



Governing Body

317th Session, Geneva, 6–28 March 2013

GB.317/WP/GBC/1

Working Party on the Functioning of the Governing Body and the
International Labour Conference

WP/GBC

Date: 5 March 2013
Original: English

FIRST ITEM ON THE AGENDA

Improving the functioning of the International Labour Conference

Context

1. In November 2012, the Governing Body, upon its review of the report of the Working Party, accepted the proposed timetable for the ILC reform, as reproduced in Appendix VI and requested the Office to: (a) submit to the Governing Body at its 317th Session (March 2013) a detailed plan for the implementation of the 102nd Session (June 2013) of the Conference, on a trial basis, of those options on which a consensus has been reached in the Working Party, together with an assessment of the cost and legal implications of those proposals; and (b) to prepare a background document and organize informal consultations on further measures to be submitted to the Working Party in March 2013.¹ A tentative plan of work for the June 2013 session, which takes into account the proposed trials, is appended (see Appendix VII).
2. Informal consultations were held on 26 February 2013. As a basis for discussions, the tripartite consultative group² had before it a background paper prepared by the Office, which is included in this document. It presents, in tabular form (table 1), an overview of all issues discussed so far in the Working Party. For ease of reference, each issue is listed separately within the framework of the three following categories: A. General issues; B. ILC structure (including the plenary and agenda setting process); and C. Working methods of ILC committees (also incorporating efficiency gains and other measures). This table also indicates: (1) the issues on which a tripartite agreement has been reached; (2) the suggestions which have received some support but on which no final decision has been taken; and (3) the proposals which require further discussion, either because the Office has been requested to provide further information or because diverging views have been expressed.

¹ GB.316/PV/Draft, para. 265.

² GB.313/PV, para. 188. The tripartite consultative group is composed of the regional coordinators and the Employers' and Workers' secretariats as set out in the introductory note to the Governing Body Standing Orders (para. 19).

3. A second table (table 2) refers to the issues identified in table 1 as requiring change to the ILC Standing Orders, and lists the Standing Orders' provisions that may be affected by the current proposals. Appendices I, II, III, IV and V provide further information on several issues mentioned in table 1 on which the Office has been requested to elaborate new proposals or scenarios. These appendices refer, respectively, to the ILC structure (B.1 and B.2), voting in plenary (B.14.5), the workplans (C.6) and the drafting groups (C.8) of general discussion committees.
4. Table 1 has been amended to reflect adjustments made as a result of the informal tripartite consultations and to provide the source of some proposals and comments.
5. Further to the decision adopted by the Governing Body at its 316th Session (November 2012), table 1 also identifies those issues already agreed for trial in June 2013, and others that, subject to agreement, could also be trialled in June 2013. A number of issues, concerning, inter alia, the printing policy (C.15), the *Provisional Record* (C.16), the working methods of the general discussion committee (C.6 and C8) could be further explored by the Working Party with a view to be trialled in June 2013.

Draft decision

6. *The Working Party, having analysed the information provided by the Office on the cost and legal implications of the proposed reforms, recommends that the Governing Body:*
 - (a) *authorize the Office to implement in June 2013, on a trial basis, those options on which a tripartite consensus has been reached and for which amendments to Standing Orders of the Conference are not needed; and*
 - (b) *request the Office to prepare for its 319th Session (October 2013):*
 - (i) *a detailed analysis of the trial implementation of those reforms together with new proposals taking into account the lessons learned from this first experience; and*
 - (ii) *a first set of proposed amendments to the Conference Standing Orders on issues identified as reaching tripartite consensus but requiring for their implementation amendments to the Standing Orders at the 103rd Session of the International Labour Conference (2014).*

Table 1. Issues discussed so far

Ref.	Proposal/request	Received tripartite support/received some support/requires further discussion	Trial at 2013 ILC	Requires change to ILC Standing Orders (for details see table 2)	Requires cost analysis	Comments
A.	General issues					
A.1.	<p><i>The guiding principles of the reform process are:</i></p> <p>(i) The reform process should be inclusive, comprehensive, constituent-led and consensus driven.</p> <p>(ii) The final reform process will be finalized once all aspects are agreed, even though some measures, on which a tripartite has been reached, could be trialled at the 2013 and 2014 sessions of the ILC.</p> <p>(iii) The final reform process will be finalized by June 2015.</p> <p>(iv) Recommendations should be made within the constitutional framework.</p> <p>(v) Amendments should be made to the ILC Standing Orders as appropriate.</p> <p>It was also agreed that the issue of the review of the functioning of Regional Meetings should be held over until the review of the ILC is completed.</p>	Received tripartite support	n.a.	n.a.	<p>It was also noted that:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ■ the results will depend on the capacity of the three groups to respond to the changing environment and on their flexibility to achieve consensus (G: Africa group); ■ resources should be directed at priorities; ■ initial reforms could pave the way for further, more ambitious reform (G: Africa and IMEC groups); ■ the findings of the informal tripartite working group on the working methods of the Conference Committee on the Application of Standards should at some stage be fed into this reform process (see GB.316/INS/12, para. 2). 	

Ref.	Proposal/request	Received tripartite support/received some support/requires further discussion	Trial at 2013 ILC	Requires change to ILC Standing Orders (for details see table 2)	Requires cost analysis	Comments
A.2.	<p><i>The objectives of the reform process are:</i></p> <p>(i) to strengthen the ILC as the supreme policy-making organ of the ILO;</p> <p>(ii) maintain the five functions of the ILC (constitutional, political, technical, forum and assembly); and</p> <p>(iii) enable the ILC to meet the needs of constituents and the international community.</p>	Received tripartite support	n.a.	n.a.	n.a.	<p>Additional objectives were stressed, such as:</p> <p>(i) increase the efficiency of the working methods of the ILC and its transparency, predictability and objectivity;</p> <p>(ii) increase the visibility and capacity of the ILC to play a meaningful and constructive role by discussing relevant and contemporary issues that were important to the world of work (G: GASPAC) (see GB.316/INS/12, para. 2).</p>
B.	ILC structure					
B.1.	<p><i>Duration</i></p> <p>The duration of the ILC shall be determined by the time required necessary for the ILC to meet its constitutional functions.</p> <p>The Office was requested to prepare a potential workplan to indicate how a two-week session could be structured.</p>	Requires further discussion	No	No		<p>Some argued that the current length of the ILC was affecting the participation (G: ASPAG and Switzerland; the Employers' group).</p> <p>A potential workplan to indicate how a two-week ILC may be structured can be found in Appendix I.</p>

Ref.	Proposal/request	Received tripartite support/received some support/requires further discussion	Trial at 2013 ILC	Requires change to ILC Standing Orders (for details see table 2)	Requires cost analysis	Comments
B.2.	<p><i>Structure</i></p> <p>The structure of the ILC should remain consistent across sessions.</p> <p>The Office was requested to undertake a legal assessment of the Conference committees including their mandates, functioning and outcomes (see Appendix II) (GASPAC).</p>	Received tripartite support	No	No	n.a.	It was recalled in that respect that the standing committees, as provided for by the Standing Orders, are the following: Selection Committee, Credentials Committee, Conference Drafting Committee, Committee on the Application of Conventions and Recommendations, Finance Committee and Resolutions Committee. The other "technical committees" are divided into categories: standard-setting, general discussion and recurrent discussion committees.
B.3.	<p><i>Side events</i></p> <p>The number of side events should be kept to a minimum.</p>	Received tripartite support	Yes	n.a.	n.a.	Formal side events should be approved by the Director-General in consultation with the Officers of the Governing Body.

Ref.	Proposal/request	Received tripartite support/received some support/requires further discussion	Trial at 2013 ILC	Requires change to ILC Standing Orders (for details see table 2)	Requires cost analysis	Comments
B.4.	<p><i>Informal knowledge sharing and Office briefing sessions</i></p> <p>To fulfil the assembly function of the ILC as well as recognizing the unique opportunity of the tripartite event, the Office was requested to arrange greater opportunities for knowledge sharing and networking among delegates.</p>	Requires further discussion	n.a.	n.a.	n.a.	<p>(GB.316/INS/12, para. 5)</p> <p>There was some interest in the proposal that the Office could arrange 1–1.5 hour informal briefing sessions during the lunch breaks of the second week of the ILC. It was suggested that these informal sessions could:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> – be facilitated by an ILO expert from the Office with predominantly a Q&A format among those present; – be based on a different subject matter; – be held in a small meeting room to ensure a low cost and reflect the informal nature of the sessions. <p>(GASPAC)</p> <p>Strong preference was however expressed for the option of presentations made, according to the demand, to the morning group meetings.</p>
B.5.	<p><i>Resolutions Committee</i></p> <p>There is broad consensus that the Resolutions Committee as provided for in the Standing Orders should not be reactivated under a reformed ILC.</p> <p>Standing Orders of the ILC should however provide clear rules on how to handle proposed resolutions not related to the items on the agenda (GB.316/INS/12).</p>	Received tripartite support	n.a.	Yes (article 17 in pertinent parts and possibly articles 4 and 55)	n.a.	<p>Questions were raised about the format/composition of the Selection Committee. An assessment of the committees (see above B.2 <i>Structure</i>, and Appendix II) should enable the Working Party to decide whether the Selection Committee is the appropriate forum to discuss draft resolutions not related to items on the agenda.</p>

Ref.	Proposal/request	Received tripartite support/received some support/requires further discussion	Trial at 2013 ILC	Requires change to ILC Standing Orders (for details see table 2)	Requires cost analysis	Comments
B.6.	<p><i>Standard-setting activities</i></p> <p>It was acknowledged that the development and supervision of international labour standards was a prime function of the Conference. It was also recognized that the double-discussion procedure over two consecutive sessions of the Conference should remain the norm when setting standards. The single-discussion procedure could only be envisaged exceptionally, e.g. following a recurrent discussion or a tripartite preparatory technical meeting.</p> <p>The added value of those tripartite meetings as part of the preparatory process of standard-setting activities was underlined and the Office was requested to provide a cost analysis of those meetings (see under comments) (Employers' group).</p>	Received tripartite support	n.a.	n.a.	Yes, see GB.316/INS/14/4	<p>The document GB.316/INS/14/4 provides cost estimates for a tripartite Meeting of Experts on Forced Labour and Trafficking for Labour Exploitation, organized with a view to prepare a possible standard-setting discussion in 2014.</p> <p>In that respect, it should be noted that the total cost of a meeting of experts of five calendar days, composed of eight representatives of each group, with interpretation services in English, French and Spanish, is approximately US\$302,000.</p> <p>This budget is based on the assumption that the meeting takes place in the ILO HQ in Geneva and does not take into account the costs related to the preparation and processing of the pre-session and in-session documents.</p>
B.7.	<p><i>Agenda-setting function</i></p> <p>It was recalled that the Governing Body is responsible for setting the ILC agenda. In that respect, the Governing Body had the authority to determine the number and nature of the items. The Conference can also decide to include an item on the agenda of its following session.</p> <p>The agenda of the Conference is composed of two parts dealing respectively with the standing items and with the technical (ad hoc) items.</p>	Received tripartite support	n.a.	n.a.		

Ref.	Proposal/request	Received tripartite support/received some support/requires further discussion	Trial at 2013 ILC	Requires change to ILC Standing Orders (for details see table 2)	Requires cost analysis	Comments
B.8.	<p><i>Agenda-setting process</i></p> <p>Agreement was expressed that the agenda should meet constituents' needs and address topical and relevant issues.</p> <p>It was also noted in that respect that the timing of final decisions on the agenda needed to take into account not only the advantages of addressing issues of importance, but also the need for adequate preparation time.</p> <p>A proposal was also made to keep a slot open until the June session of the Governing Body to allow for an item to be selected on the basis of the work of a technical committee or for a topical issue requiring urgent examination at the next session of the Conference.</p>	<p>Received tripartite support</p> <p>Received tripartite support</p> <p>Received some support</p>	n.a.	n.a.	n.a.	Informal consultations on the agenda-setting process were held in September 2012 and February 2013.
B.9.	<p><i>Proposed agenda items</i></p> <p>The Office is responsible for submitting the Governing Body proposals for ILC agenda items, coming from the following sources:</p> <p>(i) governments and recognized representative employers' and workers' organizations;</p> <p>(ii) outcomes of recurrent/general discussions (resolutions, conclusions);</p> <p>(iii) outcomes of ILO tripartite or other meetings (Regional Meetings, sectoral meetings, meetings of experts);</p> <p>(iv) other work performed by the Office.</p>	Received tripartite support	No	No	n.a.	

Ref.	Proposal/request	Received tripartite support/received some support/requires further discussion	Trial at 2013 ILC	Requires change to ILC Standing Orders (for details see table 2)	Requires cost analysis	Comments
B.10.	<p><i>Technical items</i></p> <p>While the recent practice has been to establish committees to discuss ad hoc items, it was recalled that: (a) there is no predetermined number of items; (b) the selection of an item does not necessarily imply the creation of a new Conference committee; (c) some items could also be discussed by the plenary.</p>	Requires further discussion	No	n.a.	n.a.	Concerning the option to discuss some items in plenary, it was argued that technical items required special expertise and that it was important to maintain the value of the work of the technical committees (Workers' group, GB.316/INS/12, para.10).
B.11.	<p><i>Standard-setting items</i></p> <p>The number and type of discussions required for standard setting shall be determined by the Governing Body at the time at which the item is placed on the ILC agenda, and considered on a case-by-case basis. Options that will be considered include:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> – double discussion over two ILCs; – single discussion at one ILC; – general/recurrent discussions prior to a single or double discussion; – preparatory technical meeting prior to the first discussion; and – a preparatory conference prior to a single discussion. 	Requires further discussion	No	Not at this stage		<p>It was felt that the standards review mechanism (SRM), once implemented, could be influential in recommending the most effective approach to the drafting of consolidated or new standards or revising existing standards stemming from the reviews.</p> <p>It was underlined in that respect that should a more flexible approach be retained for standard-setting activities (i.e. preparatory meetings, or general discussion used to prepare a standard-setting discussion), the time frames provided by articles 38 and 39 of the Standing Orders in relation to the dissemination of the various reports might need to be revised, subject to article 14(2) of the Constitution (“... ensure thorough technical preparation and adequate consultation ...”).</p>

Ref.	Proposal/request	Received tripartite support/received some support/requires further discussion	Trial at 2013 ILC	Requires change to ILC Standing Orders (for details see table 2)	Requires cost analysis	Comments
B.12.	<p><i>Recurrent discussions</i></p> <p>Since the adoption of the 2008 ILO Declaration on Social Justice for a Fair Globalization, the Governing Body has included a recurrent discussion each year as one technical item on the agenda since 2010. It decided that, pending a review of the first cycle, the discussion of recurrent items would follow a seven-year cycle, with employment, fundamental principles and rights at work and social protection being discussed twice in each cycle, and social dialogue once.</p> <p>It was agreed that better use should be made of these discussions to improve the agenda-setting process. It was, however, also recognized that a recurrent discussion need not automatically lead to a standard-setting discussion.</p>	Received tripartite support	n.a.	n.a.	n.a.	

Ref.	Proposal/request	Received tripartite support/received some support/requires further discussion	Trial at 2013 ILC	Requires change to ILC Standing Orders (for details see table 2)	Requires cost analysis	Comments
B.13.	<p><i>Discussions were held on the proposed major steps of a revised agenda-setting process, as follows:</i></p> <p>(i) the Office develops a short list of proposals coming from the abovementioned sources that can be presented in broad lines and in general terms;</p> <p>(ii) the Office consults the tripartite Geneva-based tripartite consultative group on the shortlist of proposals prior to the applicable session of the Governing Body;</p> <p>(iii) the Office submits to the Governing Body for decision the preferential list of proposals (refined as necessary based on the consultations);</p> <p>(iv) the Governing Body decides the number of proposals to be placed on the agenda; and</p> <p>(v) the Governing Body discusses the shortlist of proposals and considers at two consecutive sessions which ones to include on the agenda.</p>	Requires further discussion	n.a.	Not at this stage		
B.14.	<p><i>Plenary structure</i></p> <p>The plenary should be divided into four broad sections:</p> <p>I. Opening sitting.</p> <p>II. Continuous plenary session for the discussion of the reports of the Director-General and Chairperson of the Governing Body.</p> <p>III. The World of Work Summit.</p> <p>IV. Formal plenary (adopt reports, votes).</p>	Received tripartite support	Yes	No		This proposal essentially formalizes the current process with the addition of the World of Work Summit.

Ref.	Proposal/request	Received tripartite support/received some support/requires further discussion	Trial at 2013 ILC	Requires change to ILC Standing Orders (for details see table 2)	Requires cost analysis	Comments
B.14.1.	<p><i>Opening session</i></p> <p>The opening session of the plenary should be shortened and simplified to allow the committees to start their work immediately after.</p> <p>The procedure of appointing members of the Selection Committee and the officers of the groups can be simplified by displaying the nominations on a big screen and distributing a document containing the proposed nominations.</p>	Received tripartite support	Yes, but still with an extra sitting for the suspension of SO provisions.	Yes (article 76), to avoid extra sitting for the suspension of SO provisions	n.a.	<p>It was felt that, if the option of one keynote speaker was retained, the most appropriate person would be the Director-General (IMEC group).</p> <p>Some also suggested that this opening sitting could offer to the Chairperson of the Governing Body the opportunity to introduce his/her report to the ILC (Government and Employers' groups, GB.316/INS/12 para. 7).</p> <p>Another proposal was that the Officers of the Governing Body address the Conference at its opening sitting but that the report of the GB Chairperson be distributed to the Conference without introduction (Workers' group, GB.316/INS/12, para. 8).</p> <p>The implementation of this procedure implies however the observance of very strict deadlines for the submission of the nominations to the Clerk's Office.</p>
B.14.2.	<p><i>Plenary period II</i></p> <p>The delegates' right to address the Conference was underlined.</p> <p>Consensus was reached on the need to make the plenary more interactive.</p> <p>In that respect, the following options were discussed:</p>	Received tripartite support	n.a.	n.a.		

Ref.	Proposal/request	Received tripartite support/received some support/requires further discussion	Trial at 2013 ILC	Requires change to ILC Standing Orders (for details see table 2)	Requires cost analysis	Comments
	<p><i>Option 1: Discussion of the Reports of the Director-General and the Chairperson of the Governing Body</i></p> <p>The Director-General's Report should at each session address a social theme. The report of the Chairperson of the Governing Body should cover the programme implementation aspect. Plenary period II would run in parallel with the committees' meetings and the delegates would each have five minutes to address the ILC on the topic of these reports.</p>	Received tripartite support	Yes	Yes, for 2014 (article 12(2))		<p>In relation to <i>option 1</i>, this is the status quo with the one change being the clarification on the subject of the Director-General's and the Chairperson of the Governing Body's Reports. Modalities for the Director-General to address the Conference other than through a written report could also be explored (IMEC group).</p> <p>A suggestion was made to reduce the current time limit (five minutes), noting that in some other agencies the time limit for interventions was as short as two minutes, but this proposal was not retained.</p>
	<p><i>Option 2: Short thematic debates on issues covered by Reports of the Director-General and Governing Body Chairperson</i></p> <p>The Reports of the Director-General and Governing Body Chairperson could be discussed through a number of interactive thematic discussions based on specific issues discussed in the Reports. This would encourage a "real debate" and allow delegates in their own capacity to address the ILC. Such debates would be moderated by an ILO expert.</p>	Requires further discussion	No	Yes (articles 12(3), 13(2), 14(2), (3) and (6) of SO)		<p><i>Option 2</i> would be a good way to ensure the discussion of the Reports of the Director-General and the Governing Body Chairperson are interactive. However, it could become logistically difficult for the Office to arrange. It may also take delegates some time to become accustomed to it and would rely on them wanting to take part. Even if it has not so forth obtained much support, another option is having one day/session prior to plenary period III dedicated to delegates to speak on additional international labour issues of their choosing.</p>

Ref.	Proposal/request	Received tripartite support/received some support/requires further discussion	Trial at 2013 ILC	Requires change to ILC Standing Orders (for details see table 2)	Requires cost analysis	Comments
	<p><i>Option 3: Address one agenda item in plenary through three-day discussion</i></p> <p>This would take the place of a general discussion and would provide delegates in their individual capacity to address the ILC. Debate would focus on a report drafted by the Office. The discussion would be summarized in a committee-style report. A drafting group would discuss and finalize the outcome/output text (a draft set of conclusions or a resolution) at the completion of the debate and present it to the plenary during plenary period IV.</p>	Requires further discussion	No	No		<p><i>Option 3</i>, which has received some support, could be explored further. The three-day discussion could be held in the second week, with drafting group on the Saturday, and take the place of a general discussion (Africa group, Nordic countries).</p> <p>As indicated in the comments under B.10, concerns were also raised concerning this option (GRULAC, Workers' and Employers' groups, GB.316/INS/12, paras 7 and 8).</p>
B.14.3.	<p><i>World of Work Summit</i></p> <p>The one-day World of Work Summit will be scheduled following the work of the technical committees. The Director-General will select the theme for the event. The Summit would be representative of the tripartite nature of the Organization and would involve the participation not only of Heads of State and Government, but also of leaders of employers' and workers' organizations. Appropriate representation across regions should be ensured. This Summit would help give the ILC the appropriate profile within the international community.</p>	Received tripartite support for trial	Yes	Yes (potentially article 12(3), article 14(2) and (6) and article 16)		<p>The purpose of the trial would be to determine the feasibility of facilitating high-level involvement in the ILC in one day. The suitability of the theme would also be assessed as well as how the event was received by ministers, delegates, media and the international community.</p> <p>The request was made that the Officers of the Governing Body be consulted about the tripartite composition of the panel.</p>
B.14.4.	<p><i>Plenary period IV</i></p> <p>Plenary period IV will include the adoption of all committees' reports and outputs as well as votes as necessary.</p> <p>To complete the necessary work, time limits will be strictly enforced.</p>	Received tripartite support	Yes	No	n.a.	Efficiency and good time management are critical to complete the necessary work. In that respect, some were of the view that, in the case of the committees' reports, the introductory speeches by the chairpersons, the vice-chairpersons and the reporters should be limited in time (IMEC group).

Ref.	Proposal/request	Received tripartite support/received some support/requires further discussion	Trial at 2013 ILC	Requires change to ILC Standing Orders (for details see table 2)	Requires cost analysis	Comments
B.14.5.	<i>Voting in plenary</i> To complement the current electronic voting system, manual back-up has been developed (see the proposals in Appendix III).	n.a.	n.a.	No	n.a.	
C.	Working methods of ILC committees					
C.1.	The need to reinforce the principles of “transparency, predictability and objectivity” in all ILC committees was recognized.	Received tripartite support	Yes	n.a.	n.a.	
C.2.	A number of issues which had not been previously discussed by the Working Party are attached for consideration (see Appendix II).	Requires further discussion	No	n.a.	n.a.	
C.3.	The need to improve the working methods of the Committee on the Application of Conventions and Recommendations was emphasized (GRULAC). While recognizing the merits of the informal tripartite working group on the working methods of the Conference Committee on the Application of Standards, some argued that the improvements of its working methods should be discussed in the WP/GBC, while others were of the view that the work of the informal working group should remain separate.	Requires further discussion	n.a.	n.a.	n.a.	

Ref.	Proposal/request	Received tripartite support/received some support/requires further discussion	Trial at 2013 ILC	Requires change to ILC Standing Orders (for details see table 2)	Requires cost analysis	Comments
C.4	<p><i>General discussions</i></p> <p>The chief focus of general discussions would be on producing an output that:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> (i) focuses on the ILO's core mandate and areas of expertise; (ii) identifies policy priorities that result in concrete action; (iii) features best practice and knowledge sharing; (iv) is user-friendly and clearly outlines the committees' conclusions and future action by the Office and constituents; and (v) identifies follow-up mechanism(s) for implementation. 	Requires further discussion	n.a.	n.a.	n.a.	
C.5.	<p><i>Recurrent discussions</i></p> <p>Modalities for the discussion should be reviewed to better achieve the outcomes determined by the 2008 Declaration on Social Justice for a Fair Globalization. The broad developments and issues relating to the strategic objective in the upcoming discussion should be discussed in advance (preferably by the Governing Body).</p>	Requires further discussion	n.a.	Yes, if the creation of a standing committee is envisaged (see Appendix II)	n.a.	<p>In the preparatory processes, including the preparation of the Office report to the Conference, the Office should bear in mind that the focus of the recurrent discussions should closely follow the requirements as set out in the Social Justice Declaration, namely the assessment of ILO action and priorities required over the next four years.</p> <p>In the preparation of the report, the Office should also keep in mind the need:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> (i) to keep them short, concise and targeted to the scope of the recurrent discussions listed in the Social Justice Declaration; (ii) to consult constituents on the issues concerned;

Ref.	Proposal/request	Received tripartite support/received some support/requires further discussion	Trial at 2013 ILC	Requires change to ILC Standing Orders (for details see table 2)	Requires cost analysis	Comments
						(iii) to link discussion questions with each chapter; (iv) to include draft outputs, including draft plans of action or conclusions to better direct discussions.
C.6.	<i>Workplans of general discussion committees</i> General discussion committee workplans should be realistic and with greater emphasis at arriving at conclusions more rapidly (IMEC group).	Requires further discussion	Yes, if tripartite support	No	Yes	This option would imply that a maximum of five plenary sittings of the committee be devoted to the general discussion. It has been proposed that the work of the general discussion committees be completed by the Saturday of the second week (see the proposed scenario 1 in Appendix IV.)
C.7.	<i>Membership of drafting group</i> Based on experience, it was proposed that in order to ensure equal regional representation, the number of Government members on drafting groups be a multiple of four (GRULAC).	Requires further discussion	n.a.	Not necessary, but possible to adopt SO on drafting groups.	n.a.	The suggestion was also made to agree on a standard membership composed of two Government members to one Employer and one Worker member (GRULAC).

Ref.	Proposal/request	Received tripartite support/received some support/requires further discussion	Trial at 2013 ILC	Requires change to ILC Standing Orders (for details see table 2)	Requires cost analysis	Comments
C.8.	<p><i>Drafting group</i></p> <p>It has been proposed that, for general discussion committees, the drafting group would commence its work at an earlier stage of the Committee's discussions.</p> <p>A proposed scenario can be found in Appendix V, which explores the possibility that the drafting group may start its work on Friday afternoon (first week) and work in alternation with the Committee plenary on the Friday and Saturday of the first week, and during the whole day on Monday of the second week. As in the first scenario (see above C.6) the drafting group would still meet during the whole Monday of the second week.</p>	Requires further discussion	Yes, if tripartite support	No	n.a.	Reserves have been expressed concerning the feasibility to establish the drafting group at the beginning of the general discussion and to convene evening sittings of the drafting group after each plenary sitting. The proposed scenario, which takes these concerns into account, is exploring the possibility of a drafting group working in alternation with the plenary during two days with normal working hours.
C.9.	<p><i>Committee chairpersons</i></p> <p>Chairpersons of the various ILC committees should be selected early, taking into account a high level of familiarity with the ILO and the procedures used in ILC committees, as well as with the topic discussed by the committee. Once appointed, they should be appropriately briefed and assisted by the Office. Effective support from the Office in the conduct of the committee discussions is also required.</p>	Received tripartite support	Yes	n.a.	n.a.	<p>It is widely understood that the more effective the chairperson, the better quality the discussion and timeliness of the discussion. Key measures of success include:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> – effectiveness of the chairperson; – feedback from the chairperson on the level of support he/she received; – feedback from the Office on responsiveness of the chairperson to support provided.

Ref.	Proposal/request	Received tripartite support/received some support/requires further discussion	Trial at 2013 ILC	Requires change to ILC Standing Orders (for details see table 2)	Requires cost analysis	Comments
C.10.	<p><i>Technology</i></p> <p>Where necessary, up-to-date and reliable technology must be available to facilitate the work of the Committee. Screens should be provided in all committee rooms whenever amendments are discussed.</p> <p>Screens are already provided in all standard-setting committees discussing amendments, where the system, called SAMM, is used to display both amendments and subamendments in the three languages on a screen.</p>	Received some support	n.a.			<p>In the case of non-standard-setting committees where the discussion in the plenary of the committee of amendments formally submitted is limited to two days, the implications of the SAMM system in terms of human (full team of translators and SAMM operators) and technical resources might be considered as disproportionate compared with potential efficiency gains.</p> <p>The experience of last year, when the SAMM system was provided in the two drafting groups discussing draft conclusions, demonstrated that the efficiency of the system reaches its limits when the text under discussion is too long to be displayed in the three languages on a screen.</p> <p>The past practice which consists of having the text under discussion displayed in English only in the drafting groups, with the assistance of interpretation services in English, French and Spanish, still exists.</p>
C.11.	<p><i>Evening sittings</i></p> <p>The recent practice of avoiding planned evening sittings for non-standard-setting committees should be continued.</p>	Received tripartite support	n.a.	n.a.		

Ref.	Proposal/request	Received tripartite support/received some support/requires further discussion	Trial at 2013 ILC	Requires change to ILC Standing Orders (for details see table 2)	Requires cost analysis	Comments
C.12.	<p><i>ILC delegates and participants</i></p> <p>It was agreed that an appropriate balance should be found between Government, Workers' and Employers' delegates and their advisers. Each group should also be sufficient in number so as to cover all technical committees.</p> <p>Efforts should be made to ensure a better gender balance in the national delegations (GRULAC, Africa group). The reform should focus on the full participation of balanced tripartite delegations while ensuring that sessions were financially sustainable (IMEC group).</p>	n.a.	n.a.	Not at this stage (see comment)	n.a.	The Governing Body discussed the question of tripartite imbalance in Conference delegations at its 307th, 309th and 312th Sessions ¹ and requested the Office to keep the question under review and report relevant future developments to the Governing Body, keeping in mind, as the developments may justify, the possibility of amending the Conference Standing Orders in order to extend the mandate of the Credentials Committee to submissions alleging tripartite imbalance.
C.13.	<p><i>Time management</i></p> <p>All sessions of the ILC should start on time to maximize the use of time available.</p>	Received tripartite support	Yes	n.a.		
C.14.	<p><i>Online training modules for delegates</i></p> <p>The existing online training modules for delegates should be further developed and promoted.</p>	Received tripartite support	n.a.	n.a.	n.a.	<p>In addition to the information provided on practical information on the ILC and working procedures of committees, a training module should be developed on the best practices in the delivery of interventions.</p> <p>An ILO induction for Geneva-based diplomats will also be organized.</p>

Ref.	Proposal/request	Received tripartite support/received some support/requires further discussion	Trial at 2013 ILC	Requires change to ILC Standing Orders (for details see table 2)	Requires cost analysis	Comments
C.15.	<p><i>Printing</i></p> <p>The Office should aim at an overall reduction in the number of printed/hard copy publications relating to the ILC.</p> <p>A revised pre-session distribution policy could be put in place for the Conference, which would consist in sending to each member State four copies only of each report.</p>	Requires further discussion	<p>Yes, if tripartite agreement</p> <p>n.a.</p>	n.a.	Yes	<p>The pre-session distribution policy is currently based on the needs individually expressed by member States, on a case-by-case basis. At their arrival in Geneva, about 50 per cent of the delegates are requesting extra copies. In order to obtain those copies, they are, however, requested to fill and sign a form.</p> <p>The experience of the forthcoming Ninth European Regional Meeting in Oslo, which will be organized as a paper-smart meeting, could be a source of inspiration. The lessons learned from that experience will be brought to the attention of the Working Party in October 2013.</p> <p>Various options (including that of a password-protected website) will be discussed and explored in consultation with other UN organizations which have already put in place such systems.</p> <p>Some are of the view that greater use of the Internet should be encouraged at the ILC. Wi-Fi connection is provided in all Committee rooms and the Assembly Hall.</p>

Ref.	Proposal/request	Received tripartite support/received some support/requires further discussion	Trial at 2013 ILC	Requires change to ILC Standing Orders (for details see table 2)	Requires cost analysis	Comments
C.16.	<p><i>Provisional Record</i></p> <p>Translation and production of the <i>Provisional Record</i> related to the addresses in plenary by the delegates would be deferred until after the ILC, with the delegates having a period of one week to send amendments to their respective speeches. The final <i>Record of Proceedings</i> would be produced by September as usual. In the meantime, each speech in the Plenary discussion of the DG's Report would be posted on the Web as soon as it has been delivered in the forms of:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> — audio recording of the original language — audio recordings of the interpretation in English, French and Spanish, as the case may be; and — electronic copy of the speech as handed into the secretariat by the delegate, bearing a watermark stating "Check against delivery". <p>In such a case where a delegate needs to exercise his/her right to reply, the ILC secretariat would provide a written translation in English, French or Spanish upon request.</p> <p>All other interventions (high-level guests and proceedings of the Conference) would continue to be produced in writing in English, French and Spanish as usual.</p>	Requires further discussion	Yes, if tripartite support	Yes (article 23(1) and (3))	On the basis of the 2011 ILC, the potential savings were estimated at US\$150,000	<p>Key measures of success from the trial in 2013 include:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> – the accessibility of the Web recordings and original written speeches during the ILC session; – the ability for delegates to exercise effectively the right to reply; – the ease of amendments submission after the session.

¹ See GB.307/LILS/1, GB.307/10/1(Rev.), GB.309/LILS/1, GB.309/12/1(Rev.), GB.312/LILS/2, GB.312/PV, paras 531–537.

Table 2. List of ILC Standing Orders' provisions that may be affected by the current proposals on Conference reform

Proposals	Current provisions of ILC Standing Orders	Legal implications of the proposals
<p>B.5. Resolutions Committee</p> <p>There is broad consensus that the Resolutions Committee as provided for in the Standing Orders should not be reactivated under a reformed ILC.</p> <p>Standing Orders of the ILC should however provide clear rules on how to deal with the resolutions not related to the items on the agenda.</p>	<p>Article 17 in pertinent parts and possibly articles 4 and 55</p>	<p>Article 17's provisions relating to the Resolutions Committee could be replaced by a set of criteria and procedures relating to urgent resolutions (in non-resolutions years) and exceptional resolutions not involving items on the agenda, with the aim of ensuring a certain predictability and transparency in the processing of such resolutions. If it was decided that such resolutions would be handled by the Selection Committee, article 4 would be amended to expand the mandate of the Selection Committee to receive and consider such resolutions, and make the above criteria and procedures applicable to the Selection Committee, when it is handling such resolutions.</p> <p>Article 55 may also be amended to reflect any new procedures for participation from which the Selection Committee is currently exempt under article 55, para. 2. The limited composition of the Selection Committee as established under article 4 could also be reviewed for purposes of its role in handling resolutions involving items not on the agenda.</p>
<p>B.14.1. Opening session</p> <p>The opening session of the plenary should be shortened and simplified to allow the committees to start their work immediately after.</p>	<p>Article 76</p> <p>As to nomination of members of Selection and other committees and the group secretariats, the articles concerning these would not change; only a practical adjustment (use of a visual screen rather than reading out names) would be involved.</p>	<p>The proposal for derogation of an ILC procedure in the Standing Orders could be taken up and decided directly in the sitting in which it is proposed, rather than awaiting the following sitting as currently provided in the last sentence of article 76. To accommodate the reason for which a second sitting has been required (i.e. consultation on the proposal), any proposal for derogation could be circulated in writing prior to the opening sitting of the ILC (as a <i>Provisional Record</i>, made subject to the unanimous recommendation of the Officers).</p>
<p>B.14.2. Plenary period II</p> <p>Option 1</p> <p><i>Discussion of the Reports of the Director-General and the Chairperson of the Governing Body</i></p> <p>The Director-General's Report should at each session address a social theme. The report of the Chairperson of the Governing Body should cover the programme implementation aspect.</p>	<p>Article 12</p>	<p>Article 12(2) would be changed to provide that at each session, rather than every other, the Director-General would provide such a Report on a social theme, and to provide that the Report of the Director-General on programme implementation which has been submitted to the Governing Body would be forwarded through the report of the Chairperson of the Governing Body and may contain the Director-General's revisions based on the Governing Body's discussion (e.g. as an annex).</p>

Proposals	Current provisions of ILC Standing Orders	Legal implications of the proposals
<p>Option 2 <i>Small thematic debates on issues covered by Reports of the Director-General and Governing Body Chairperson</i></p> <p>The Reports of the Director-General and Governing Body Chairperson could be discussed through a number of interactive thematic discussions based on specific issues discussed in the Reports. This would encourage a “real debate” and allow delegates in their own capacity to address the ILC. Such debates would be moderated by an ILO expert.</p>	<p>Articles 12(3), 13(2), 14(2) and (6), and 16</p>	<p>Article 12(3): Possibly more flexibility inserted in the first sentence regarding the identity of who speaks in respect of each member State (e.g. adviser or other public figure), and eliminate the provision for speaking not more than once.</p> <p>Article 13(2): To permit moderators of debates other than the President, a provision for delegation of the President’s authority to direct debates to other than the Vice-Presidents would be foreseen.</p> <p>Articles 14(2) and (6), and 16: Revise to permit order of speakers at the discretion of the President or other moderator, consider whether flexibility is desired as to length of speeches beyond five minutes (e.g. for panels), and whether to eliminate motion for closure during panel process – either in the provisions or in a special provision exempting panels from certain Standing Orders.</p>
<p>B.14.3. World of Work Summit</p> <p>The one-day World of Work Summit will be scheduled following the work of the technical committees. The Director-General will select the theme for the event. The Summit would include keynote addresses by Heads of State and Government, and interactive activities, including panel discussions, with the high-level tripartite participation of ministers and leaders of social partner organizations. Appropriate representation across regions and countries of differing developmental status would be ensured. This Summit would help give the ILC the appropriate profile within the international community.</p>	<p>Article 12(3) if it concerns the Director-General’s Report; article 14(2) and (6) if it is a separate agenda item; article 16</p>	<p>See proposals above in B.14.2 regarding articles 12(3), 14(2) and 16; as to article 14(6), consider flexibility as to whether length of speeches beyond ten minutes is desirable; and whether to eliminate motion for closure during Summit – either in the provisions or in a special provision on panels exempting Summits from certain Standing Orders.</p>
<p>C.16. Provisional Record</p> <p>Translation and production of the <i>Provisional Record</i> related to the addresses in plenary by the delegates would be deferred until after the ILC, with the delegates having a period of one week to send amendments to their respective speeches. The final <i>Record of Proceedings</i> would be produced by September as usual. In the meantime, each speech in the Plenary discussion of the DG’s Report would be posted on the Web as soon as it has been delivered in the forms of:</p>	<p>Article 23(1)–(3)</p>	<p>Revise article 23(1)–(3): Revisions would provide for dissemination rather than printing, and adjust the reference to “verbatim report” to refer to “verbatim record” thus permitting electronic distribution of a recording.</p>

Proposals	Current provisions of ILC Standing Orders	Legal implications of the proposals
<ul style="list-style-type: none">– audio recording of the original language– audio recordings of the interpretation in English, French and Spanish, as the case may be; and– electronic copy of the speech as handed into the secretariat by the delegate, bearing a watermark stating “Check against delivery”.		
<p>In such a case where a delegate needs to exercise his/her right to reply, the ILC secretariat would provide a written translation in English, French or Spanish upon request.</p> <p>All other interventions (high-level guests and proceedings of the Conference) would continue to be produced in writing in English, French and Spanish as usual.</p>		

Appendix I

Suggested workplan for a two-week session of the Conference

Analysis of the current situation

The following key elements have to be taken into consideration:

- *Concerning the discussion of the Report of the Director-General*, and based on the experience of June 2012, 283 slots of five minutes are needed, which means approximately 28 hours and 15 minutes.
- *Concerning the Committee on the Application of Standards*: The first week (Wednesday afternoon, Thursday, Friday and Saturday), is currently devoted, inter alia, to the discussion of the General Survey and the report to the Recurrent Discussion Committee). The second week (Monday to Friday (sometimes Saturday morning)) is entirely assigned to the discussion of special cases. The report is then adopted by the Committee (usually on the Tuesday of the third week), and the discussion and adoption in plenary of the ILC (at least two hours) is usually scheduled two days after the adoption by the Committee.
- *Concerning standard-setting committees*: A minimum of 16 sittings are needed (including a first sitting devoted to a general discussion) to discuss all the amendments to the proposed text; one day is needed for the committee drafting committee; one sitting is needed for the adoption of the report by the Committee; a minimum of 90 minutes is needed in plenary for the adoption of the report and instrument by the plenary; and a second slot is needed in plenary (at least 24 hours after its formal adoption by the ILC) for a vote.
- *Concerning non-standard committees (recurrent and general discussions)*: In the current format, four to five sittings are devoted to the general discussion; a drafting group meets four times to discuss the tentative conclusions prepared by the Office (even if some of these meetings can be held in alternation with those of the committee's plenary); one day is devoted to the submission of amendments; four plenary meetings are needed for the discussion of the amendments formally submitted; one meeting of the committee is devoted to the adoption of the report; and 90 minutes are needed for the adoption of the report, resolution and conclusions by the ILC.

Several options could, however, be explored to shorten the duration of the general discussion committees. The structure of the general discussion could be reviewed. Moreover, in addition to the proposed alternation of the drafting group with the committee's plenary, alternatives to the formal submission of amendments could also be explored. The proposed conclusions, as discussed by the drafting group, could, for example, be amended by the plenary itself, with the possibility for the plenary to reconvene the drafting group if needed. An alternation of the plenary committee and the drafting group could also be envisaged to reach a final tripartite agreement on the proposed text.

Conclusions for a two-week session scenario

- The formal opening of the ILC session should be preceded by a full day of group meetings (held on Sunday).
- The discussion of the Director-General's Report in the framework of a continuous plenary would not raise a problem in the context of a two-week scenario.
- If the current workplan of the non-standard-setting committees (as described above) is incompatible with the two-week scenario, alternative scenarios could however be explored to work more efficiently within the framework of a shortened workplan.
- As regards the standard-setting committees, to ensure a proper discussion within the framework of a two-week Conference, a preparatory conference (see article 14.2 of the Constitution) could be held back to back with the Conference, the week prior to the Conference.

Week 1

Monday	Tuesday	Wednesday	Thursday	Friday	Saturday
10 a.m.–11 a.m. Opening of ILC (Plenary period I)	All day: – Technical committees – Other committees – [Plenary period II]	All day: – Technical committees – Other committees – [Plenary period II]	All day: – Technical committees – Other committees – Plenary period II	All day: – Technical committees – Other committees – Plenary period II	All day: – Technical committees – Other committees – Committee drafting committee (if needed) – Drafting groups (if needed)
11.30 a.m.–1 p.m. Opening session of technical committees					
3 p.m.–6 p.m. Technical committees					

Week 2

Monday	Tuesday	Wednesday	Thursday	Friday	Saturday
All day: 10 a.m.–11 a.m. Technical committees (adopt reports)	All day: – Technical and other committees adopt reports – Plenary period II	All day: – Plenary period II – Plenary IV (adoption of reports)	All day: – Plenary IV (voting, adoption of reports)	All day: – Plenary IV (adoption of reports) – Closing ceremony	Governing Body
11 a.m.–1 p.m. Plenary III World of Work Summit (Part 1)					
3 p.m.–6 p.m. Plenary III World of Work Summit (Part 2)					

Appendix II

Possible modifications regarding the Conference committees

Which committees are mentioned in the Constitution and Standing Orders?

1. The only reference to Conference committees in the ILO Constitution is in article 17, paragraph 1, which states that the Conference “may appoint committees to consider and report on any matter”.
2. The Conference Standing Orders establish the following standing committees and regulate their mandate through specific provisions:
 - Selection Committee (article 4);
 - Credentials Committee (article 5);
 - Conference Drafting Committee (article 6);
 - Committee on the Application of Conventions and Recommendations (article 7) (Applications Committee);
 - Finance Committee of Government Representatives (article 7bis); and
 - Resolutions Committee (article 17).
3. For ad hoc committees, the Standing Orders repeat the text of the Constitution, simply stating the Conference may appoint a committee to consider and report on any matter (article 8 of the Standing Orders).
4. Since 2010, a recurrent discussion on one of the four strategic objectives of the Organization has been included as an item on the agenda of each session of the Conference. This standing arrangement follows the introduction of a scheme of recurrent discussions by the Conference under the ILO Declaration on Social Justice for a Fair Globalization. As decided by the Conference, the purpose of the recurrent discussions is to:
 - (i) understand better the diverse realities and needs of ILO’s Members with respect to each of the strategic objectives so as to:
 - (a) respond more effectively to them through all its means of action, including standards-related action, technical cooperation, and the technical and research capacity of the Office; and
 - (b) adjust its priorities and programmes of action accordingly; and
 - (ii) assess the results of ILO activities with a view to informing programme, budget and other governance decisions.¹
5. To facilitate clarity and effectively implement the Conference decision on recurrent discussions, the Conference may wish to appoint a standing Committee on the Recurrent Discussion. As with the other standing committees (see paragraph 2 above), the Standing Orders could provide that the Committee is subject to appointment by the Conference, that it shall consider the two items ((i) and (ii) above), and that it shall submit a report to the Conference.

¹ ILO Declaration on Social Justice for a Fair Globalization, Annex, Part II(B)(i)–(ii).

How do committees function?

6. Procedure regulating work of the committees is found in Section H of the Standing Orders (articles 55–68). The Credentials Committee and the Drafting Committee are excluded from this section and some of these provisions are also not applicable to the Selection, Finance and Resolution Committees.
 7. The current practice of the Conference committees does not entirely correspond to the text of the Standing Orders. There may be a need to identify relevant provisions of the Standing Orders and align them to the practice that has proven to be useful (e.g. on weighting of votes).
 8. Furthermore, the Standing Orders do seem to be most adapted to the work of the standard-setting committees, while the committees for the general or recurrent item discussions have developed practices that may be added to the Standing Orders (see the box below).
 9. Finally, as committees are composed of technical advisors who may not be familiar with the Conference and ILO practices, a simplification and improvement of the drafting of certain provisions may be helpful to better understand procedures regulating amendments, subamendments, voting and adoption of reports and proposals.
- A. Composition of committees
10. The Standing Orders provide that it is for the Conference to designate “the governments to be represented on each committee by Government members and shall appoint the delegates or advisers to be Employers’ and Workers’ members of the said committee”. The number of governments may even be restricted (article 56, paragraph 4, of the Standing Orders). In practice, the registration is done by the secretariat and approved by the Selection Committee. That is why the persons registered during the day do not acquire full rights to participate in the committee work until the following day. Some deadlines may be useful to determine quorum and who has the right to speak at least at the beginning of each sitting, but the procedure as set out by the Standing Orders may be simplified.
- B. Right to participate in the committee work
11. The Standing Orders seem sufficiently clear as far as traditional participants are concerned. However, the practice of recent years has shown that there may be a need for a general clause that would allow the Selection Committee or the officers of each committee to invite to a committee sitting a “special guest”, “moderator” or any other person who is not accredited through national delegations.
 12. In recent years, some persons accredited as “other persons attending the Conference” by the Members started participating actively in the work of committees. Beyond the logistic problems that their presence cause for the size of conference rooms, it may need to be further clarified that the persons accredited in this category, who normally have no active role in the Conference, cannot replace delegates and advisers, whose roles are well-defined in the Constitution and Standing Orders and whose credentials can be challenged in the Conference.
- C. Languages of committees
13. For a number of years, the committees have been working in English, French and Spanish. The place of Spanish may need to be adjusted in article 58 of the Standing Orders.

D. Committee drafting committees; subcommittees

14. While the role of the committee drafting committee is clear and well-defined in the Standing Orders, the role and procedure of the drafting groups for conclusions in general and recurrent discussions, currently operating as “subcommittees” under article 59, paragraph 3, of the Standing Orders, may benefit from some basic rules. For example, there may be some guidance on how to “set up” a subcommittee (composition, way of selection, chairing, etc.).

E. Motions, resolutions and amendments

15. All three issues are included in one single article of the Standing Orders (article 63), which is not the best example of clear drafting. For the sake of delegates and the officers of the committee, it may be useful to rewrite this article in a more accessible manner in order to reflect best practices and legal opinions given over the years to clarify article 63 of the Standing Orders.

F. Outcome of the committees' work

16. While the task assigned to standard-setting committees is well-defined (first or second discussion, proposed Recommendation or Convention, or both), proposals of the general discussions, currently in the form of “conclusions” or recurrent item discussions are not clearly defined beyond the requirement to report back to the plenary on the matter assigned to them.

Process of work of different ILC committees: Overview

In standard-setting committees:

- (i) discussion is based on a report prepared by the Office and draft instruments proposed by the Office following a consultation process with the Members;
- (ii) amendments to the text proposed are deposited;
- (iii) all amendments submitted to a proposed text are examined and decisions taken on them (adopted, adopted as subamended, rejected);
- (iv) the draft instrument (Convention or Recommendation or both) resulting from the debate is established;
- (v) the committee drafting committee reviews the text ensuring linguistic coherence and legal clarity;
- (vi) the Committee adopts its report and the draft instrument, as well as any related draft resolution.

General discussion committees (including recurrent discussion committees):

- (i) conduct discussion based on a report prepared by the Office;
- (ii) hold a general discussion based on a list of “suggested points for discussion”;
- (iii) establish a drafting group to prepare the “draft conclusions” on the basis of a first draft prepared by the Office;
- (iv) their drafting groups meet separately and discuss draft conclusions;
- (v) examine and take decisions on all amendments submitted to those draft conclusions;
- (vi) adopt their reports and the draft conclusions with an introductory resolution discussed by them.

Appendix III

Possible modifications regarding voting in plenary

Which basic methods of voting are provided for in the Standing Orders?

1. Article 19 of the Conference Standing Orders (reproduced at the end of this appendix for ease of reference) provides for three different methods of voting:
 - **Vote by show of hands**
Use: By default if none of the other methods is prescribed.
Procedure: If no electronic vote is taken, votes are expressed by show of hands and counted by the secretariat; final result is announced by the President; final result is recorded and published.
 - **Record vote**
Use: In all cases in which a majority of two-thirds of the votes is required by the Constitution (admission of new Members; invalidation of credentials; approval of the Organization's budget; confirmation of agenda item objected to; inclusion of a *new* agenda item for the following session; recovery of right to vote of a Member in arrears; final adoption of Convention or Recommendation; adoption of amendments to the Constitution) and where requested by 90 delegates or a group.
Procedure: If no electronic vote is taken, votes are expressed orally upon being called by the secretariat in the French alphabetical order of the member States; a second call is made for delegates that did not respond to the first call; final result is announced by the President; individual votes (by name) and the final result are recorded and published.
 - **Vote by secret ballot**
Use: For the election of the President (if a vote has to be taken) and for any other matter for which no record vote is prescribed if requested by 90 delegates or a group.
Procedure: If no electronic vote is taken, votes are expressed on ballot papers counted by the secretariat under the supervision of three returning officers (Government, Employer, Worker); the final result is announced by the President; only final result is recorded and published.
2. Unless otherwise specified, decisions are taken by a simple majority (Constitution, article 17(2)). In practice, such votes are usually replaced by consensus. Since decisions requiring a two-thirds majority cannot be taken by consensus and require a record vote under the current Conference Standing Orders, the record vote is in practice the most common voting method of the Conference. The most common decisions that are taken by record vote are, in the order of their frequency over the last ten years: (i) permission for a Member in arrears to recover the right to vote (article 13(4) Constitution); (ii) the final adoption of a Convention or Recommendation (article 19(2) Constitution); and (iii) adoption of the budget of the Organization (article 6(9) of Financial Regulations).¹

¹ From 2003 to 2012, there were 13 decisions on recovery of voting rights, 12 adoptions of a Convention or Recommendation and five budget adoptions.

How does electronic voting work?

3. In accordance with article 19(15) of the Conference Standing Orders, votes are taken by electronic means, unless the officers otherwise decide in special circumstances. Another exception is implied: since no one can achieve the impossible, votes are also not taken electronically if the available electronic voting system is not working properly, as happened for the final record vote on the Social Protection Floors Recommendation, 2012 (No. 202), at the 2012 ILC.
4. The current electronic system is based on up to 190 mobile voting stations, touch screen tablets linked to a central server by a wireless connection. Voting delegates log on to the system by using a PIN code generated by the system and distributed by the secretariat before the vote and express their vote by pushing the corresponding screen buttons.
5. After an electronic vote has been taken, its result is announced, recorded and published following the same rules as a vote taken by the traditional means (“manually”).
6. Since the 98th Session (2009) of the ILC, electronic votes have been taken concurrently with the plenary discussions, inside of the plenary hall or with the voting stations installed outside it, in order to create the minimum disruption of the discussions.

How could the voting methods be improved?

7. The current system using electronic voting concurrently with continuing plenary discussions is generally considered to work satisfactorily. This option, which is in line with the current Standing Orders, has been successfully tested at the 2009, 2010 and 2011 sessions of the ILC, both with voting stations installed inside or outside the plenary hall. What may need to be improved, however, are the default methods that apply in case the electronic voting system is not working as expected, as at the 101st Session (2012).

Possible technical solutions

8. The main points of possible failure are the voting server itself and the Wi-Fi/network connections for the voting stations. Although the server could be doubled, the network of the United Nations Office in Geneva would remain an issue. A purely manual fallback position has proven to be a very long and tedious process. It could be envisaged to use, in case of failure, a simple solution consisting of a small number of interconnected PCs (independent of the main network), sharing an up-to-date voting list set up in an area outside of the main Conference hall. Delegates would be asked to come to this area to submit their vote upon presentation of their badge for verification of voting rights, while Conference proceedings continue. Results could then be announced in the Conference hall immediately after the process has finished. The only requirement for such a solution is that electricity is still available. If desired, such a solution could be tested during the forthcoming ILC in such a case where a vote for a Member in arrears to recover the right to vote is needed.

Possible proposals to improve voting methods that imply changes to the Standing Orders

9. The experience of 2012 has shown that due to the number of ILO member States now attending the Conference and the number of substitute delegates they nominate, a “manual” record vote by double roll-call as prescribed by article 19(7) can take three hours for one single vote. While the normal fall-back solution is “manual” voting by traditional means as described in article 19(3), (7)–(9) and (12), there is a need to limit use of manual record votes and simplify the applicable procedure. Proposals to do that follow.

Recovery of right to vote: Adoption by show of hands rather than record vote

10. First, it could be envisaged to **reduce the scope for record votes by no longer requiring a record vote to adopt decisions on the recovery of the right to vote** by a member State in arrears. This change, which would require an amendment to article 19(5) of the Conference Standing Orders, would eliminate the need for a record vote in what has accounted for more than 40 per cent of cases in the last ten years (see footnote 1).
11. Instead, the vote on recovery of the right to vote would be adopted by show of hands, which cannot be replaced by consensus; this is the case because the constitutionally required two-thirds majority has to be positively ascertained. Since decisions on the recovery of the right to vote are typically uncontroversial and adopted by a large majority, the risk that a record vote is requested following an unclear result of a show of hands seems minimal. Moreover, as such decisions do not have the solemnity and importance for the future that decisions on the adoption of Conventions or Recommendations or of the budget have, the fact that individual votes are not recorded and published could be considered acceptable. It should be noted that this change would also apply in the normal case of votes by electronic means.

Manual voting methods: Deletion of the second roll-call

12. Second, the procedure of a manual record vote could be simplified by **dropping the second roll-call**. This change, which would require an amendment to article 19(7) of the Conference Standing Orders, would considerably shorten the procedure. However, since the second call gives delegates who missed the first call another opportunity to express their vote, it would increase the risk of not reaching the quorum (see article 20 of the Conference Standing Orders). Experience at the 93rd Session (2005) of the ILC shows that missing the quorum by one or two votes can result in serious consequences.
13. The above options do not affect the procedure in case of electronic voting.

Excerpt from the Standing Orders of the International Labour Conference

ARTICLE 19

Methods of voting

1. The Conference shall vote by a show of hands, by a record vote or by secret ballot.
2. Voting shall be by a show of hands except as hereinafter provided.
3. Votes by a show of hands shall be counted by the Secretariat and the result announced by the President.
4. In case of doubt as to the result, the President may cause a record vote to be taken.
5. A record vote shall be taken in all cases in which a majority of two-thirds of the votes is required by the Constitution of the Organisation, except when the Conference is voting on the inclusion in the agenda of the following session of an item already on the agenda of the session at which the decision is taken.
6. A record vote shall be taken on any question if the request is made by show of hands of not less than 90 delegates present at the sitting, or by the Chairman of a group, or by his representative duly appointed by notice in writing addressed to the President, whether such a request be made before or immediately after the vote by show of hands.

7. Record votes shall be taken by calling upon each delegation voting in turn in the French alphabetical order of the names of the Members of the International Labour Organisation. A further and final call shall immediately be made, in the same alphabetical order, of delegates who did not respond to the first call.
8. The vote shall be recorded by the Secretariat and announced by the President.
9. The names of the delegates voting in a record vote shall be inserted in the verbatim report of the sitting.
10. Any vote on the election of the President shall be by secret ballot.
11. A vote by secret ballot shall also be taken on any question not covered by paragraph 5, if the request is made by show of hands of not less than 90 delegates present at the sitting or by the Chairman of a group acting on behalf of his group.
12. Votes by secret ballot shall be counted by the Secretariat under the direction of three returning officers nominated respectively by the Government, Employers' and Workers' groups.
13. If, on the same question, requests are made both for a record vote in pursuance of paragraph 6 of this article and for a vote by secret ballot in pursuance of paragraph 11 of this article, the vote shall be taken by secret ballot if the Conference so decides by a simple majority vote by secret ballot.
14. The President shall permit any delegate who so requests to explain his vote briefly immediately after the voting except where the vote is taken by secret ballot. The President may limit the time allowed for such explanations.
15. Unless the Officers otherwise decide in special circumstances, the Conference shall vote by electronic means.
16. When the Conference votes by electronic means, paragraphs 7 and 12 above shall not apply. In the case of a vote by show of hands, the individual votes cast by the delegates shall be accessible during the sitting at which the vote is taken, but only the final result of the vote shall be announced and recorded. In the case of a record vote, the individual votes cast by the delegates shall be recorded and published and the final result of the vote shall be announced and recorded. In the case of a vote by secret ballot, the individual votes cast by the delegates shall in no case be recorded or accessible and only the final result of the vote shall be announced and recorded.

Appendix IV

Tentative plan of work for a general discussion (2013)

First scenario

Date and time	Committee programme	Secretariat
Monday, 3 June	No committee sittings	
Tuesday, 4 June	No committee sittings	
Wednesday, 5 June		
11.30 a.m.–1 p.m.	Group meetings	
2.30 p.m.–6.30 p.m.	First sitting of the committee <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ■ Election of Officers ■ Introduction by the representative of the Secretary-General of the report and points for discussion ■ Vice-Chairpersons' opening/general statements ■ Government opening/statements 	
Thursday, 6 June		
10 a.m.–11 a.m.	Group meetings	Secretariat begins translation of the draft report
11 a.m.–1 p.m.	Second sitting <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ■ Discussion: Point 1 and point 2 	
2 p.m.–3.30 p.m.	Group meetings	
3.30 p.m.–6.30 p.m.	Third sitting <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ■ Discussion: End of discussion on point 2 and point 3 	Secretariat prepares tentative conclusions on points 1, 2 and 3
Friday, 7 June		
10 a.m.–11 a.m.	Group meetings	Secretariat translates tentative conclusions on points 1, 2 and 3
11 a.m.–1 p.m.	Fourth sitting <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ■ Appointment of the drafting group ■ Election of the reporter ■ Discussion: Point 4 and point 5 	
2.30 p.m.–3.30 p.m.	Group meetings	
3.30 p.m.–6.30 p.m.	Fifth sitting <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ■ Discussion: End of discussion on point 5 and point 6 	Secretariat translates tentative conclusions on points 1, 2 and 3
7 p.m.–9 p.m.	Additional sitting (<i>if necessary</i>) <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ■ Conclusion of discussion on point 6 	Distribution of tentative conclusions on points 1, 2 and 3 to the members of the drafting group

Date and time	Committee programme	Secretariat
Saturday, 8 June		
10 a.m.–11 a.m.	Group meetings	Secretariat translates tentative conclusions on points 4, 5 and 6
11 a.m.–1 p.m.	Drafting group	Drafting group discusses tentative conclusions on points 1, 2 and 3
2 p.m.–6 p.m.	Drafting group	6 p.m. – Distribution of tentative conclusions on points 4, 5 and 6
Sunday, 9 June		
		Secretariat translates the first part of the draft conclusions as agreed by the drafting group
Monday, 10 June		
10 a.m.–1 p.m.	Drafting group	Drafting group discusses the full text of the tentative conclusions (including on points 4, 5 and 6)
2.30 p.m.–3.30 p.m.	Group meetings	
3.30 p.m.–6.30 p.m.	Drafting group	Secretariat finalizes three language versions of draft conclusions
Tuesday, 11 June		
10 a.m.–1 p.m.	Group meetings to discuss draft conclusions and formulate amendments	Draft conclusions distributed to groups by 10 a.m.
2.30 p.m.–4.30 p.m.	Group meetings to discuss draft conclusions and formulate amendments	Advance copy of conclusions is sent for translation into German, Russian, Arabic and Chinese
3 p.m.–5 p.m.	Submission of amendments to secretariat	Brief for Chairperson on procedural aspects of the discussion of amendments Secretariat receives amendments from 3 p.m. to 5 p.m. Secretariat translates amendments
Wednesday, 12 June		
10 a.m.–11 a.m.	Group meetings to review amendments	9.30 a.m. – Meeting with Chairperson to go through amendments Amendments distributed to groups by 10 a.m.
11 a.m.–1 p.m.	Seventh sitting ■ Consideration of amendments to draft conclusions	
2.30 p.m.–3.30 p.m.	Group meetings to review amendments	
3.30 p.m.–6.30 p.m.	Eighth sitting ■ Consideration of amendments to draft conclusions	

Date and time	Committee programme	Secretariat
Thursday, 13 June		
10 a.m.–11 a.m.	Group meetings to review amendments	
11 a.m.–1 p.m.	Ninth sitting ■ Consideration of amendments to draft conclusions	
2.30 p.m.–3.30 p.m.	Group meetings to review amendments	
3.30 p.m.–6.30 p.m.	Tenth sitting ■ Consideration of amendments to draft conclusions	Final copy of conclusions is sent for translation into German, Russian Arabic and Chinese
Friday, 14 June		
		Draft report is completed in original language version Secretariat finalizes draft report and conclusions in three languages
Saturday, 15 June		
10 a.m.–11 a.m.	Group meetings to review the Committee's draft report	Draft report distributed by 10 a.m.
11 a.m.–1 p.m.	Eleventh sitting ■ Adoption of the Committee's report ■ Conclusion of the Committee's work	Secretariat finalizes Committee's report 4.30 p.m.–6 p.m. – Secretariat meets for last coordination meeting
Sunday, 16 June		
Monday, 17 June		
Wednesday, 19 June		
(Time to be announced in <i>Daily Bulletin</i>)	Submission of the Committee's report and proposed conclusions to the plenary of the Conference, and adoption (time to be announced in the <i>Daily Bulletin</i>)	Committee report and proposed conclusions published in the <i>Provisional Record</i>

Appendix V

Tentative plan of work for a general discussion (2013)

Second scenario

Date and time	Committee programme	Secretariat
Monday, 3 June	No committee sittings	
Tuesday, 4 June	No committee sittings	
Wednesday, 5 June		
11.30 a.m.–1 p.m.	Group meetings	
2.30 p.m.–6.30 p.m.	First sitting of the committee <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ■ Election of Officers ■ Introduction by the representative of the Secretary-General of the report and points for discussion ■ Vice-Chairpersons' opening/ general statements ■ Government opening/statements 	
Thursday, 6 June		
10 a.m.–11 a.m.	Group meetings	Secretariat begins translation of the draft report
11 a.m.–1 p.m.	Second sitting <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ■ Discussion: Point 1 and point 2 	
2 p.m.–3.30 p.m.	Group meetings	
3.30 p.m.–6.30 p.m.	Third sitting <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ■ Discussion: End of discussion on point 2 and point 3 	Secretariat prepares tentative conclusions on points 1, 2 and 3
Friday, 7 June		
10 a.m.–11 a.m.	Group meetings	Secretariat translates tentative conclusions on points 1, 2 and 3
11 a.m.–1 p.m.	Fourth sitting <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ■ Appointment of the drafting group ■ Election of the reporter ■ Discussion: Point 4 and point 5 	
2.30–3.30 p.m.	Group meetings	Distribution of tentative conclusions on points 1, 2 and 3
3.30 p.m.–6.30 p.m.	Drafting group	Secretariat prepares tentative conclusions on point 4

Date and time	Committee programme	Secretariat
Saturday, 8 June		
10 a.m.–11 a.m.	Group meetings	Secretariat translates tentative conclusions on point 4
11 a.m.–1 p.m.	Fifth sitting ■ Discussion: End of discussion on point 5 and point 6	
2 p.m.–6 p.m.	Drafting group	Distribution of tentative conclusions on point 4
Sunday, 9 June		
		Secretariat prepares and translates tentative conclusions on points 5 and 6 Secretariat translates the first part of the draft conclusions as agreed by the drafting group
Monday, 10 June		
10 a.m.–11 a.m.	Group meetings	Distribution of tentative conclusions on points 5 and 6
11 a.m.–1 p.m.	Drafting group	
2.30 p.m.–3.30 p.m.	Group meetings	
3.30 p.m.–6.30 p.m.	Drafting group	Secretariat finalizes three language versions of draft conclusions
Tuesday, 11 June		
10 a.m.–1 p.m.	Group meetings to discuss draft conclusions and formulate amendments	Draft conclusions distributed to groups by 10 a.m.
2.30 p.m.–4.30 p.m.	Group meetings to discuss draft conclusions and formulate amendments	Advance copy of conclusions is sent for translation into German, Russian, Arabic and Chinese
3 p.m.–5 p.m.	Submission of amendments to secretariat	Brief for Chairperson on procedural aspects of the discussion of amendments Secretariat receives amendments from 3 p.m. to 5 p.m. Secretariat translates amendments

Date and time	Committee programme	Secretariat
Wednesday, 12 June		
10 a.m.–11 a.m.	Group meetings to review amendments	9.30 a.m. – Meeting with Chairperson to go through amendments Amendments distributed to groups by 10 a.m.
11 a.m.–1 p.m.	Seventh sitting ■ Consideration of amendments to draft conclusions	
2.30 p.m.–3.30 p.m.	Group meetings to review amendments	
3.30 p.m.–6.30 p.m.	Eighth sitting ■ Consideration of amendments to draft conclusions	
Thursday, 13 June		
10 a.m.–11 a.m.	Group meetings to review amendments	
11 a.m.–1 p.m.	Ninth sitting ■ Consideration of amendments to draft conclusions	
2.30 p.m.–3.30 p.m.	Group meetings to review amendments	
3.30 p.m.–6.30 p.m.	Tenth sitting ■ Consideration of amendments to draft conclusions	Final copy of conclusions is sent for translation into German, Russian, Arabic and Chinese
Friday, 14 June		
		Draft report is completed in original language version Secretariat finalizes draft report and conclusions in three languages
Saturday, 15 June		
10 a.m.–11 a.m.	Group meetings to review the Committee's draft report	Draft report distributed by 10 a.m.
11 a.m.–1 p.m.	Eleventh sitting ■ Adoption of the Committee's report ■ Conclusion of the Committee's work	Secretariat finalizes Committee's report 4.30 p.m.–6 p.m. Secretariat meets for last coordination meeting
Sunday, 16 June		
Monday, 17 June		
Wednesday, 19 June		
(Time to be announced in <i>Daily Bulletin</i>)	Submission of the Committee's report and proposed conclusions to the plenary of the Conference, and adoption (time to be announced in the <i>Daily Bulletin</i>)	Committee report and proposed conclusions published in the <i>Provisional Record</i>

Appendix VI

Proposed timetable approved in November 2012

- November 2012: Agreement on some changes which might be implemented at the 102nd Session of the Conference, on a trial basis, and without requiring amendments to the Standing Orders.
- March 2013: Agreement on any further proposals for reform and on a detailed plan of implementation at the 102nd Session; analysis of the cost implications and identification of possible amendments to the Standing Orders required. Agreement on a revised agenda-setting process for the Governing Body.
- June 2013: First implementation on a trial basis of a set of reforms that do not involve amendments to the Standing Orders.
- November 2013: Lessons learned from the trial implementation in June 2013 of some changes and agreement on a further set of reforms.
- March 2014: Further examination of the proposed draft amendments to the Standing Orders which might be submitted to the Conference in June 2014.
- June 2014: Implementation of further changes that do not require amendments to the Standing Orders and adoption of amendments to the Standing Orders.

Appendix VII

Tentative plan of work – 102nd Session (5–20 June 2013) of the International Labour Conference

	T 4	W 5	Th 6	F 7	Sa 8	M 10	T 11	W 12	Th 13	F 14	Sa 15	M 17	T 18	W 19	Th 20	F 21
Plenary sittings		▬▬						▬	▬	▬		▬ ⁵	▬ ³	▬ ³	▬ ³	
Committee on the Application of Standards		▬ ²	▬	▬	▬	▬	▬	▬	▬	▬	□		A		PI	
Committee for the Recurrent Discussion on Social Dialogue (<i>recurrent discussion</i>)		▬ ²	▬	▬	▬	▬	▬	▬	▬	▬		A		PI		
Committee on the Employment and Social Protection in the New Demographic Context (<i>general discussion</i>)		▬ ²	▬	▬	▬	▬	▬	▬	▬	▬	A ¹			PI		
Committee on Sustainable Development, Decent Work and Green Jobs (<i>general discussion</i>)		▬ ²	▬	▬	▬	▬	▬	▬	▬	▬	A ¹			PI		
Finance Committee			▬	▬			▬		A				PI	V		
Selection Committee		▬ ²					□	□		A			PI			
Group meetings	▬										▬					
Governing Body		▬ ⁴														▬

¹ Subject to the approval of the Governing Body.

² After the opening sitting.

³ Extended sitting if necessary.

⁴ Programme, Financial and Administrative Section of the Governing Body.

⁵ World of Work Summit.

A Adoption by the Committee of its report/products.

PI Adoption of the report by the Conference in plenary sitting.

V Record vote in plenary sitting.

▬ Half-day sitting.

▬ All-day sitting.

□ Sitting if necessary.