Informal tripartite consultations on the working methods of the Committee on the Application of Standards (2 November 2019)

Background note

Introduction

1. Informal tripartite consultations on the working methods of the Conference Committee on the Application of Standards (CAS) took place 11 times from June 2006 to 2011. Subsequently, at its 322nd Session (October–November 2014), the Governing Body decided to relaunch informal tripartite consultations to prepare recommendations for the 323rd Session of the Governing Body (March 2015), in the context of decisions taken by the Governing Body concerning the Standards Initiative. The latest informal tripartite consultations on the working methods of the CAS were held on 23 March 2019.

2. The outcome of these informal tripartite consultations and the subsequent adjustments made to the working methods of the CAS are reflected in document D.1, adopted each year by the CAS, entitled “Work of the Committee”.

3. The most recent informal tripartite consultations continued the review of the functioning of the CAS. Specifically, the discussions addressed the preparation and adoption of conclusions and arrangements for special events to mark the Centenary. There was also a brief discussion of the General Survey.

4. This meeting follows up on the discussions of March 2019, during the 335th Session of the Governing Body, including the informal tripartite consultations held on 23 March 2019.

5. It was proposed that the March meeting address the following items:

   – proposals for possible further improvements to the working methods of the CAS, including the production of the CAS report as a verbatim record, the reorganization of the structure of Parts I and II of the report, the finalization of the report in all three languages after the Conference, and the possibility of enabling governments on the long list of individual cases to submit additional written information prior to the Conference;

   – special arrangements for the Centenary;

   – the discussion of the General Survey;

   – the preparation, adoption and follow-up of conclusions;

1 GB.322/PV, para. 209(3).

2 A brief report of the 23 March 2019 meeting of the informal tripartite Working Group is reproduced in Appendix 1.
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seating arrangements at the CAS.

6. The participants at the meeting discussed the possibility of increasing the number of seats allocated to government delegations in the CAS. The Office indicated that each delegation would be entitled to two seats. Given the high number of delegations usually registered in the CAS, it was difficult, however, to guarantee more seats. Additional seating could nevertheless be allocated on a case-by-case basis, when high-level authorities wished to attend the sittings relating to their countries.

7. The participants at the meeting discussed the possibility of publishing part of the CAS report as a verbatim record as well as the proposal to restructure Parts I and II of the report. It was noted that reproducing the discussions as a verbatim record would increase transparency, save time and reduce certain costs. It was decided that verbatim records would be prepared for delegates’ statements concerning the discussion of the General Survey, the discussion of individual cases and the general discussion. It was also decided that the CAS report would be restructured, so that Part I would comprise the introduction, general questions relating to international labour standards, the outcome of the discussion on the General Survey, conclusions on individual cases, cases of serious failure, adoption of the report and closing remarks. The Working Group also agreed that Part II of the CAS report would be adopted both by the Committee itself and by the International Labour Conference in plenary, in a trilingual patchwork form. Moreover, given that reproducing discussions in verbatim form would result in a longer document and therefore require additional translation time, the report would be available on the CAS web page in the three working languages no later than one month following its adoption in plenary. It was also decided that governments on the long list of cases would be able to submit, on a purely voluntary basis, new written information before the beginning of the Conference, in one of the ILO working languages and should not exceed three pages. In addition, it was decided that the matter regarding the publication dates of the lists of individual cases would be further discussed at the next meeting of the Working Group.

8. With regard to the specific arrangements made for the ILO Centenary celebrations, the Working Group decided that the first sitting of the CAS would be devoted to marking the Centenary and it discussed, in particular, the content of the messages for the visual “curtain-raiser”. The participants at the meeting also welcomed the fact that the Chairperson and Vice-Chairpersons of the CAS had been invited to participate in a round table as part of the next meeting of the Committee of Experts on the Application of Conventions and Recommendations (hereinafter the Committee of Experts).

9. Concerning the proposals to enhance the discussion of General Surveys, the participants at the meeting agreed to reduce the time allotted for opening statements and for general discussions in order to allocate more time to the discussion of the General Surveys, while also highlighting the limited room for manoeuvre in that respect. The Working Group considered the proposal to structure the discussion of the General Survey around a series of questions in order to keep discussions more targeted. It was agreed that further consideration would be given at the next meeting to methods for developing these questions.

10. The process of preparing and adopting the conclusions of the discussion of individual cases was again considered, with a focus on the role that the Chairperson of the CAS could play in that respect. Recalling the importance of not hindering the proper functioning of the work of the CAS, the Working Group decided it would re-examine this proposal at its next meeting and asked the Office to present a summary of how the role of the CAS Chairperson has developed. The proposal that the conclusions be transmitted to the government concerned in advance and that the government representative have the right to take the floor prior to the adoption of the conclusions was also discussed, and the consideration of that proposal would continue.
11. On the basis of the discussions during the meeting of 23 March 2019, it is proposed that this meeting of the Working Group address the following items:

- functioning of the CAS in the light of the changes introduced in June 2019 (section I);
- the General Survey: structuring the discussion around a series of questions (section II);
- publication of the list of individual cases (section III);
- adoption of the conclusions (section IV);
- information on the round table held during the next meeting of the Committee of Experts on 28 November 2019 (section V).

I. Functioning of the CAS in the light of the changes introduced in June 2019

12. During the 107th Session of the International Labour Conference (May–June 2018), the Office carried out an internal review of the working methods of the secretariats of all the committees of the Conference, with a view to identifying areas for improvement. In that context, the Working Group examined and approved, during its last meeting, a number of proposals aimed at improving the working methods of the CAS secretariat. These changes were implemented during the most recent session of the CAS and seem to have been generally well received by constituents.4

13. Verbatim records – The practice of fully reproducing delegates’ statements has responded to calls from many governments for increased transparency. Nevertheless, the Office wishes to draw attention to the difficulties encountered with statements delivered in a language other than one of the three working languages since, in such cases, the transcription of the statement is based on the interpretation into one of the working languages. In such circumstances, it is important that delegates submit their speeches in advance in order to be transmitted to the interpretation services, speak slowly and check the verbatim so that any necessary changes can be made.

14. Reorganization of the content of Parts I and II of the CAS report and finalization of the CAS report in all three languages after the Conference – Parts I and II of the CAS report, which were restructured following the decisions made during the most recent consultations, were published on time. Part I had been published as usual in all three languages for adoption by the Conference in plenary. Part II of the report, comprising trilingual (patchwork) verbatim minutes of the discussion of the General Survey, the discussion of the “automatic” cases and the discussion of individual cases, was first submitted to the Conference for adoption in plenary only in electronic format. The verbatim minutes were posted on the CAS web page as they were adopted. Taking into account the length of these minutes, the translation deadlines were extended and Part II of the CAS report was published on the Conference web page in all three languages on 26 July 2019 – 35 days after it was adopted. The initial deadline for publication was 30 days. In light of the above, the Office proposes that the Working Group review this deadline and consider increasing it to 40 days.

15. Submission of additional written information by governments on the long list of individual cases. During the most recent informal tripartite consultations, it was decided that governments on the long list of cases would be provided with the opportunity to submit, if they so wished,

written information to the CAS. This information, provided on a purely voluntary basis, should concern only new developments not yet examined by the Committee of Experts. It must be transmitted in one of the three working languages of the ILO at least two weeks prior to the opening of the session of the Conference and should not exceed three pages. A total of 15 countries took the opportunity to submit written information, of which nine submitted the information on time, and six complied with the three-page limit. What is more, while most countries transmitted information on developments not examined by the Committee of Experts, a number of countries provided information which was partially or substantially similar to information that had been submitted previously in reports under article 22 of the ILO Constitution. Appendix 2 summarizes this information.

16. Prior to publishing the written information received in this context, the participants at the meeting may wish to consider the possibility of enabling the Office to: (i) summarize the information submitted if it exceeds the length permitted; (ii) remove information concerning developments already examined by the Committee of Experts. Furthermore, since it may be difficult to assess the three-page limit depending on the format used, a 1,500 word limit is suggested.

II. General Survey: structuring the discussion around a series of questions

17. During recent informal consultations, the Working Group examined ways of improving the Committee’s consideration of General Surveys. In this respect, the Conference has explicitly requested the ILO to “adopt modalities to ensure that General Surveys and the related discussion by the Committee on the Application of Standards contribute to the recurrent discussions as appropriate”.

18. During the last consultations, the proposal to structure the discussion of General Surveys around questions formulated in advance was received positively by the participants, considering that these questions would allow discussions to focus on key points and facilitate the adoption of constructive conclusions. Methods for developing the questions should be discussed in greater detail.

19. General Surveys are prepared by the Committee of Experts, under article 19(5)(e) of the ILO Constitution, on the basis of reports sent by member States and information submitted by the social partners. General Surveys list the national law and practice of member States concerning certain Conventions or Recommendations and aim to: (i) examine progress and challenges identified by governments in their application; (ii) analyse obstacles to ratification when the survey concerns a Convention or a group of Conventions; (iii) identify good practices and means of overcoming these obstacles; and (iv) identify the need for standards-related action and technical assistance to contribute to the recurrent discussion. The discussion of the General Survey could be organized around the following themes: i) progress and challenges in the implementation of the instruments under examination; ii) measures to be taken to promote Conventions and their ratification in light of the good practices and obstacles identified; and iii) pathways for future ILO standards action and technical assistance. In addition, the Committee of Experts could be requested to draw the attention of the CAS to a more specific question when it deems necessary.

20. The participants at the meeting may wish to consider this matter further based on the proposals set out above.
III. Publication of the list of individual cases

21. During the last meeting, several government representatives reiterated their request that the lists of cases be published earlier, while noting the difficulties raised by the social partners in that respect. There was consensus that this matter should be discussed further.

22. The matter of the publication date of the long list and the final list of individual cases has been discussed regularly by the Working Group since 2006 and significant progress has been made in this respect. Appendix 4 lists the dates on which the long list of individual cases has been published since 2006 – when the social partners introduced this practice. Initially, this list was published two weeks before the Conference and since 2015, the social partners agreed to make it publicly available at least 30 days before the start of the Conference. It may be possible to explore using new information technologies, such as web-based applications, in order for the Employers’ group and the Workers’ group to effectively carry out the consultations required to establish the long list.

23. Appendix 3 lists the date/session on which the final list of individual cases was adopted by the CAS between 2000 and 2019. Since 2013, the CAS has adopted this list at its second sitting. On several occasions at the meetings of the Working Group, it has been recalled that the adoption of the list is the prerogative of the CAS and that the adoption of the list before the session of the Conference begins is therefore not legally possible.

24. The participants at the meeting may wish to consider this matter further.

IV. Adoption of conclusions

25. At the previous meeting, discussions continued on the proposal made by the group of Latin American and Caribbean countries during the meeting of the Working Group of November 2017 that the Chairperson of the CAS could play a consultative role in the preparation of the conclusions. This proposal was supported by the Asia and Pacific group and the Africa group, which considered that this role would strengthen tripartite consensus and thus the supervisory system. The Western European group and the Eastern European group underlined the importance of pursuing the discussion, on the understanding that the integrity of the Committee was guaranteed. The Employers’ group and the Workers’ group stressed that the conclusions must not be examined in isolation and that the governments had various means of transmitting all the information that they considered useful in order to influence the content of the discussions and, therefore, the conclusions. The Chairperson emphasized that there was nothing to prevent the Chairperson of the CAS or the member State concerned from communicating with the Vice-Chairpersons to ensure that there viewpoints were reflected in the conclusions. There was consensus to continue the discussion on the process of adopting conclusions, and the Working Group requested the Office to provide information on how the role of the Chairperson of the CAS had developed in that regard.

26. As indicated in the previous background note, from the 1980s onwards, the CAS began adopting the conclusions on individual cases using a more systematic approach, in the form of a brief summary of the discussion. These conclusions were prepared and proposed by the Chairperson of the CAS, who would read them immediately after the discussion of the case or after a pause. Prior to 2003, D.1 documents (on working methods of the Committee on the Application of Standards) did not refer to the adoption of conclusions. Following the informal consultations led by the Office with all of the groups in February–March 2003, the Office identified in the D.1 document the matters on which consensus could be reached concerning improvements in working methods. With regard to the adoption of conclusions, paragraph 19 of that document stated:
19. Conclusions proposed by the Chairperson of the Committee should continue to be prepared by him/her. The conclusions should take due account of the elements raised in the discussion. The Chairperson should take the time necessary to finalize the proposed conclusions, if needed during a brief pause. He/she could consult the Rapporteur and the Vice-Chairpersons of the Committee before proposing the conclusions to the Committee. This should not, however, lead into disruptions in the work of the Committee, and a short pause and possible brief consultations with the Officers should not turn into a negotiating session.

27. In addition, the appendix to that D.1 document shows that the possibility of a brief pause had already been explored and that it had been decided to follow this approach, as reflected in the wording of the D.1 document adopted in 2005.

The conclusions regarding individual cases are prepared and proposed by the Chairperson of the Committee, who should have sufficient time for reflection to draft the conclusions and to hold consultations with the Reporter and the Vice-Chairpersons before proposing the conclusions to the Committee. These conclusions take due account of the elements raised in the discussion.

28. The improvement of the procedure for adopting conclusions was examined during the first consultations held in the informal tripartite Working Group on the working methods of the CAS in 2006. As a result, improvements were introduced to ensure that the conclusions: (i) took due account of the elements raised in the discussion and information provided by the government in writing; and (ii) were adopted within a reasonable time limit after the discussion of the case and were succinct. For example, the D.1 document adopted in 2012 stated:

The conclusions regarding individual cases are proposed by the Chairperson of the Committee, who should have sufficient time for reflection to draft the conclusions and to hold consultations with the Reporter and the Vice-Chairpersons before proposing them to the Committee. The conclusions should take due account of the elements raised in the discussion and information provided by the Government in writing. The conclusions should be adopted within a reasonable time limit after the discussion of the case and should be succinct.

29. This matter was put back on the agenda of the informal tripartite consultations on the working methods of the CAS in 2015, at the request of the Vice-Chairpersons, who called for their increased participation in the drafting of the conclusions. As a result, there was consensus that from 2015 onwards the conclusions regarding individual cases would be proposed by the Vice-Chairpersons and submitted by the Chairperson to the Committee for adoption. The conclusions should be short and clear and should specify the action expected of governments. They may also include reference to the technical assistance to be provided by the Office. The conclusions should reflect consensus-based recommendations. Divergent views could be reflected in the CAS record of proceedings. Furthermore, since 2015, the conclusions have been adopted at dedicated sittings of the Committee.

30. In that connection, the Workers’ group indicated during tripartite consultations in March 2016 that it was important to receive a summary of the discussion from the Office, following which the drafting of the conclusions and the points for action would be shared with the social partners. Since 2017, the Office has no longer been preparing this summary.

---

5 Appendix: List of issues which might be considered at the informal consultations on the working methods of the Conference Committee on the Application of Standards (February 2003).

6 It should be recalled that the Office, which acts as the secretariat of the Conference, and therefore of the Committee on the Application of Standards, has always made its technical expertise available to the Chairperson, the Vice-Chairpersons and the Rapporteur, including for the preparation of draft conclusions.
31. The participants in the meeting may wish to consider further the matter of the role of the Chairperson in the process of drafting conclusions.

32. Furthermore, with regard to the proposal that the conclusions be transmitted to the government concerned in advance and that the government could take the floor prior to the adoption of the conclusions, the Employers’ group and the Workers’ group considered that it was problematic on many levels and that it could affect the proper functioning of the CAS. There was consensus on the need to examine the implications of such a proposal more thoroughly. The meeting may wish to consider this matter further.

V. Information on the round table to be held during the next meeting of the Committee of Experts (28 November 2019)

33. In order to mark the ILO Centenary and reflect upon the history of the Organization and the challenges ahead, members of the Committee of Experts have requested the Office to prepare a special event during its next meeting in 2019. Accordingly, a special session of the Committee of Experts will be held on 28 November 2019, which will highlight some of the cases in which, through the work of the Committee of Experts and the CAS, significant progress has been achieved in terms of compliance with international labour standards. Alongside the current Chairperson of the Committee of Experts (Ms Graciela Dixon-Catton), three former chairpersons of the Committee of Experts will attend this event (Ms Robyn Layton, Ms Janice Bellace and Mr Abdul Koroma) as well as the Chairperson of the CAS (2019) and the two Vice-Chairpersons.

34. At the end of this special session, the Director of the International Labour Standards Department will present a new publication on ensuring compliance with international labour standards and the essential role of the Committee of Experts on the Application of Conventions and Recommendations of the ILO.

    * * *

35. The Office wishes to bring to the attention of those attending the meeting a table summarizing the improvements made to the working methods of the CAS on the basis of the recommendations of the Working Group since it was established in 2006 (Appendix 5).
Appendix 1

Informal tripartite consultations on the working methods of the Committee on the Application of Standards (23 March 2019)

Brief report of the meeting

1. Informal tripartite consultations on the working methods of the Conference Committee on the Application of Standards (CAS) were held on 23 March 2019 from 2 p.m. to 5 p.m.

2. The meeting was chaired by Mr Sipho Ndebele (Government representative, South Africa). The Employer Vice – Chairperson of the CAS at the 107th Session (2018) of the International Labour Conference (ILC), Ms Sonia Regenbogen, and the Worker Vice – Chairperson of the CAS, Mr Marc Leemans, spoke on behalf of the Employers’ and Workers’ groups, respectively. The Government representatives were from the following nine countries: Algeria, Brazil, China, Egypt, Greece, Lebanon, Malaysia, Poland and Uruguay. The meeting was also attended by a number of observers.

3. The meeting had before it a background note prepared by the Office. The agenda of the meeting was presented by the Chairperson, who opened the floor for comments in relation to the summary report of the previous meeting held on 3 November 2018.

I. Seating arrangements at the CAS

4. The Director of the International Labour Standards Department suggested to continue with the practice introduced the previous year of allocating two seats to Government delegations in the CAS. Extra number of seats were also given for country delegations to attend the full deliberation from Room II.

5. Speaking on behalf of the Group of Latin American and Caribbean Countries (GRULAC), a Government representative of Brazil considered that flexibility in the allocation of seats should be kept, as during some sittings there was space available in the room. Since the CAS was an important Committee, he expressed concern that high – level authorities of the countries might be prevented from attending the discussions due to seating arrangements.

6. Speaking on behalf of the Africa group, a Government representative of Algeria said that he considered that the current number of seats per Government delegation was insufficient. He therefore supported the proposal to increase the number to three.

7. Speaking on behalf of the Western European Group, a Government representative of Greece agreed with the practice already followed of having some seats for each country delegation. The speaker concurred with the request made by GRULAC of having some degree of flexibility in the allocation of seats when high – level authorities wished to attend the sessions.

8. Speaking on behalf of ASPAG, a Government representative of Lebanon supported the proposal made to increase the number of seats from two to three.

9. The Director of the International Labour Standards Department noted the request for some flexibility in the allocation of seats. The margin of manoeuvre to respond to this call depends on the number of delegations registered for the various sittings. Bearing this in mind, when high – level authorities wished to attend a sitting, the secretariat would accommodate their request.
depending on the number of seats available. However, a commitment to increase the number of
seats to three per Government delegation was not possible due to the limited number of seats in
the room.

II. Further proposals for possible improvements to
the working methods of the CAS

10. The Director of the International Labour Standards Department recalled the agreement
reached during the last informal consultations to fully reproduce delegates’ statements on the
General Survey and on individual cases in verbatim. The Employers had proposed to reorganize
Part I of the report so that it included the introduction; the summary report of the general
discussion; the outcome of the discussion of the General Survey; the conclusions of the
individual cases; the adoption of the report and the concluding remarks. It was also proposed
that the CAS report be adopted in patchwork by the plenary and finalized in the three languages
one month later. Finally, the meeting should also discuss the proposal to enhance the use of D
documents whereby governments on the longlist could submit additional information prior to the
start of the CAS.

11. The Worker spokesperson agreed to reproduce the conclusions of the individual cases both in
Parts I and II of the CAS report, considering that it was important to keep the conclusions and
the discussion of the case together. The speaker also expressed their support for the reproduction
in verbatim of the discussions of the General Survey and the individual cases. The enhanced use
of D documents could have some value as long as the information provided concerned new
developments that had not been examined by the Committee of Experts. This would prevent the
Committee from adopting conclusions on items that had evolved. The speaker also agreed with
the Office proposal to reorganize Parts I and II of the CAS report as long as no information was
lost.

12. The Employer spokesperson agreed with the three proposals in the background note. The
Employers’ group stressed that Part I of the CAS report would not be a record of proceedings
but would rather provide an overview of the results achieved during the discussions. Part II
would contain the verbatim of the discussions, thus improving accuracy by avoiding
misinterpretations through the summarizing process. This would also allow for savings and the
resources saved could be used more efficiently.

13. Speaking on behalf of GRULAC, a Government representative of Brazil reiterated that his
region was still deeply concerned with the working methods of the CAS: the voice of the
Governments was not heard; there was a lack of true tripartism; and there was a lack of adequate
parliamentary procedure. GRULAC had proposed on a number of occasions that the lists of
cases be published in advance. While acknowledging the difficulties raised by the social partners
in this regard, modern technology should allow room for making progress. The speaker
requested that the concerns expressed by various governments be taken into consideration and
that the issue of an advance publication of the list of cases be considered during the next meeting.
For this purpose, the Office should provide information on the practice followed in the past as
well as on the technological methods available through web – based applications to advance the
publication of the list. His group agreed with the publication of the discussion of individual
cases and General Surveys in the form of verbatim. The summary of the general discussion
would appear in Part I together with the conclusions on individual cases and the outcome of the
discussion of the General Survey. However, the speaker expressed concern that the general
discussion would not be reproduced in verbatim since, in the past, discrepancies had been
identified in the summary of the general discussion and had to be corrected. His group requested
that the general discussion also be reproduced in verbatim records in Part II. Finally, in relation
to the enhanced used of D Documents, it should be made clear that governments would provide
information on a voluntary basis. This would be an opportunity for governments to clarify
certain issues.
14. **The Chairperson** requested the Office to clarify where the summaries would be placed.

15. **The Director of the International Labour Standards Department** indicated that Part I would contain the introduction, the summary of the general discussion, the outcome of the discussion on the General Survey, the summary report on the cases of serious failures and the conclusions on the individual cases. The verbatim of the discussion on the General Survey and the verbatim of the discussion of the cases of serious failure would be included in Part II. The only question left was whether the general discussion would appear in summary or in verbatim.

16. **The Employer and the Worker spokespersons** agreed to reproduce the general discussion in verbatim.

17. **Speaking on behalf of the Western European Group, a Government representative of Greece** also agreed with the proposal to reproduce the general discussion and the discussion of individual cases in verbatim; to reproduce the conclusions of the individual cases both in Part I and Part II of the report; and to adopt the report in patchwork. The speaker asked whether the special paragraphs would continue to appear in Part I. In relation to the proposal to allow governments appearing on the longlist to provide information before the session of the CAS, the process had to be completely voluntary and no pressure should be put on governments. Her group also expressed appreciation at the efforts that the social partners were willing to make to anticipate the publication of the shortlist.

18. **Speaking on behalf of the Eastern European Group, a Government representative of Poland** underlined that it was important for Member States to be informed in advance of the discussion of their case and to have the opportunity to deliver comprehensive information.

19. A **Government representative of Uruguay** supported the statement by GRULAC. She emphasized that the restructuring of Parts I and II would improve transparency and highlighted the importance of speakers being able to amend the verbatim records before they were published.

20. **Speaking on behalf of the Africa group, a Government representative of Algeria** emphasized the need to strengthen tripartism in the CAS by reviewing its working methods. Tangible results must be achieved in that regard. He agreed with proposals to publish verbatim records of discussions in order to ensure greater transparency and to restructure Parts I and II of the report. With regard to the publication of the report in the three languages one month after the end of the Conference, that deadline must be respected. Lastly, governments on the longlist should be able to provide information in the form of a D document of at least five pages in length.

21. **The Employer spokesperson** agreed to place on the agenda of the next meeting the issue of the early publication of the lists of cases. While there was, in principle, agreement to publish the longlist earlier than 30 days before the opening of the session of the Conference, more reflection was needed on the practicability of this proposal. This would extend the time during which governments would appear on the list and at the same time give social partners more time to engage with the governments concerned. Concerning the publication of the shortlist, while technology might help, there was value in people meeting in person and, practically, the first opportunity to discuss the shortlist laid at the beginning of the CAS. The social partners had worked in good faith to be able to publish the shortlist on the second day of the CAS. Furthermore, considering that double – footnoted cases were discussed first, the other cases were not discussed until the end of the first week. In conclusion, the Employers’ group considered that a change in the practice would be difficult.

22. **The Chairperson** confirmed that the timeline for the publication of the lists of cases would be further discussed at the next meeting.
23. At the request of a Government representative of Greece, the Director of the International Labour Standards Department clarified that governments on the longlist would be invited to provide new information on a purely voluntary basis, which would be indicated when the longlist was sent to governments. There would be no specific letters addressed to the governments to that end. Document D1 would refer to the voluntary nature of the process and to the fact that the information provided should not exceed three pages.

24. Following suggestions from a number of participants on the wording that should be used in Document D1 concerning the voluntary nature of the process, the Chairperson indicated that since there was agreement on the voluntary nature of the process, it could be left to the Office to work on the language to be used.

25. A Government representative of Algeria reiterated his request to extend the length of the document that governments could provide to five pages.

26. The Director of the International Labour Standards Department said that for logistical reasons related in particular to translation, the Office was not able to satisfy this request.

III. Special Centenary arrangements

27. The Director of the International Labour Standards Department referred to the proposals in paragraphs 24 and 25 of the background note that the first session of the CAS be devoted to the Centenary celebration and explained the content of the curtain – raiser.

28. The Employer spokesperson agreed with the Office’s proposal. In relation to the key messages for the curtain – raiser, the Employers’ group expressed concern about the phrasing of the point concerning interaction according to which the CAS “adds political legitimacy to the more technical findings and technical assessments” of the Committee of Experts. The CAS made its own assessment of compliance while taking into account the Committee of Experts’ findings, as well as the submission made by governments, workers, and employers during the CAS. The Office should properly describe the role of the CAS in the “curtain – raiser”. Additional measures could be taken to celebrate the ILO Centenary, such as the exhibition of photographs and monitors outside the Governing Body room. In addition, the release of the special Centenary publication on the impact of the work of the Committee of Experts and the CAS during the CAS session should be considered.

29. The Worker spokesperson concurred with the Office’s proposals included in paragraph 24 of the background note and suggested to publish the visual curtain – raiser online. The speaker agreed with the Employers’ group that the point on interaction should be reformulated. It was not accurate that the role of the CAS was to add political legitimacy to the technical findings and assessments of independent experts. In relation to the Centenary ratification campaign, the speaker expressed hope that governments would be ambitious and go beyond the ratification of one Convention. Furthermore, Conventions identified as up to date by the Standards Review Mechanism (SRM) should be included in the ratification campaign. The Workers’ group requested the Office to provide more information on the high – level event on freedom of association and collective bargaining during the ILO Centenary, as well as on the scope, the purpose and the participation in the round table that would take place during the 2019 November–December sitting of the Committee of Experts.

30. Speaking on behalf of GRULAC, a Government representative of Brazil welcomed the proposal concerning the celebration of a round table during the 2019 sitting of the Committee of Experts with the participation of the Chairperson of the CAS. This would add the voice of governments to the event. In relation to the messages for the curtain – raiser, the point on interaction should be reformulated since the reference to the CAS as a mechanism to add political legitimacy was not accurate. With respect to the point on tripartism, the speaker indicated that tripartism was deficient at the CAS, considering that sometimes the CAS did not
take account of the voices of governments. The point on *the global conscience of social justice* adequately characterized the CAS as a parliamentary body.

31. **Speaking on behalf of the Western European Group, a Government representative of Greece** agreed with the Office’s proposals as well as with that of the Employers’ group to reproduce the curtain – raiser in different monitors. Her group concurred with the statements made by GRULAC and the Employers’ and Workers’ groups regarding the need of reformulating the point on interaction. While welcoming the participation of the Chairperson of the CAS in the round table that would take place during the 2019 sitting of the Committee of Experts, she echoed the request made to the Office of providing further information on this event.

32. **Speaking on behalf of the Africa group, a Government representative of Algeria** endorsed the programme planned for the Centenary celebration in the CAS and the key messages of the video. However, with regard to the message on tripartism, there was a contradiction between the tripartite nature of the CAS and the fact that only the Workers and the Employers played a role in the selection of individual cases. With regard to the round table organized for the next session of the Committee of Experts, the speaker sought confirmation that the President of the CAS would participate in that event.

33. **A Government representative of Uruguay** noted, with regard to the key messages of the curtain – raiser, that the CAS was “one” of the oldest global monitoring bodies. The message with regard to tripartism, as well as referring to the independence of workers’ and employers’ representatives, should also mention in a positive way the role of Government representatives.

34. **The Chairperson** took due note of the concerns expressed by the participants in relation to the need to revise the message on interaction of the curtain – raiser. He requested clarification from the Office on the other issues raised by the participants.

35. **The Director of the International Labour Standards Department** indicated, with regard to the ratification campaign, that the dashboard accessible online showed on a daily basis the progress made in the ratification of Conventions and that it did include the follow – up to the SRM decisions. The Director indicated that the publication of the curtain – raiser online and in monitors could be feasible. The Office would also look at the possibility of a photo exhibition. Nevertheless, the Office was not able to accommodate the request of launching the special Centenary publication on the impact of the work of the Committee of Experts in June 2019. With respect to the round table that would take place during the 2019 sitting of the Committee of Experts, the Office had still not received confirmation on the availability of all the participants. In relation to the high – level event that would take place during the ILO Centenary on freedom of association and collective bargaining, she indicated that it was still being discussed within the Governing Body and that the Office would inform the participants when the information became available. Finally, the Office would take due note of the request made by the participants in relation to the reformulation of the point on interaction of paragraph 25 of the background note.

**IV. Discussion of the General Survey**

36. **The Director of the International Labour Standards Department** explained that the Office’s proposal was to structure the discussion of General Surveys around a limited number of questions with a view to make the discussion more focused and outcome oriented. If the participants agreed with the proposal, it should be decided how and who would formulate the questions. The framing questions for the discussion could be addressed during the informal tripartite meeting.

37. **The Worker spokesperson** indicated that his group would continue to make efforts to reduce the opening statements in order to dedicate more time for the discussion of General Surveys. In
relation to the follow – up to these discussions, the Governing Body should continue to debate additional measures to ensure greater policy coherence. The speaker welcomed the possibility of organizing the discussions of the General Surveys on the basis of questions formulated in advance, for instance, during the informal tripartite meeting. The questions should help guide the discussion without limiting its scope. The opportunity to share good experiences should be maintained.

38. **The Employer spokesperson** welcomed the proposal of devoting more time to the discussion of General Surveys, but recalled that due to the already compressed timetable there was little latitude. The participation of experts during the discussion of General Surveys could be considered on an exceptional basis when the technical guidance was found useful and after consultation of the Officers of the CAS. They agreed to organize the discussion of the General Surveys on the basis of questions. These would help to keep the focus on key issues and come to structure outcomes. The questions should be determined in consultations with the Employers’ and Workers’ groups and the regional coordinators. Discussions on how to improve the General Surveys should also take place, in particular with regard to the possibility of including a simple recurrent structure for all General Surveys; using diagrams and tables to illustrate trends; and including more background information on the electronic version of the General Survey.

39. **Speaking on behalf of the Western European Group, a Government representative of Greece** concurred with the proposal of structuring the discussion of General Surveys around questions.

40. **Speaking on behalf of GRULAC, a Government representative of Brazil** indicated that the discussion of General Surveys should allow for a better understanding of the issues and better participation of all constituents. He concurred with the Employers’ group on the difficulty of allocating more time to the discussion of General Surveys. It was precisely for this reason that they had proposed to have preliminary discussions on the General surveys and the outcomes. The idea of structuring the discussion in advance would give constituents more time to reflect and allow for more targeted interventions in order to achieve meaningful conclusions. The speaker expressed concern that assessing the General Survey with a view to preparing the questions would probably be beyond the scope of the informal meeting. Other forms of consulting on this needed to be sought.

41. **Speaking on behalf of the Africa group, a Government representative of Algeria** expressed support for the proposals to allocate more time to the discussion of General Surveys and allowing experts to participate. Another proposal would be to study the feasibility of discussing the General Survey in another Conference committee, which would give greater importance to the resultant conclusions and recommendations.

42. **The Director of the International Labour Standards Department** noted the interest expressed by the participants on the proposal of structuring the discussions on the General Surveys around a set of questions. The Office would provide new proposals with regard to the modalities for framing these questions on which guidance would be sought. Concerning the proposal to create another forum during the ILC to discuss the General Surveys, this was not feasible due to the limited resources allocated to the functioning of the CAS.

V. **Preparation, adoption and follow – up of conclusions**

43. **The Director of the international Labour Standards Department** referred to the background note and indicated that the CAS had started to adopt conclusions in 1980. Conclusions had been prepared by the Chairperson of the CAS, in consultation with the Reporter and the Vice – Chairpersons. From 2012, there had been some years of turbulence, which had impacted the functioning of the CAS. However, an agreement between the Workers’ and the Employers’
groups had helped to overcome those turbulences and, as from 2015, conclusions had been prepared by the Vice – Chairpersons.

44. **The Employer spokesperson** indicated that while she had listened to the concerns expressed about the role of the Chairperson of the CAS, at the moment, she did not see value in the direct involvement of the Chairperson in the preparation of the conclusions. Conclusions could not be considered in isolation. They came at the end of an entire discussion (now provided in verbatim records), and were adopted with the fundamental objective to provide governments with a road map for action to work towards compliance. Rather than calling for a change in the role of the Chairperson, governments should consider other ways of increasing their participation. The possibility for governments to make submissions on a voluntary basis prior to the beginning of the CAS was an opportunity to influence the discussion. Moreover, submissions that focused on technical (rather than political) aspects of the case would be a way for governments to make suggestions on a possible road map that would be reflected in the conclusions. The process was transparent and governments could influence the debate. The Employers’ group remained open to discussion. Nevertheless, there was also a need to take into account the practical realities in the CAS and the need to draft short, concise and clear conclusions.

45. **The Worker spokesperson** expressed complete agreement with the Employer spokesperson’s views. Governments had an adequate role and their effective participation was critical for the development of conclusions. This role started with adequate reporting to the Committee of Experts. Governments had the possibility to submit written information after the publication of the preliminary list of cases, and they were allocated speaking time at the beginning and at the end of the discussions. Conclusions were based on those submissions. The current way of working was based on a consensus which had been difficult to reach. Both Governments’ and the Workers’ group had considered it extremely unhelpful that divergences had appeared in the past in the conclusions themselves, as the objective of the conclusions was to give clear directions to governments. In 2014, no consensus had been reached on how to deal with such divergences and therefore no conclusions had been adopted except for double – footnoted cases. Since 2015, under the current way of working, the Employer and Worker members had developed conclusions based on consensus for every single case that had been discussed. The Workers’ group remained open to discussion but reiterated that there were already a lot of opportunities for governments to make contributions, which would help in reaching agreement on consensual conclusions.

46. **Speaking on behalf of the Africa group, a Government representative of Algeria** underscored the importance of giving the President of the CAS a more specific role in the preparation of the conclusions in order to consolidate tripartite consensus and, thereby, the supervisory system. It was regrettable that the conclusions did not reflect all of the views expressed. The involvement of the President would make it possible to represent the perspectives of the governments concerned. Besides, fairness required that the government should be informed of the conclusions before they were pronounced and given the opportunity to express itself before they were formally adopted.

47. **On behalf of the Western European Group, a Government representative of Greece** welcomed the willingness of the social partners to continue being engaged in the discussion.

48. **Speaking on behalf of GRULAC, a Government representative of Brazil** considered that the CAS was an important tripartite body that lay at the heart of the ILO supervisory system. However, when it came to drafting conclusions, that Committee was not tripartite, i.e. only employers and workers were involved in the process. This raised a legitimacy problem. While the Chairperson of the CAS had held an important role in the past, it was not suggested that the Chairperson would be responsible for the drafting of conclusions. The Vice – Chairpersons would continue to have a final say but they would consult with and listen to the views expressed by the Chairperson. While recognizing the high level of technical and legal expertise of workers and employers, the Chairperson was also in a position to assess the proposed conclusions from
a Government perspective. Governments’ involvement through the consultation of the Chairperson, would give the conclusions a higher degree of legitimacy. It was therefore regrettable that the proposal had not gained the support of the social partners for the moment. In 2018, GRULAC objected to the working methods of the CAS. More significant steps had to be taken to achieve progress, which was why the proposal on the role of the Chairperson had been made. These concerns would be alleviated if, after being presented with the conclusions, governments could take the floor immediately before the adoption of the conclusion. Government participation was crucial not only for the preparation of the conclusions, but also for their implementation. If governments did not recognize true tripartite legitimacy in the conclusions, their implementation would become difficult. The consultation of the Chairperson in the drafting of the conclusions, which he emphasized remained the role of the Vice – Chairpersons, and the possibility for the government concerned to respond immediately after the presentation of the proposed conclusions was essential for the governments. This was in line with parliamentary practice. The concerned government should be made aware of the conclusions with reasonable anticipation with a view to be in a position to inform its relevant authorities of the conclusions. This could be done through the organization of a preliminary informal session with the concerned government.

49. A Government representative of Lebanon speaking on behalf of ASPAG fully supported the points raised by GRULAC and the Africa group.

50. Speaking on behalf of the Eastern European Group, a Government representative of Poland indicated that it was important to continue the discussion.

51. A Government representative of Uruguay, while appreciating the comments of the social partners, emphasized that, without questioning the legitimacy of the CAS, it was important to retain some flexibility in the process of preparing the conclusions and to recognize the consultative role of the Chairperson of the CAS.

52. The Employer spokesperson recalled that the Chairperson and the government whose case was under discussion were not prevented from sharing their views with the Vice – Chairpersons. The verbatim record would reflect all the statements made and give visibility to the views expressed. Every aspect of the government’s view could not be reflected in the conclusions, in view of their short and concise nature. Where there was no consensus, the government might not appreciate the discussion or be in agreement with all the elements of the conclusions. When a court rendered a decision, although it was understood that the CAS was not a court, it would hear all the arguments of the parties involved, come to a decision and communicate that decision. The possibility for governments to intervene before the adoption of the conclusions would raise the question of whether the Employer and Worker members should be offered an opportunity to take the floor again. This would be a duplication of the process. Equal opportunities should be given to all parties without any privileges. Governments had the opportunity to make any submission they wished to make. If a government were to take the floor in advance of the presentation of the conclusions and express disagreement with certain aspects of the conclusions, that would be a departure from past practice and would also appear to be a direct challenge to the legitimacy of those conclusions. Furthermore, the opportunity to provide the conclusions in advance had to be thought through carefully. The CAS did not foresee a right of “rebuttal” and governments were not requested to provide an immediate response to the conclusions during the discussion. Any additional concern could be provided by the governments in their reports to the supervisory system. The right of all parties to feel heard should be thought about with an open mind. However, the functionality and integrity of the CAS should also be considered, and no decisions should be taken that undermined its legitimacy.

53. The Worker spokesperson explained that certain elements provided by the Government might not be reflected in the conclusions because there was an absence of consensus between workers and employers on certain issues. There was also not necessarily common agreement on something brought to the attention of the Officers by the government or the Chairperson. Giving
the governments the opportunity to respond to proposed conclusions that were not yet adopted would raise a number of questions related to the status of that response, the risk of duplicating the process and the difficulty in bringing the discussion to an end. Another point was that if governments were to be invited to take the floor before the adoption of the conclusions, should the Employers’ or the Workers’ groups or the Employer or Worker members of the member States also be invited to restate their views? All the possibilities that such changes implied should be considered. Governments should take advantage of all the existing opportunities at their disposal to raise issues in their responses during the discussions with a view to help the CAS to elaborate strong conclusions.

54. **Speaking on behalf of GRULAC, a Government representative of Brazil** indicated that there was a difference of perspective as regards the nature of the CAS. Although the Committee had been compared to a legal court – like body, it was rather a parliamentary body. Therefore parliamentary procedures should apply. When the conclusions were adopted by the Committee, there should be careful consideration and discussion by all parties of the text proposed, in accordance with parliamentary procedures. With regard to the provision of the conclusions in advance, even in a legal court – like procedure, there was clearly no obligation to take the floor again. However, from a diplomatic procedure, it would be relevant for governments to be in a position to provide a structured, meaningful response. His group considered that this could be realized through a one – day advance notice of the text of the proposed conclusions. The speaker asked that this issue be raised again at the next meeting and requested the Office to provide more information on the history of the procedure of the adoption of the conclusions.

55. **Speaking on behalf of the Africa group, a Government representative of Algeria** emphasized that the same questions had been raised at several meetings and that each side was maintaining its position. It was necessary to assess the action taken and the changes needed for there to be tripartism at all levels and in order to ensure that the process was transparent and fair.

56. **The Chairperson** noted that there was consensus for further engagement in the process. There was a need for more background information in terms of how the process had been handled in the past and the Office could be requested to provide the next meeting with a historical perspective on the evolving role of the Chairperson. It was also important to consider other implications of the proposed amendments to the process. It came out of the discussion that governments should take into consideration the need for more technical interventions with a view to providing solid arguments to the social partners in the drafting of the conclusions. Both the Chairperson and the member State concerned were not prevented from engaging with the Vice – Chairpersons to ensure that their views were reflected in the conclusions. The proposal to make the conclusions available to the government in advance raised questions that had to be considered further. The central point remained that the work of the Committee should not be undermined.

57. **Speaking on behalf of GRULAC, a Government representative of Brazil** recalled that the Chairperson of the CAS had an important role and prerogative as provided for in the Standing Orders of the Conference.
Appendix 2

Written information provided to the Conference by countries on the long list

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Countries</th>
<th>Convention</th>
<th>Reception date</th>
<th>No. of pages</th>
<th>No. of words</th>
<th>Duplication of information</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Egypt</td>
<td>C87</td>
<td>23 May 2019</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>790</td>
<td>NO</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>India</td>
<td>C81</td>
<td>24 May 2019</td>
<td>17 (including 13 pages of annexes)</td>
<td>1765</td>
<td>NO</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Colombia</td>
<td>C29</td>
<td>24 May 2019</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>2836</td>
<td>NO</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Argentina</td>
<td>C87</td>
<td>27 May 2019</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>1501</td>
<td>NO</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fiji</td>
<td>C87</td>
<td>27 May 2019</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>807</td>
<td>NO</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Malawi</td>
<td>C29</td>
<td>27 May 2019</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1010</td>
<td>NO</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ethiopia</td>
<td>C138</td>
<td>27 May 2019</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>1925</td>
<td>NO</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Guatemala</td>
<td>C169</td>
<td>27 May 2019</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>2051</td>
<td>NO</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Philippines</td>
<td>C87</td>
<td>27 May 2019</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>5588</td>
<td>Partially</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Honduras</td>
<td>C87</td>
<td>28 May 2019 *</td>
<td>13 (including 3 pages of annexes)</td>
<td>3304</td>
<td>NO</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kazakhstan</td>
<td>C87</td>
<td>28 May 2019 *</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>528</td>
<td>Partially</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Algeria</td>
<td>C87</td>
<td>28 May 2019 *</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1326</td>
<td>NO</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Belarus</td>
<td>C29</td>
<td>29 May 2019 *</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>2610</td>
<td>Substantially</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Brazil</td>
<td>C98</td>
<td>4 June 2019 *</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>1471</td>
<td>Substantially</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nicaragua</td>
<td>C117</td>
<td>7 June 2019 *</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>701</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* Information provided after the deadline of 27 May 2019.
Appendix 3

Adoption of the final list of individual cases by the Committee

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Conference dates</th>
<th>Date and sitting on which the list was adopted</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2000: 30 May – 15 June</td>
<td>2 June morning (5th sitting)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2001: 5 – 21 June</td>
<td>7 June morning (4th sitting)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2002: 3 – 20 June</td>
<td>6 June morning (4th sitting)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2003: 3 – 19 June</td>
<td>5 June morning (4th sitting)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2004: 1 – 17 June</td>
<td>3 June morning (4th sitting)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2005: 31 May – 16 June</td>
<td>1 June afternoon (4th sitting)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2006: 31 May – 16 June</td>
<td>1st June morning – list of 22 countries (2nd sitting)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>5 June afternoon – full list (8th sitting)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2007: 30 May – 15 June</td>
<td>31 May (2nd sitting)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2008: 28 May – 13 June</td>
<td>Provisional: 2nd sitting (29 May)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(only double – footnoted countries)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Definitive: 6th sitting (31 May)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2009: 3 – 18 June</td>
<td>4 June après – midi (3th sitting)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2010: 2 – 17 June</td>
<td>Provisional: 2nd sitting (3 June)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(only double – footnoted countries)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Definitive: 5th sitting (5 June)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2011: 1 – 16 June</td>
<td>Provisional: 2nd sitting (2 June)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(only double – footnoted countries)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Definitive: 7th sitting (6 June)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2012: 30 May – 14 June</td>
<td>No list adopted</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2013: 5 – 20 June</td>
<td>6 June afternoon (2nd sitting)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2014: 28 May – 12 June</td>
<td>28 May afternoon (2nd sitting)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2015: 1 – 12 June</td>
<td>2 June morning (2nd sitting)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2016: 30 May – 10 June</td>
<td>31 May morning (2nd sitting)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2017: 5 – 16 June</td>
<td>6 June morning (2nd sitting)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2018: 28 May – 8 June</td>
<td>29 May morning (2nd sitting)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2019: 10 – 21 June</td>
<td>11 June morning (2nd sitting)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Appendix 4

Publication date of the long list of individual cases

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Conference dates</th>
<th>Communication/publication of the long list *</th>
<th>Days before the opening of the Conference</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>31 May – 16 June 2006</td>
<td>22 May 2006</td>
<td>9 days</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>30 May – 15 June 2007</td>
<td>15 May 2007</td>
<td>15 days</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>28 May – 13 June 2008</td>
<td>12 May 2008</td>
<td>16 days</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3 – 18 June 2009</td>
<td>12 May 2009</td>
<td>22 days</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2 – 17 June 2010</td>
<td>12 May 2010</td>
<td>21 days</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1 – 16 June 2011</td>
<td>11 May 2011</td>
<td>21 days</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>30 May – 14 June 2012</td>
<td>8 May 2012</td>
<td>22 days</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5 – 20 June 2013</td>
<td>13 May 2013</td>
<td>23 days</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>28 May – 12 June 2014</td>
<td>7 May 2014</td>
<td>21 days</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1 – 12 June 2015</td>
<td>30 April 2015</td>
<td>32 days</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>30 May – 10 June 2016</td>
<td>29 April 2016</td>
<td>31 days</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5 – 16 June 2017</td>
<td>5 May 2017</td>
<td>31 days</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>28 May – 8 June 2018</td>
<td>27 April 2018</td>
<td>31 days</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10 – 21 June 2019</td>
<td>10 May 2019</td>
<td>31 days</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* Since 2017, publication on the Webpage of the CAS at the same date.
## Appendix 5

### Improvements introduced by the Committee on the basis of the recommendations of the Working Group on the Working Methods of the CAS (2006–19)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Date</th>
<th>Improvements proposed and adopted</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| November 2006  | - Release of the preliminary list 15 day before the opening of the Conference.  
                  - Advance elective registration of Governments on the final list to Friday noon. |
| March 2007     | - Non interactive information session by the Worker and Employer Spokespersons after the adoption of the list.  
                  - Conclusions adopted in a reasonable timeframe after the discussion of the case. |
| March 2008     | - Discussion of a case maintained although the country is not present.  
                  - Additional language on respect of rules of decorum and on the role of the Chairperson included in Document D.1.  
                  - Documents D.0 and D.1 sent with the preliminary list. |
| March 2010     | - Limits on speaking time during the discussion of individual cases strictly enforced and included in Document D.1.  
                  - Installation of a time management equipment in the room.  
                  - Automatic registration of countries for the discussion of individual cases (using the French alphabetic order and beginning with the group of double footnoted cases). |
| March 2011     | - Modalities for selecting the starting letter of the alphabet for the automatic registration of countries for the discussion of individual cases. |
| March 2015     | - Long list of cases available no less than 30 days before the opening of the Conference.  
                  - Final list agreed upon by Workers and Employers spokespersons on the Friday before the opening of the session, submitted to groups on the first day, and adopted at the second sitting of the CAS.  
                  - Conclusions of individual cases adopted at dedicated sittings.  
                  - Adoption of time management improvements. |
| March 2016     | - List of speakers visible on the screen.  
                  - Early registration of speakers encouraged.  
                  - Reduced speaking times when there is a very long list of speakers.  
                  - Draft minutes of the discussion of individual cases reproduced in patchwork and available on line.  
                  - Electronic transmission of amendments.  
                  - Three dedicated sittings for the adoption of conclusions. |
| March 2017     | - Adoption of Part II of the CAS Report in patchwork and publication in the three languages 10 days following its adoption.  
                  - Publication of a document on the follow-up to the CAS conclusions on the dedicated Web page of the CAS. |
| November 2017  | - Conclusions on individual cases visible on a screen while being read by the Chairperson.  
                  - Hard copy of the conclusions given to the Government concerned.  
                  - Government concerned has the right to take the floor immediately after the adoption of the conclusions. |
| March 2018     | - Agreement to reduce the time allocated to opening items to permit additional time for the discussion of the General Survey. |
| March 2019     | - Production of parts of the CAS report as a verbatim record.  
                  - Restructuration of the content of Parts I and II of the CAS report.  
                  - Adoption of Part II of the report by the CAS and the ILC plenary in patchwork form and publication in three languages 30 days following its adoption.  
                  - Enhanced use of D Documents for Governments in the long list. |