

Appendix VI

Results of the ballot by correspondence of 4–10 June 2020

REGULAR MEMBERS/MEMBRES TITULAIRES/MIEMBROS TITULARES				DEPUTY MEMBERS/MEMBRES ADJOINTS/MIEMBROS ADJUNTOS			
GOVERNMENTS GOUVERNEMENTS GOBIERNOS	AGREE POUR DE ACUERDO	DO NOT AGREE (CONSENSUS) CONTRE (CONSENSUS) EN DESACUERDO (CONSENSO)	DO NOT AGREE (NO CONSENSUS) CONTRE (PAS DE CONSENSUS) EN DESACUERDO (NO CONSENSO)	GOVERNMENTS GOUVERNEMENTS GOBIERNOS	AGREE POUR DE ACUERDO	DO NOT AGREE (CONSENSUS) CONTRE (CONSENSUS) EN DESACUERDO (CONSENSO)	DO NOT AGREE (NO CONSENSUS) CONTRE (PAS DE CONSENSUS) EN DESACUERDO (NO CONSENSO)
Azerbaijan	X			Australia	X		
Bahrain	X	4(a); 5(b)		Bangladesh			
Barbados				Brunei Darussalam			
Brasil	X		1(b)	Bulgaria	X	1(b), 1(c), 1(e)	
Canada	X			Cameroun			
Chile				Cuba			
China	X			Czechia	X		
Côte d'Ivoire	X			Ecuador	X		
Ethiopia				Eswatini			
France				Finland	X		
Germany	X			Greece	X		
India				Guatemala			
Iran (Islamic Republic of)	X			Indonesia			
Ireland	X			Iraq			
Italy	X	1(a), 1(b), 1(c), 1(e), 1(g)		Maroc			
Japan	X			México	X		
Korea (Republic of)	X			Myanmar			
Lesotho	X			Namibia			
Mauritanie				Nepal			
Panamá	X	1(a), 1(b), 1(e), 1(f), 1(g)		Nigeria			
Perú				Paraguay			
Poland	X			Romania	X		
Russian Federation				Rwanda			
Sénégal	X	1(b); 1(g)		Saudi Arabia	X		
Tchad	X	4(b)		Suisse	X		
Thailand	X	(a), 1(b), 1(c), 1(e), 1 (f), 1(g)		Turkey	X		
United Kingdom	X			Uganda			
United States	X			Uruguay			
TOTAL	20	6	1	TOTAL	11	1	0

REGULAR MEMBERS/MEMBRES TITULAIRES/MIEMBROS TITULARES				DEPUTY MEMBERS/MEMBRES ADJOINTS/MIEMBROS ADJUNTOS			
EMPLOYERS EMPLOYEURS EMPLEADORES	AGREE POUR DE ACUERDO	DO NOT AGREE (CONSENSUS) CONTRE (CONSENSUS) EN DESACUERDO (CONSENSO)	DO NOT AGREE (NO CONSENSUS) CONTRE (PAS DE CONSENSUS) EN DESACUERDO (NO CONSENSO)	EMPLOYERS EMPLOYEURS EMPLEADORES	AGREE POUR DE ACUERDO	DO NOT AGREE (CONSENSUS) CONTRE (CONSENSUS) EN DESACUERDO (CONSENSO)	DO NOT AGREE (NO CONSENSUS) CONTRE (PAS DE CONSENSUS) EN DESACUERDO (NO CONSENSO)
Mr Scott BARKLAMB	X			Mr Adnan ABU EL RAGHEB			
M. Hamidou DIOP	X			Mr Farooq AHMED	X		
Mr Rajeev DUBEY	X			Mme Joséphine ANDRIAMAMONJIARISON	X		
Sr. Alberto ECHAVARRÍA	X			Mr John BECKETT	X		
Ms Renate HORNUNG-DRAUS				Sr. Pablo DRAGÚN	X		
Sr. José María LACASA ASO	X			M. Khelil GHARIANI			
Mr Thomas MACKALL				Mr Vern GILL			
Mr Hiroyuki MATSUI	X			Mr Chariton KYRIAZIS			
Mr Khalifa MATTAR	X			Ms Hansong LIU			
Mr Mthunzi MDWABA	X			Sr. Juan MAILHOS			
M. El Mahfoudh MEGATELI	X			M. Blaise MATTHEY	X		
Mr Henrik MUNTHE	X			Ms Marina MOSKVINA			
Mme Anne VAUCHEZ	X			Ms Jacqueline MUGO			
Sr. Fernando YLLANES				M. Koffi N'DRI			
				Mr Olusegun OSHINOWO	X		
				Sr. Guido RICCI	X		
				Mr Ton SCHOENMAECKERS	X		
				Mr Joze SMOLE			
				Mr Ancheta TAN	X		
TOTAL	11	0	0	TOTAL	9	0	0

REGULAR MEMBERS/MEMBRES TITULAIRES/MIEMBROS TITULARES				DEPUTY MEMBERS/MEMBRES ADJOINTS/MIEMBROS ADJUNTOS			
WORKERS TRAVAILLEURS TRABAJADORES	AGREE POUR DE ACUERDO	DO NOT AGREE (CONSENSUS) CONTRE (CONSENSUS) EN DESACUERDO (CONSENSO)	DO NOT AGREE (NO CONSENSUS) CONTRE (PAS DE CONSENSUS) EN DESACUERDO (NO CONSENSO)	WORKERS TRAVAILLEURS TRABAJADORES	AGREE POUR DE ACUERDO	DO NOT AGREE (CONSENSUS) CONTRE (CONSENSUS) EN DESACUERDO (CONSENSO)	DO NOT AGREE (NO CONSENSUS) CONTRE (PAS DE CONSENSUS) EN DESACUERDO (NO CONSENSO)
Mr Francis ATWOLI				Sr. Antonio AMANCIO VALE			
Ms Silvana CAPPUCCIO	X			Mr Zahoor AWAN			
Mr R. Pillai CHANDRASEKHARAN				Ms Amanda BROWN			
Ms Marie CLARKE WALKER				Ms Annette CHIPELEME	X		
M. Luc CORTEBEECK	X	1(a), 1(f)		Mr Plamen DIMITROV	X		
Sra. Maria Fernanda FRANCISCO	X			Mme Amal EL AMRI			
Ms Akiko GONO	X			Sra. Eulogia FAMILIA	X		
Mr Guangping JIANG				Sra. Rosa Elena FLERERZ GONZÁLEZ			
Sr. Gerardo MARTINEZ	X			M. Mody GUIRO			
Ms Catelene PASSCHIER	X			Mr Said IQBAL			
Mr Kelly ROSS				Ms Mary LIEW KIAH ENG			
M. Bernard THIBAUT	X	1(a), 1(f)		Ms Claudia MENNE			
Mr Ayuba WABBA				Ms Toni MOORE			
Mr Richard WAGSTAFF				M. Modeste NDONGALA	X		
				Mr Magnus NORDDAHL	X		
				Mr Bheki NTSHALINTSHALI			
				Ms Binda PANDEY	X		
				Mr Mohammed Shafer SAED	X		
				Mr Alexey ZHARKOV	X		
TOTAL	7	2	0	TOTAL	8	0	0

TOTAL	AGREE POUR DE ACUERDO	DO NOT AGREE (CONSENSUS) CONTRE (CONSENSUS) EN DESACUERDO (CONSENSO)	DO NOT AGREE (NO CONSENSUS) CONTRE (PAS DE CONSENSUS) EN DESACUERDO (NO CONSENSO)
Regular members /membres titulaires / miembros titulares	38	8	1
Deputy members /membres adjoints / miembros adjuntos	28	1	0
All members / tous les membres / todos los miembros	66	9	1

Count of votes of regular members on decision 1(b)

GOVERNMENTS	AGREE	DO NOT AGREE	ABSTAIN
Azerbaijan	X		
Bahrain	X		
Barbados	X		
Brazil		X	
Canada	X		
Chile	X		
China	X		
Côte d'Ivoire	X		
Ethiopia	NO REPLY		
France	X		
Germany	X		
India	NO REPLY		
Iran (Islamic Republic of)	X		
Ireland	X		
Italy		X	
Japan	X		
Korea (Republic of)	X		
Lesotho	X		
Mauritania	NO REPLY		
Panamá	X		
Peru	X		
Poland	X		
Russian Federation	NO REPLY		
Senegal			X
Chad	X		
Thailand		X	
United Kingdom	X		
United States	X		
TOTAL GOVERNMENTS	24	3	1

EMPLOYERS	AGREE	DO NOT AGREE	ABSTAIN
Mr Scott BARKLAMB	X		
MR Hamidou DIOP	X		
Mr Rajeev DUBEY	X		
Mr Alberto ECHAVARRÍA	X		
Ms Renate HORNUNG-DRAUS	NO REPLY		
Mr José María LACASA ASO	X		
Mr Thomas MACKALL	NO REPLY		
Mr Hiroyuki MATSUI	X		
Mr Khalifa MATTAR	X		
Mr Mthunzi MDWABA	X		
MR El Mahfoudh MEGATELI	X		
Mr Henrik MUNTHE	X		
Ms Anne VAUCHEZ	X		
Mr Fernando YLLANES	NO REPLY		
TOTAL EMPLOYERS	14	0	0

WORKERS	AGREE	DO NOT AGREE	ABSTAIN
Mr Francis ATWOLI	NO REPLY		
Ms Silvana CAPPUCCIO	X		
Mr R. Pillai CHANDRASEKHARAN	NO REPLY		
Ms Marie CLARKE WALKER	NO REPLY		
MR Luc CORTEBEECK	X		
Ms Maria Fernanda FRANCISCO	X		
Ms Akiko GONO	X		
Mr Guangping JIANG	NO REPLY		
Mr Gerardo MARTINEZ	X		
Ms Catelene PASSCHIER	X		
Mr Kelly ROSS	X		
MR Bernard THIBAUT	X		
Mr Ayuba WABBA	NO REPLY		
Mr Richard WAGSTAFF	NO REPLY		
TOTAL WORKERS	14	0	0
	AGREE	DO NOT AGREE	ABSTAIN
GRAND TOTAL	52	3	1

Comments from Governing Body members

BULGARIA
Deputy Government
member

1(b) We express the position for voluntary rather than mandatory provision of additional information containing new developments on reports already submitted to the ILO under article 22 in 2019. We believe that the abovementioned point will impose additional burden on those Member States, which have already started preparing their national reports under the normal reporting under article 22 of the ILO Constitution. The process of preparing national reports on ratified conventions of the Organization is, by its nature, a long-term task, requiring information and data to be provided by different departments, which in turn requires timely action to request the necessary information from the competent institutions. In this regard, kindly please be informed that Bulgaria has already started the preparation of its national reports under article 22. The Ministry of Labour and Social Policy has sent letters to the relevant directorates and agencies for the reporting purposes. The suggested approach in item (b) will require a whole reorganization of the already started process of preparing the national reports. We believe that this would create not only additional burden, but also confusion among the administration. Furthermore, from a time perspective the proposed new reporting format would create in our opinion difficulties, given the fact that it is already the end of the first half of the year and we are getting closer to the new proposed deadline for reporting – 15 September–1 October 2020. The need for time to translate the reports should also be taken into account.

1(c) Our position on this item should be read in line with the opinion expressed under item (b).
1(e) As already noted, Bulgaria has started the preparation of the reports under article 22 of the ILO Constitution, according to this year's list for reporting of the International Labour Office. Our position on this point should be read in conjunction with the views expressed on point (b).

Bulgaria understands the complex situation and the challenges faced by all Member States in relation to the crisis caused by the COVID-19 pandemic and we aim at finding the most appropriate and effective solution for Member States in order to fulfil their reporting obligations. We would like to point out that at this stage certain unclarity still exist with regard to the new proposed reporting approach. First, whether the 2021 reporting reference period for the list of ratified conventions (foreseen under the normal reporting for 2020) will now cover five instead of four years. Second, whether the new reporting approach for this year affects also the preparation of the very first report on a ratified convention – in case of reopening the 2019 reports, should the aforesaid first report be submitted or not. This year Bulgaria was requested to submit its first report on the Minimum Wage Fixing Convention, 1970 (No. 131), that was ratified in March 2018.

MEXICO
Deputy Government
member

The Government of Mexico wishes to state its disagreement with the change made to the voting options for deputy members of the Governing Body – namely: (1) Agree; (2) Do not agree but without blocking consensus and (3) Do not agree and block consensus – as the options do not correspond to the practice nor are they in line with the provisions on voting established by the Standing Orders of the Governing Body and the Standing Orders of the Conference.

The inclusion of the term “block consensus” contradicts the explanation in paragraph 46 of the introductory note to the Standing Orders of the Governing Body, which indicates that consensus is “an established practice under which every effort is made to reach without vote an agreement that is generally accepted”. The practice of the Governing Body is precisely this – that the reservations of any member do not mean any ability to “block consensus”, as was included in the options. Furthermore, the voting system under the Standing Orders of the Governing Body provides sufficient leeway for those who dissent from the general trend to make their position or reservations known, as indicated in paragraph 46, without the need to block consensus, and to have them placed on record. Consequently, the Government of Mexico reiterates that it is not possible to create voting categories that are different from those set out in the Standing Orders of the Governing Body, and that the exceptional nature of the current vote by correspondence does not create any precedent for the future.

1(b) The Government of Mexico understands that this decision is not to be interpreted as a break in the 2019 reporting cycle, hence the decision must not set any precedent, as it stems from the health emergency resulting from the COVID-19 pandemic.

PANAMA
Regular Government
member

1(f) The Government of Panama already submitted this report on 28 February 2020.

1(g) The Government of Panama is engaged in tripartite consultations on the responses to that questionnaire and will be sending them shortly.

THAILAND
Regular Government
member

1(g) Thailand has submitted the 2019 and 2020 reports under article 19, as well as the 2019 reports under article 22. We have already started the 2020 reporting process and will submit the reports by 1st September 2020. If the report cycle has been deferred by one year, we would definitely have to review our work plans and reports. Consequently, we would like to propose to submit the reports as planned.

Mr Luc CORTEBEECK Regular Worker member	1(a) and 1(f) I think that the wording is too weak. We invite Member States to ... and then we add “if they so wish”. That is not the meaning of article 19, and risks setting a precedent.
Ms Eulogia FAMILIA Deputy Worker member	<p>1(a) I think that it is important to obtain information on the overall employment situation to be able to evaluate the impact of COVID-19 on employment – the setbacks and new situations in the protection of decent work that the pandemic has caused for workers – and to promote a more solid recovery of the economy and work.</p> <p>1(b) It is important that States provide information on their actions to apply Conventions before the pandemic became global and that more in-depth knowledge is obtained on the strengths and weaknesses of the working conditions when the pandemic took us by surprise.</p> <p>1(e) Although the ILO Conventions are valid tools for overcoming the crisis and bringing about economic recovery, we are aware that the paralysis and authoritarianism imposed by confinement and the break in normal operations make it necessary to continue require it but to leave some breathing space to States so that they can return to normality and the parties can submit more precise reports.</p> <p>1(f) and 1(g) Very much in agreement. Mainly because we need more in-depth information on the role of these groups of workers, especially in healthcare, and the risks, vulnerability and opportunities in the circumstances.</p>
Ms Catelene PASSCHIER Regular Worker member	<p>On behalf of my group, I am asked to convey the message to you that as a group we have major difficulties with the way the points for decision on the reporting exercise (point 1), notably about the points 1(a) and 1(f) have been formulated by the Screening Group. Both the fact that they are conveying the message that Member States do not really have to make an effort to report (by using the language that they are only “invited” to report, and only “if they so wish”) and the fact that in all points (including 1(b)) there is no explicit reference whatsoever to the Coronavirus pandemic (only asking about “relevant developments”), whereas the issues to report about, notably employment and specific instruments related to the care system, such as the nursing Convention, have a clear and important relevance in the current crisis. This has a negative impact on how seriously the reporting obligations by Member States will be taken, and how relevant the exercise will turn out to be in terms of its results and the possibilities for the Committee of Experts to deal with them. However, in the interest of moving forward with the reporting exercise my group will reluctantly agree with the proposed points for decision. We want these comments to be reported to the Screening Group when the results of this voting exercise are discussed, including our message that this way of working is questioning the importance of upholding the supervisory system, also in times of crisis, and cannot and should not be used as a precedent for the future.</p>
