents to safeguard the rights and welfare of seafarers. He indicated that his country's support for those amendments was grounded in their ongoing efforts to implement the Convention by strengthening national legislation and inspection systems to address the evolving needs of the maritime workforce and to improve the working and living conditions of seafarers through close collaboration with national tripartite stakeholders, including seafarers' and shipowners' associations. By endorsing the proposed

amendments, his country reaffirmed their commitment to effective tripartite cooperation and to the promotion of high labour standards for seafarers, both domestically and within the wider global maritime community. In conclusion, he supported the draft decision contained in paragraph 35, and in particular paragraph 35(b). That decision was of strategic importance to the advancement of the Blue Economy agenda in his country, in line with his Government's ambition to position the ports of Dar es Salaam, Tanga, Bagamoyo and Zanzibar as competitive logistical hubs for the East and Central African region.

30. **A Government representative of Colombia** indicated that, as a country with strategic infrastructure for foreign trade, the maritime sector for Colombia is fundamental for socio-economic development. The changes under the leadership of the Ministry of Labour and the future ratification of the MLC, 2006, are very important steps to guarantee the rights of seafarers and promote decent work. In September, in the framework of the Standing Committee on Wage and Labour Policy Coordination, tripartite consultations had been carried out in relation to the possible ratification of the MLC, 2006, leading to a positive outcome. The next step includes the adoption of the law of ratification of the Convention by Congress (which bill is currently being reviewed by the Ministry of Foreign Affairs). The ratification of the MLC, 2006, was of strategic importance for Colombia, as it would enable the country to increase competitiveness in the maritime sector and ensure decent, safe and healthy working conditions for seafarers. That represented important progress, which would allow the harmonization of national legislation with ILO standards, at the same time reinforcing Colombia's commitment to decent work, social protection, compliance with the human and labour rights of seafarers, and effective implementation of the relevant instruments. Colombia reaffirmed its motivation to continue strengthening cooperation with ILO multilateral bodies and to move towards consolidating policies that guarantee the protection, well-being and dignity of all seafarers. That process was the fruit of the close cooperation of the country with the ILO International Labour Standards department, which he thanked.
31. **A Government representative of Oman** expressed appreciation to the Office for preparing the document related to the report of the fifth meeting of the STC. His Government valued the work carried out by the STC and its adoption of seven new amendments to the Code of the MLC, 2006. In this context, Oman continued its efforts to strengthen legislative frameworks and maritime inspection mechanisms, in coordination with the relevant authorities, to protect seafarers, regulate hours of work and rest, and improve procedures for repatriation and medical care, in line with the provisions of the MLC, 2006. He welcomed the conclusions related to the ILO/IMO JTWG and supported the proposed amendments to the standing orders of the STC, while emphasizing the importance of strengthening technical support for countries and providing guidance materials in Arabic to facilitate the implementation of the new amendments. In conclusion, he reaffirmed his country's commitment to supporting efforts aimed at improving seafarers' working conditions and promoting social justice in the maritime transport sector and endorsed the draft decision.
32. **A representative of the Director-General** (Director, International Labour Standards Department), referring to the questions that were put to the Office about how the current situation would be taken into account as regards the financing and organization of the two requested JTWG meetings, indicated that they would be financed from savings from the budget and, should this prove to be impossible, the Director-General would propose alternative funding methods at a later stage. She added that the first meeting would be hosted by the IMO in London, which would entail lower costs for the ILO. For that meeting, the budget estimated was around US\$60,000 to pay for the participation of the shipowners and seafarers attending

the meeting, the travel of the Secretariat staff supporting the meeting and the translation of the report.

- 33.** Replying to the Government representative of the United States, she indicated that the Standing Orders of the STC provided that the Governing Body was in charge of convening extraordinary meetings. It was only in exceptional circumstances where time was too short for the Governing Body to convene such meetings that it would delegate this power to the Officers of the STC, on a very exceptional basis and on the condition that the modalities of the meeting were adjusted to the financial resources available. This had been discussed at length during the fifth meeting of the STC, where the Office had brought to the attention of the delegates the financial constraints. The proposed language agreed by the STC took into account those concerns. She added that the proposed amendment resulted from the lessons learned from the COVID-19 pandemic, which took everyone by surprise and badly impacted the maritime industry. Seafarers were confined on board, their access to shore leave suspended and access to medical care was denied. This called for extraordinary support and guidance to the industry and required enhanced cooperation between Member States. The ILO had demonstrated its convening power in such extraordinary times, which helped connect the parties and find solutions to concrete real-life situations. The STC considered that it should have a mechanism whereby, in such extraordinary circumstances, and in order to be prepared, among others, for a possible next pandemic, such extraordinary meetings could be convened. She noted that if no budget was available, the industry was very used to holding meetings remotely and in English, so that costs could be kept to a minimum, provided there would be acceptance of exceptional circumstances impeding full multilingualism.

Decision

- 34. The Governing Body welcomed the work conducted by the Special Tripartite Committee (STC) established under the Maritime Labour Convention, 2006, as amended (MLC, 2006), and:**
- (a) took note of the report of the Chairperson of the STC on the fifth meeting of the STC (7–11 April 2025) and of the resolutions adopted at that meeting;**
 - (b) endorsed the request of the International Maritime Organization (IMO) Legal Committee to convene a meeting of the Joint ILO/IMO Tripartite Working Group to identify and address seafarers' issues and the human element (JTWG) to consider the final report of the Task Force to review and update (or redevelop) the ILO/IMO Joint Database on Abandonment of Seafarers and requested the Director-General to liaise with the IMO Secretary-General to that effect;**
 - (c) endorsed the STC's request to convene a meeting of the JTWG on hours of work and hours of rest, with the terms of reference contained in the resolution mentioned in paragraph 24 of document GB.355/LILS/2, and requested the Director-General to liaise with the IMO Secretary-General to submit the request to the IMO Maritime Safety Committee;**
 - (d) approved the amendment to paragraph 19 of the Terms of Reference of the JTWG;**
 - (e) decided that the relevant cost of the three-day meetings of the JTWG, if held in 2026 and 2027, be financed in the first instance from savings in Part I of the budget or, failing that, through Part II, on the understanding that, should this subsequently prove impossible, the Director-General would propose alternative financing methods at a later stage in the 2026–27 biennium;**

- (f) requested the Director-General to forward to the IMO the resolution recommending that the IMO Facilitation Committee consider the amendment to the MLC, 2006, on shore leave adopted during the Fifth Meeting of the STC, and take action as appropriate;
- (g) adopted the amendments related to the addition of a new Article 3 *bis*; Article 4, paragraph 4; Article 6, paragraphs 2 and 4, in the Standing Orders of the STC as proposed in the appendix to document GB.355/LILS/2, and referred the amendments proposed to paragraph 10 of the Introductory Note to the STC for further consideration;
- (h) reappointed Mr Martin Marini (Singapore) as Chairperson of the STC for the three-year period 2025–28;
- (i) decided to convene the sixth meeting of the STC from 3 to 7 April 2028 and requested the Director-General to include a provision for that purpose in the Programme and Budget proposals for 2028–29.

(GB.355/LILS/2, paragraph 35, as amended by the Governing Body)

3. Choice of Conventions and Recommendations on which reports should be requested under article 19 of the ILO Constitution in 2027 (GB.355/LILS/3)

- 35. **The Employer spokesperson** expressed surprise at the five options outlined in the paper and the order in which they were presented. He noted that option 5, which proposes pausing the preparation of a General Survey in 2027, was initially suggested by the Office during consultations and represents the most logical and appropriate way forward. He expressed disappointment that this option was placed last and given minimal explanation, as it should have been presented first due to its sound rationale and alignment with the increased workload during the transitional year prior to the launch of the streamlined reporting system in 2026.
- 36. Regarding option 1 on prospects of ratification of selected up-to-date instruments, his group did not support this option for several reasons. First, the purpose of a General Survey is to examine national law and practice on certain instruments in order to have a comprehensive understanding on how they are implemented at the national level. Second, the Office already has dedicated activities to promote ratification of up-to-date and new instruments, such as the centenary campaign in 2019 and various global ratification campaigns. Ratification is a sovereign act that should only occur after the interested government has undertaken comprehensive pre-ratification reviews of national laws and practices. In this regard, the role of the Office is to assist governments to undertake such an assessment so that ratification, if it happens, does not turn into a mere declaration of intent. Further, a global General Survey would not add value to this process, as pre-ratification reviews must be country specific, and would be a misuse of the opportunity to examine a specific thematic area. As discussed in the context of GB.355/INS/7, the focus of the Office should be to support Member States to effectively implement ratified Conventions. Third, this option overlaps with the work of the Standards Review Mechanism (SRM), particularly because from the perspective of some constituents, the ratification of up-to-date instruments is directly linked to the abrogation of outdated instruments. Given that the Officers of the SRM already agreed to have a discussion next year on how to deal with outdated instruments, his group believes that a General Survey on this topic would be premature and may create confusion. If a study on ratification prospects

is needed, it could be provided as an Office paper or information note to the SRM, which is the appropriate forum. His group therefore rejected option 1 entirely.

37. Option 5, pausing the preparation of a General Survey in 2027, is the option preferred by his group. He said that this is a pragmatic and responsible approach that would allow the Office, the Committee of Experts, and constituents to focus on the successful launch of the streamlined reporting system under article 22. Pausing the General Survey for 2027 would ensure coherence and avoid unnecessary strain on resources, as producing a Survey requires significant efforts. This concern was repeatedly raised during consultations on the streamlining of the reporting system. His group considered that planning too far ahead could be counterproductive and that pausing the General Survey at least for 2027 is the most logical solution. His group therefore did not consider it necessary to review the other options, as option 5 is their preferred choice.
38. **The Worker spokesperson** said that her group appreciated the Office's efforts to enhance synergies between the General Survey and other standard related processes, particularly the follow-up to the SRM Tripartite Working Group (TWG) recommendations which the Governing Body has consistently emphasized as an institutional priority. The group had considered concerns about the Office workload and the need to facilitate reporting obligations effectively while meeting constitutional requirements. She noted that longer-term planning could assist in achieving these objectives and underscored the importance of maintaining annual General Surveys mandated by the ILO Constitution. These Surveys provide a comprehensive overview of national law and practice and identify obstacles to ratification. For these reasons, her group could not support option 5 or any proposal that would suspend the General Survey in 2027 or render article 19 obligations ineffective. She noted that, as mentioned in Appendix III, General Surveys had never been suspended since 1949, not even during the pandemic.
39. She said that her group supported option 1, which aligned with the follow-up to the SRM as an institutional priority and the Governing Body's endorsement of SRM Tripartite Working Group's work on ratification, targeted promotion and effective implementation of up-to-date instruments. This option would reinforce coherence in standards-related processes and enhance the impact of the Office's work. While acknowledging that this was a departure from normal practice, she noted that similar approaches had been taken in the past. Being mindful of the workload of the Office, she said that her group understood that this proposal would be compatible with the introduction of the streamlining of article 22 reporting. She said that surveys must align with article 19 requirements and that report forms should include questions on the extent to which effect was given to each instrument and any difficulties delaying or preventing ratification. She said that it might also be appropriate for the Office to provide a summary of the content of each instrument as well. Her group believed option 1.2 offered the best balance between limiting the reporting burden and reflecting the exceptional nature of this approach. She proposed adjustments to the list of instruments, including moving instruments on fishers and dock work to 2027 and removing the Indigenous and Tribal Peoples Convention, 1989 (No. 169) from the list of instruments for year two, with a view to planning a full General Survey on that Convention.
40. She said that her group attached particular importance to Convention No. 169, noting that indigenous and tribal peoples continued to face serious violations of their rights worldwide. She described the Convention as a cornerstone instrument for protection of those rights and promoting equality, consultation and sustainable development. With only 24 ratifications to date, she said that a General Survey on this Convention would allow for a timely review of law and practice to identify challenges and promote ratification and implementation.

41. Regarding option 3 on the Work in Fishing Convention, 2007 (No. 188), she said that while the sector faced widespread decent work deficits, the Office should focus on promoting ratification at this stage, and inclusion of this instrument under option 1.2 was preferable to a comprehensive Survey.
42. On option 4 concerning instruments on protection of workers' claims in cases of employers' insolvency, she welcomed a General Survey, noting its universal significance and the first ever opportunity to obtain an up-to-date picture of law and practice at a time of rising insolvencies. She said that such a Survey would provide invaluable information on gaps and measures needed to protect workers' entitlements. In conclusion, she reiterated that her group could not support option 5 and favoured a longer-term plan starting with option 1, particularly option 1.2, followed by option 4 and then options 2 and 3.
43. **Speaking on behalf of the Africa group**, a Government representative of Sudan reaffirmed his group's commitment to reporting under article 19 of the ILO Constitution, which allows to track progress in ratification and implementation of up-to-date Conventions. He welcomed the introductory part of the report, which set out the linkages between the recurrent discussion and the standards-related work, and took note of the background provided in option 1 concerning the extensive work of the SRM TWG. The classification of outdated instruments and the need for the comprehensive information on national actions and ratification prospects underscored the importance of selecting an approach that strengthened the effectiveness and coherence of the ILO supervisory system.
44. He said that his group supported option 1.1, which proposed an advanced three-year cycle for article 19 reporting. His group considered this option a balanced and realistic response to the reporting capacities of many developing and least developed countries. By distributing the workload over several years, option 1.1 would ease reporting pressure, ensure coherence with the strategic objectives of the Decent Work Agenda – including the recurrent discussions planned for 2027, 2028, 2029 – and provide a more structured and predictable framework for assessing ratification prospects and identifying obstacles to the implementation of up-to-date instruments. His group recognized the value of General Surveys focusing on prospects of ratification of up-to-date instruments, which would help address current information gaps, identify challenges faced by Member States – especially those still bound by outdated Conventions – and guide the Office in tailoring technical assistance. This was particularly important for many African countries undergoing labour reforms and facing institutional capacity limitation and resonated with ongoing national efforts in areas such as informality, social protection, labour inspection and employment creation.
45. With regard to options 2, 3 and 4, his group considered them important and called on the Office to pursue them under the recommendations of the SRM TWG, which called for targeted and general promotional campaigns towards increased ratification. Regarding option 5, his group did not view it as a viable option, as it would affect and disrupt the existing sequence of recurrent discussions.
46. He called for broad and inclusive consultations among constituents ahead of the 356th Session of the Governing Body to ensure that the final selection reflected balanced regional priorities and realistic reporting expectations. His group reaffirmed its unwavering commitment to the ILO supervisory system and to advancing social justice through decent work.
47. **Speaking on behalf of GRULAC**, a Government representative of Brazil said that compliance with the fundamental obligation of Member States under the ILO Constitution to submit reports was of utmost importance for her group. She considered appropriate the proposals to promote ratification; encourage countries to examine their situation concerning the

ratification and implementation of instruments; provide guidance for their application; evaluate the impact and relevance of standards; and select Conventions and Recommendations on which reports should be requested under article 19 of the Constitution. She welcomed the measures aimed at establishing effective links between the recurrent discussions and the results of standards-related initiatives, which would allow the exploration of options to make better use of article 19 without increasing the reporting obligations of Member States. She noted that the decision to be adopted by the Governing Body under this item was closely related to the decision taken during the previous discussion on the proposal to streamline the submission of reports on ratified Conventions under article 22 of the Constitution through the progressive implementation of thematic reports on the application of Conventions. She noted that the proposals set out in the document envisaged a possible transitional period from 2027 to 2029, during which Member States would adapt to the new reporting modalities and the overall reporting workload would be monitored, including the workload associated with the preparation of reports requested under article 19 of the Constitution.

48. With regard to the guidance to the Office for the further development of the report form, she said that GRULAC would appreciate receiving a proposal from the Secretariat using language adapted to the current realities and needs of the world of work and enabling the effective systematization of the information collected.
49. She noted the importance of promoting information exchange and strengthening the capacity of constituents to effectively implement international labour standards. She welcomed the alternatives for instruments proposed for the General Survey to be prepared by the Committee of Experts in 2027 and considered relevant the guidance provided by the Office in formulating alternatives that would support studies aimed at identifying measures promoting the ratification and implementation of international labour standards. She welcomed the pertinence of the proposal and underlined the identification of instruments with a low and limited number of ratifications.
50. She took note of the rationale behind the proposal made by some constituents during the informal consultations, who expressed support for a possible alternative involving a one-year suspension of the preparation of a General Survey in order to rationalize reporting, as set out in option 5. Bearing in mind the current budgetary situation, as well as the proposal to streamline reporting under article 22 of the Constitution and the definition of future institutional measures, she said that her group preferred this alternative.
51. **Speaking on behalf of IMEC**, a Government representative of Austria, said that her group considered that the General Surveys remained a key element of the ILO's standards-related work. Her group acknowledged that option 1 on prospects of ratification of selected up-to-date instruments which comes out of the SRM. She appreciated that this option would provide insight into the various national circumstances influencing the ratification and effective implementation of up-to-date standards. However, she considered that this option would be burdensome for governments in terms of reporting, particularly in view of the increased workload expected under the new article 22 reporting system. Her group supported option 1.1, as outlined in Appendix I, which would divide the task into three General Surveys to be developed in 2027, 2028, and 2029. Only up-to-date Conventions related to outdated Conventions should be encompassed and Conventions not related to any outdated instrument, such as the Working Conditions (Hotels and Restaurants) Convention, 1991 (No. 172), should therefore be removed.

52. With regard to option 5, she noted that this proposal came originally from the Office in November 2024 in order to free resources for properly ensuring the transition to the new article 22 reporting system. She asked the Office to explain to the Governing Body how burdensome article 19 reports were in terms of resources and costs required by the Office, and whether adopting option 5 would help facilitate that transition. If that were the case, IMEC could be open to this option as an alternative.
53. As regards options 2, 3, and 4, she thanked the Office for presenting options that were timely and relevant and for providing elaborated and valuable argumentation for each of them. While IMEC members held different preferences regarding these options, the group remained open to any consensus that might emerge.
54. Regarding the respective questionnaire, she said that the Office should aim for simpler and less burdensome questionnaires that remained within the scope of the respective instruments.
55. **A representative of the Director-General** (Director, International Labour Standards Department) responded to a question regarding how burdensome the preparation of General Surveys for consideration by the Committee of Experts was, and stated that their preparation required a substantial investment. Although the work normally required a team of two to three staff members, depending on the complexity of the subject matter, working over a period of six months, the Office was receiving extra support for only three months. She expressed that, despite receiving less resources than were needed, the Office had nevertheless managed to deliver as required.
56. In relation to option 1, she recalled a similar General Survey that had been undertaken in 1968 and published in 1969, and noted that it had been much smaller than a traditional General Survey. She therefore explained that option 1 would require a reduced investment from the department. She noted that option 1.1 appeared to have received the greatest expression of support. In relation to option 5, she confirmed that it had been previously explored in the context of a proposal concerning regular reporting, and clarified that it had not been further developed because it would disrupt the normative input into the recurrent discussions established by the ILO Declaration on Social Justice for a Fair Globalization in 2008, as amended in 2022.
57. **The Worker spokesperson** acknowledged the clarification provided by the Office, which indicated that, through the adoption of option 1.1, the cycle of recurrent discussions would continue undisrupted, and the burden associated with the normal process of General Surveys would be reduced. Despite the Workers' group's original preference for option 1.2, they could be flexible and support Option 1.1. Regarding the retention of options 2, 3 and 4 for future consideration, she requested that their order be changed to options 4, 2 and 3.
58. **The Employer spokesperson** noted that, while there was a division of opinion, there were good reasons to adopt option 5, which would pause the General Survey. In the context of the transition phase, pausing the General Survey would provide governments and the Office the necessary space to adjust and prepare for the next cycle. He stated that the adoption of option 1 would further strain the Office's resources. The Employers' group also believed that the subject matter in option 1, concerning up-to-date standards, was already on the agenda of the SRM TWG, and was therefore not appropriate to be the subject of a General Survey at this time. He expressed concern that the SRM TWG had already planned to discuss this issue, and that a General Survey would amount to second-guessing the outcome of that discussion. He stated that, while discussions about up-to-date standards were not off the table, in the interest of efficiency and streamlining, they needed to be channelled appropriately to prevent duplication.

59. **The Worker spokesperson** stated that, while there was no consensus, there was a majority opinion. She referenced the concern regarding duplication of the SRM TWG process and explained that option 1 related to matters that had already been concluded at the SRM and endorsed by the Governing Body. She explained that, as an institutional priority recognized by the Governing Body, efforts needed to be undertaken to promote up-to-date standards and to understand the difficulties Member States faced in moving from outdated to up-to-date standards. She recalled the work of the SRM, particularly the identification and promotion of up-to-date standards, and noted that option 1 established the route to achieving its mandate. She also recalled the Office's statement that the adoption of option 1 would not increase the workload burden and would be managed within the new article 22 process, and therefore reiterated the feasibility and benefit of choosing this option.
60. **Speaking on behalf of GRULAC**, a Government representative of Brazil said that initially the group expressed preference for option 5 but it was ready to show flexibility with regard to option 1.1.
61. **Speaking on behalf of IMEC**, a Government representative of Austria reiterated her group's support for option 1.1, under the condition that the General Survey would cover only up-to-date Conventions related to outdated instruments. Her group remained flexible with regard to other options too.
62. **Speaking on behalf of the Africa group**, a Government representative of Sudan reiterated his group's support for option 1.1.
63. **A representative of the Director-General** (Director, International Labour Standards Department) said that the draft decision in the document had been adjusted to reflect the instruments covered under option 1.1.

Decision

64. **The Governing Body requested the Office to prepare, for its consideration at its 356th Session (March 2026):**
- (a) the article 19 report form on the Work in Fishing Convention, 2007 (No. 188), the Occupational Safety and Health (Dock Work) Convention, 1979 (No. 152), the Indigenous and Tribal Peoples Convention, 1989 (No. 169), and the Maternity Protection Convention, 2000 (No. 183), for the General Survey to be prepared by the Committee of Experts on the Application of Conventions and Recommendations in 2027 for discussion by the Conference Committee on the Application of Standards in 2028;
 - (b) the article 19 report form on the Safety and Health in Mines Convention, 1995 (No. 176), the Safety and Health in Construction Convention, 1988 (No. 167), the Occupational Safety and Health Convention, 1981 (No. 155), the Protocol of 2002 to the Occupational Safety and Health Convention, 1981, the Occupational Health Services Convention, 1985 (No. 161) and the Promotional Framework for Occupational Safety and Health Convention, 2006 (No. 187), and the Minimum Age Convention, 1973 (No. 138), for the General Survey to be prepared by the Committee of Experts on the Application of Conventions and Recommendations in 2028 for discussion by the Conference Committee on the Application of Standards in 2029;
 - (c) the article 19 report form on the Private Employment Agencies Convention, 1997 (No. 181), the Employment Service Convention, 1948 (No. 88), the Labour Statistics Convention, 1985 (No. 160), the Social Security (Minimum Standards) Convention,

1952 (No. 102) (Part IV), the Equality of Treatment (Social Security) Convention, 1962 (No. 118), the Employment Promotion and Protection against Unemployment Convention, 1988 (No. 168), the Labour Inspection Convention, 1947 (No. 81) and Labour Inspection (Agriculture) Convention, 1969 (No. 129), for the General Survey to be prepared by the Committee of Experts on the Application of Conventions and Recommendations in 2029 for discussion by the Conference Committee on the Application of Standards in 2030.

([GB.355/LILS/3](#), paragraph 71)