



## 第一项议程

# 改善国际劳工大会和区域会议的运行

## 背景

1. 自理事会和国际劳工大会的运行工作组(WP/GBC)在理事会第 312 届会议(2011 年 11 月)期间举行会议后，理事会要求劳工局编写一份文件，将工作组在讨论期间提出的所有各点加以合并，并举行一次设在日内瓦的三方磋商小组会议<sup>1</sup>，以便制定包括时间框架在内的一个工作计划。<sup>2</sup>
2. 磋商小组在其 2012 年 2 月 9 日举行的会议上审议了一份议题文件(附后)，该文件以排列成表的形式介绍了 11 月份提出的建议，这些建议被分成 7 个主要的章节：A.一般问题；B.国际劳工大会的结构；C.国际劳工大会的议程确定；D.国际劳工大会全会；E.国际劳工大会委员会的工作方法；F.国际劳工大会的代表和与会者；G.提高效率和其他。议题文件还概括了工作组的成员就在理事会第 312 届会议上提交供讨论的议题所表达的反应。<sup>3</sup>
3. 应当忆及磋商小组不具有决策权，其作用是通过提出一些问题并确定主要的方向促进理事会的讨论，然后可将它们馈入工作组的讨论。
4. 这份文件的第一部分逐章概括了这些非正式磋商期间所表达的重要问题和观点，以供工作组讨论。第 2 部分论述了工作组的今后工作计划。

<sup>1</sup> 设在日内瓦的三方磋商小组由区域协调员以及雇主组和工人组的秘书组成。

<sup>2</sup> 理事会文件 GB.312/INS/13，第 13 段。

<sup>3</sup> 理事会文件 GB.312/WP/GBC/1。

## 第一部分

### A. 一般问题

5. 就下列各点形成了广泛的共识：(i)在现行章程框架范围内开展改革进程的必要；(ii)加强作为本组织的最高机构的国际劳工大会(ILC)的必要；(iii)维持国际劳工大会的5个主要职能<sup>4</sup>(章程性、政治性、技术性、论坛和会议)；(iv)为改革进程制定一个时间表的必要，牢记将于2012年5月选出的新局长对这一进程的指导将是至关重要的；和(v)改革进程应受共识驱动，使三方成员具有一种对国际劳工大会的拥有感。

### B. 国际劳工大会的结构

6. 关于区域会议(亦属于工作组的权责范围)与国际劳工大会之间的联系，以及在这两个论坛之间取得更多一致性的必要，工作组考虑应优先审议国际劳工大会的运行，然后再根据在有关国际劳工大会方面取得的进展审议区域会议。关于国际劳工大会的会期，这一观点得到了广泛的共鸣，即其目前的持续时间对于渴望的参与水平来说是一个障碍，并进而影响到三方成员对大会及其成果的拥有感。缩短会期将会是有益的，但条件是确保大会能够令人满意和充分地履行其职能。假如筹备进程得以改善，可能会影响到大会的会期及其结构。
7. 2006年2月的国际劳工大会海事会议的创新程序和形式，被当作一个可能的灵感来源加以强调。然而，人们注意到尽管筹备是非常有效的，但大会本身的会期也同样有效。海事大会的特殊性也得到了强调。此外，人们承认不应低估技术筹备会议的费用，并应在以此类筹备会议取代第一次大会讨论的可能性的任何考虑中牢记这一点。
8. 法律顾问证实由成员国提交的有关劳工标准的批准与实施报告的审议是必须在章程规定的基础上列入议程的唯一项目。将要列入大会议程的其他技术性项目的数目由理事会根据惯例和已确定的将由大会成立的技术委员会的数目决定。

### C. 国际劳工大会的议程确定

9. 磋商小组忆及其2012年2月2日就国际劳工大会的议程确定进程所开展的先前讨论，并重申了其某些结论如下：
- 将向理事会提交的大会议程项目的遴选(根据《国际劳工组织关于争取公平全球化的社会正义宣言》进行周期性讨论的项目除外)应是在与三方成员的广泛磋商基础之上进行不断审议的一个进程，在这方面，三个主要的来源被确定为潜在

<sup>4</sup>如同在理事会文件 GB.312/WP/GBC/1 第 17 段中提出的那样。

建议的“生成器”：劳工局；国际劳工组织会议的成果和从劳动世界中涌现出的问题；和三方成员本身；

- 尽管应将周期性讨论视为是议程确定进程中筹备工作的组成部分，并将为今后的大会产生新的议程项目，但这一进程不应自动将周期性讨论转变成两次讨论；
- 为允许对包括周期性讨论委员会在内的作为技术性委员会之一的工作的后续措施可能选择一个项目，或就需要迫切审议的一个主题性问题进行可能的选择，在理事会 6 月份的会议之前应留出一段时间。应当承认，有关议程项目最后决定的时间选择不仅需要考虑到处理具有主题重要性问题的益处，而且也需要考虑到包括标准制订在内的筹备工作所需的适当时间。

## D. 国际劳工大会全会

10. 人们承认，“全体会议未能获得希望吸引的广泛兴趣”。同时，在全会上发言的权利被普遍认为是极其重要的。
11. 普遍的观点是应在较晚的阶段处理局长报告的主题和讨论形式，以使新局长有机会就其作用提出他/她的愿景。不过，人们承认，通过讨论局长的报告而给他/她一个与国际劳工组织的三方成员互动的机会是国际劳工大会的一个重要特征。
12. 应探讨可供选择的和创新型解决办法，如主题会议而不是一个连续性的全会，目的是使全体会议更具互动性和吸引力。
13. 尽管数目日益增加的国家元首和政府首脑到访大会被认为是本组织的一个积极的发展，但应采取努力，以确保将这些到访更有效地结合进国际劳工大会的全面工作计划。

## E. 国际劳工大会委员会的工作方法

14. 人们同意，透明、可预测和客观应在大会委员会的工作方法中成为主流，包括标准实施委员会的工作方法在内。在这方面强调了这一点，即应将实施公约和建议书专家委员会非正式三方工作组的讨论结果馈入理事会和国际劳工大会运行工作组的讨论。在这方面，建议在国际劳工大会开幕前至少两周将标准实施委员会讨论的初步案例清单送交给成员国。
15. 人们注意到一般性讨论项目是在国际劳工大会上有价值的议程项目。然而，人们对近期出现的后续措施的质量表达了某种程度的失望，并建议一般性讨论项目的选择应更具战略性。在某些情况下，它们可被视为是有关标准制订活动的筹备工作。

## F. 国际劳工大会的代表和与会者

16. 提出了平衡出席国际劳工大会的国家代表团的构成的问题。要求劳工局向工作组提供有关代表团的构成，特别是有关组和性别的更具体的分列数据。人们注意到，代表团的规模应允许其成员参与国际劳工大会议程上的所有项目。

## G. 效率的提高和其他

17. 人们承认，劳工局需要对大会管理采取一种更具成本效益的处理方法。关于计划和预算要求减少国际劳工大会预算的问题，劳工局已确定了一些措施，包括：

- 口译服务的更好计划；
- 减少加班小时；
- 避免延长非标准制订会议或周期性讨论；
- 临时记录的准备方面的节省方法。

18. 人们还同意，不应将国际劳工大会的改革视为纯粹的削减费用举措。其主要目的是使国际劳工大会的设计能够有效地履行其《章程》权责和职能。

19. 咨询小组承认发行临时记录的重要性，但同意进一步检查提出的减少其生产成本的各种选择。

## 第二部分

### 前进的方向

20. 磋商小组进行讨论之后的普遍意见是，考虑到上述情况以及即将进行的局长选举，为工作组今后的工作计划确定一个固定的时间表为时尚早。然而，可以这样设想，根据工作组 2012 年 3 月将要进行的讨论及其可能就下一步改革进程向劳工局提供的指导，劳工局可准备一份已将新当选局长的观点纳入其中的文件。可先将该文件提交给将于夏天的几个月期间举行的磋商小组的一次会议。然后，将由理事会于 2012 年 11 月提出一个更详尽的改革项目的议程，并提出了应在其中处理这些项目的一个拟议时间框架。

## ILC Reform/Working Party GBC

# Issues Paper

(For informal consultations – February 2012)

1. Following the meeting of the Working Party (WP/GBC) held during the 312<sup>th</sup> Session of the Governing Body (November 2011), the Office was requested to prepare an issues paper to be discussed by the Geneva-based tripartite consultative group.
2. Based on the interventions made during the meeting of the Working Party, the proposals have been divided into seven main chapters: A) General issues; B) ILC structure; C) ILC agenda-setting; D) ILC Plenary; E) Working methods of ILC committees; F) ILC delegates and participants; and G) Efficiency gains and others.
3. Within each chapter, the Office has followed the order of presentation at the November 2011 meeting. The numbering has been introduced to facilitate references to respective proposals during the next phase of the consultations.

<b>A. General issues</b>	
<b>Proposals :</b>	<b>Office comments :</b>
<p><b>1. Government G:</b> <i>“...objectives of this exercise should be, first, to strengthen the ILC as the highest policy-making body of the ILO. Second, to ensure that its deliberations respond to addressing issues and contemporary challenges. Third...to enhance transparency of efficiency in its procedures. Fourth, to guarantee the predictability in the proceedings...and, fifth, to enhance objectivity of documents and procedures.”</i></p> <p><b>2. GRULAC:</b> <i>“...It is crucial ... that the functioning of the ILO should be improved: 1) so it can serve and answer better to the needs of its tripartite constituents; 2) so it can fulfil its mandate as a high level body in which vital decisions are taken and which sets out the most important orientations for the ILO; and to continue perfecting procedures with a view to enhancing objectivity, predictability and transparency...”</i></p> <p><b>3. ASPAG:</b> <i>“The five major functions of the Conference namely its constitutional function, political function, technical function, forum function and assembly function, should be meticulously examined for further fundamental improvement and higher level of efficacy.”</i></p> <p><b>4. AFRICAN G.:</b> <i>“...improvements can be introduced regarding the five essential functions”.</i></p> <p><b>5. Workers:</b> <i>“...any discussion to improve the Conference should aim at strengthening the supreme organ of the Organization, particularly, its standard-setting and</i></p>	<p><u>General comments:</u> -It seems that there is a general consensus on the main functions of the ILC as set out in paragraph 17 of GB.312/WP/GBC/1. -It seems that there is also a general consensus to work within the existing framework of the ILO Constitution.</p> <p>Can we take these two assumptions as part of the framework of the present exercise?</p> <p>-Proposal 5.A: As a legal matter, the standard-setting and recurrent discussion functions could be considered a <i>sine qua</i></p>

<p><i>supervision functions and improve its tripartite participation. We therefore reaffirm a commitment to the five functions of the Conference as identified in paragraph 17: constitutional; political; technical; forum; and assembly...Our engagement in any discussion on Conference improvement can only take place if there is an agreement on these fundamentals.”</i></p> <p><b>6. Workers:</b> “ <i>We also agree with paragraph 20 of the document, in that any measures that may eventually be adopted in the future to improve the functioning of the Conference, should remain within the Constitutional framework of the Conference. “</i></p> <p><b>7. Employers:</b> “<i>...We agree firstly that this reform must indubitably be carried out within the framework and in the limits of the Constitution.”</i></p> <p><b>8. France :</b> “ <i>...We must put our priorities in order. Is the ILC first and foremost a parliament of labour, which votes texts and approves the budget? Is it a political platform, a showcase for the Organization, a tripartite forum, or is it a little bit of all this at the same time? Once we have our priorities in order of importance that will help us to determine the means that need to be put in place.”</i></p> <p><b>9. China :</b> “ <i>...it is essential to improve the efficiency and transparency of the Conference. All proposals concerning the structure and procedures of the Conference must be based on that.”</i></p>	<p><i>non</i> (see Preamble and art. 9 of the ILO Constitution; ILO Declaration on Social Justice for a Fair Globalization, 2008).</p> <p>-Proposal 8.A: The « constitutional » and « political » functions concern constitutionally-mandated substantive outputs of the ILC, while the categories « technical », « forum » and « assembly » concern the nature of the ILC and its procedures. How the different functions interrelate is relevant to this exercise to achieve efficiency, transparency, while maintaining the ILC’s essential role, as many noted. The constitutional and political functions could be properly prioritized recognizing the imperative nature of certain constitutional functions of the ILC; and the technical, forum and assembly functions treated as means to achieving the substantive functions.</p>
---	---

<b>B. ILC structure</b>	
<b>Proposals :</b>	<b>Office comments :</b>
<p><b>1. GRULAC:</b> “<i>the objective of any reform of the current structure of the Conference must be to enhance its clarity and transparency. More than structural changes, improvements in procedures, working methods and the functioning of meetings are called for.”</i></p> <p><b>2. AFRICAN G.:</b> “<i>... a greater number of regional meetings would have a significant effect on the success of the Conference. To this end, the agendas of regional meetings should be brought into line with the ILC agenda, such that</i></p>	<p>-Proposal 2.B: On the linkage between Regional Meetings (RMs) and the ILC, while increased frequency of RMs may be difficult to operationalize, in</p>

<p><i>regional meetings provide a preparatory framework for Conference sessions...</i></p> <p><b>3. IMEC:</b> <i>“... need for more in-depth reform of the present structure of the ILC, alternating between full sessions and lighter sessions, as suggested in past debates, might be desirable. On the other hand, the ILC should still meet today’s demands of efficiency and results. The experience made in relation with the elaboration and the adoption of the Maritime and Labour Convention should be kept in mind. Therefore, IMEC sees a need in reviewing the whole process of the Conference and find a more efficient means to address some of the more routine procedural issues. For example...it should be possible to reduce the length of the opening session and make it possible to start work in the committees earlier on the opening day. If necessary, Standing Orders should be adjusted to allow more efficiency.”</i></p> <p><b>4. IMEC:</b> <i>“...sees a link between the ILC reform and the reform of the Regional Meetings...Therefore, IMEC would have appreciated that the discussions on the cost merits for the Regional Meetings...had been reflected in the paper too...”</i></p> <p><b>5. Workers:</b> <i>“...not convinced that, in the light of the suspension of the <b>Resolutions Committee</b> in 2006, the transfer to the Selection Committee of urgent resolution is a good solution. What happened this year with the resolution on policy coherence, showed the limitation of using the Selection Committee as a body to debate the political content of resolution. Another issue is resolutions in general as opposed to urgent resolutions. When the Resolutions Committee still existed, it allowed the Conference, every two years, to have important policy debates. We could therefore think of re-establishing the Resolutions Committee, for instance, to replace a general discussion every two years by a Resolutions Committee...”</i></p> <p><b>6. Workers:</b> <i>“...Our group would be opposed to the idea of alternating between the lighter and a full session of the Conference as this would go against the principle of strengthening the Conference and its tripartite participation.”</i></p> <p><b>7. Workers:</b> <i>“... We also do not understand the link made between the ILC reform and the reform of Regional Meetings. We hope this is not the way for shifting policy decision on a regional basis in meetings where there is not participatory approach in the agenda setting for example nor real tripartism in the action. We do not see the added value of Regional Meetings as preparatory meetings of the ILC as proposed by some of the Governments.”</i></p> <p><b>8. Switzerland:</b> <i>“...feel that it is necessary to go further in reforming the Conference. There is a pressing need to alternate complete sessions with lighter sessions, as far as possible without general discussions. The Office should</i></p>	<p>particular due to the present budget constraints, it may be useful to consider tighter coherence across the RMs in relation to the developments concerning the ILCs between RMs, and to include the RM results at higher visibility in the Director-General’s Reports to the ILC.</p> <p>-Proposal 3.B: To avoid the opening day formalities relating to suspensions of the Standing Orders, one could consider proposals for revision of the Standing Orders in some of the areas subject of consistent suspensions since 2008 (see para.31 GB.312/WP/GBC/1).</p> <p>-Proposal 4.B: See comment to proposal 7.B (ILC structure)</p> <p>-Proposal 5.B: On the Resolutions Committee, the agenda of the ILC already has a built-in biennial rhythm for a P&amp;B year and non-P&amp;B year: this biennial cycle provides for no Resolutions Committee in P&amp;B years. However, Resolutions Committees in non-P&amp;B years have been suspended since 2006, leaving only urgent and formal resolutions. One could consider further lightening the agenda, either in the way proposed by the Workers or in other ways.</p> <p>-Proposal 7.B: The main reason why the Office raised this question was because, in the past, suggestions have been made to hold Regional Meetings in Geneva immediately after or before the ILC. This would reduce the financial burden both for Governments and for the Office.</p> <p>-Proposal 8.B: One would need to keep in mind the needs of Members who do not regularly attend the ILC due to costs constraints and distance. Regarding</p>
--	---

<p><i>provide concrete proposals along these lines.... The holding of technical preparatory conferences would contribute to improving the effectiveness of the discussion of draft standards. This was possible when drawing up the Maritime Labour Convention (MLC, 2006), in a single session, without clashing with the rules in force.... Such technical preparatory conferences do not necessarily have to coincide with the sessions of the Conference. The Office paper should also explore the possibility of placing these technical preparatory conferences within the sphere of sectoral activities so as to replace meetings of experts, sectoral meetings and even global dialogue forums..."</i></p>	<p>preparatory technical conferences/commissions, experience shows that they are costly. Apart from the technical and political considerations, a cost-comparison in relation to a first discussion could also be useful.</p> <p>Is there enough merit in this idea (Switzerland), for the Office to make concrete proposals?</p>
--	---

<p><b>C. ILC agenda-setting</b></p>	
<p><b>Proposals :</b></p>	<p><b>Office comments :</b></p>
<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. <b>GRULAC:</b> <i>"... consider it essential that the process of establishing and preparing the agenda should be made more simple and objective. Thus, items that do not encounter significant support should not be retained as proposals year after year. Items should be as current as possible and should follow labour market developments for a general discussion."</i></li> <li>2. <b>AFRICAN G.:</b> <i>"... When drawing up the agenda, the Office must stress priorities and promote tripartite consultations. "</i></li> <li>3. <b>IMEC:</b> <i>"...It is of utmost importance to ensure a transparent decision-making process for setting the ILC agenda that facilitates the participation of the three groups. The use of electronic expression of preference is an option to be considered. The objectives should be to identify current and emerging issues for which the ILC can develop focus concrete responses. The process also needs to be sufficiently flexible to allow changes to address urgent new issues as they arise. The Office should support the agenda selection process by developing well explained and justified proposals on timely and forward-looking issues. These should include issues proposed by the Governments, Workers' and Employers' groups, standard setting items identified in the conclusions of the recurrent discussions, and recommendations of the standard review mechanism once it is operational. Items that are not chosen year after year should be removed from the list."</i></li> <li>4. <b>Netherlands:</b> <i>"... stress the need for a more central role of the recurrent discussions in the process of preparing for the ILC agenda. The 2008 Declaration... introduced the important recurrent item discussions at the ...Conference....The main purpose...is to better understand the current needs of constituents...On the basis of that experience...we feel that the recurrent item discussion...should be more central to the ILC and its agenda setting. Not only by having the recurrent discussion itself but also in its preparation and its follow-up. The GB should decide on the basis of the conclusions of the recurrent discussion if it should be followed up by the Conference. If that is the case this could</i></li> </ol>	<p>-Proposals 3.C and 4.C: The Office has proposed that the ILO constituents take advantage of the ongoing informal consultations on the 2014 ILC Agenda, to discuss the modalities of selection of the Conference agenda items. A short note has been prepared, highlighting, among others, the possible implications of the 2008 Declaration in that regard.</p>



*take the form of either standard setting or general discussion which addresses specific aspects that came up in the recurrent discussion. This way we would be truly acting in the spirit of the 2008 Declaration...*

- 5. Switzerland:** *"...reducing the Governing Body discussion on the Conference agenda to a single round, as close as possible to the Conference, is a possibility to be examined. Abandoning general discussions, in so far as possible, is an option for consideration, since such discussions are not part of the Conference's constitutional mandate. One solution would be that a general discussion could be held, even in plenary, on the report of the Director-General. Another option would be once again to reinforce sectoral activities, and reformat general discussions to take place within the framework of meetings of experts, technical meetings or global dialogue forums."*

## **D. ILC Plenary**

### **Proposals :**

### **Office comments :**

- 1. GRULAC:** *"... recognize that plenary sittings do not enjoy the general interest that is desired and believe that we should discuss means of making them more attractive. However, tripartite delegates should retain the right to take the floor in plenary."*
- 2. IMEC:** *"... the last review of the ILC resulted in the current arrangement, whereby the plenary session takes place during the third week. This allowed savings by reducing the needs to rent the plenary hall for a full two weeks. However, with the introduction of numerous high-level guests and panels, we have experienced that plenary sessions are now being scheduled in the second week, eliminating such savings. In addition, many speakers addressed a near-empty plenary hall. While the selection of high-level speakers and the quality of the panel discussions have been excellent, there still is a need to balance such events with the requirement to complete the work of the agenda of the Conference, including the adoption of the Committee Reports. IMEC suggests that a working group explores alternatives that could improve efficiency while protecting the right of delegates to address the ILC."*
- 3. Workers:** *"...The two points on suspension of rules on time limits at the Conference, panels and high-level summits deal with the interactive nature of the Conference and high-level participation. While Workers support such dimension in both cases, we want to stress that the tripartite nature of the Organization needs to be enhanced. Too many times we have seen speaking slots mostly allocated to Governments with no Worker and Employer participation."*
- 4. Workers:** *"... we do not deny that the participation rate for the plenary debate outside speeches of Heads of State is unsatisfactory. We are ready to discuss how to make the*

-Proposal 2.D: In fact, the Office has always booked the plenary room for the entire duration of the ILC in order to accommodate planned or last-minute high-level guests and panels, as well as other unforeseen events.

<p><i>speeches of the delegates...become part of the real life of the Organization.”</i></p> <p><b>5. Workers:</b> “... are happy that the document sees value in maintaining the voting process in the plenary as a democratic affirmation of the Conference. We also noted that time has been saved in relation to the debate on the Director-General report by having some of the Director-General replies provided in writing.”</p> <p><b>6. Employers:</b> “...There is no denying... that the plenary debate is a succession of monologues, followed by any circumstantial event that might capture attention, but let’s not be fooled: it is the crisis that has made us relevant over the past few years...”</p> <p><b>7. Employers:</b> “...we should not avoid the subject of the length of the Conference. Frankly we already know that to capture and retain the attention of relevant personalities from the field of governments, workers and employers over a three week period is a losing battle... In fact, today, we have two Conferences – a technical one and a political one, and between the two ... there is a clear split. The split occurs because participants coming for the technical part normally leave on the Friday or Saturday of the second week, and those arriving for the political part turn up with almost no knowledge of what has been discussed the previous week...”</p> <p><b>8. Switzerland:</b> “...In lighter sessions, plenary sittings could be limited to the essential functions of the Conference: the standard setting and technical functions... The discussion of the report of the Director-General should be restricted to two days, organized around round tables or high-level interactive debates. One day should then suffice for adopting the committee reports without discussion, including the budget, and for fulfilling the other technical and standard setting functions.</p>	<p>-Proposal 8.D: There is room for innovation, so long as the right of Members to speak at the time of adoption of reports is preserved (this apart from the Credentials reports which do not so permit.).</p> <p>Is there enough merit in this idea (Switzerland), for the Office to make concrete proposals?</p>
---	---

<b>E. Working methods of ILC committees</b>	
<b>Proposals :</b>	<b>Office comments :</b>
<p><b>Technical committees:</b></p> <p><b>1. GRULAC:</b> “... all the committees ... can and must be improved with a view to ensuring more transparency, objectivity and predictability. As a suggestion... stresses that the relation between the work of the Committee on the Application of Conventions and Recommendations in its analysis of the Global Report, and the committees for recurrent discussion items, should be re-evaluated, because we cannot see positive results coming from discussions held separately”.</p> <p><b>2. IMEC:</b> “The standard-setting role of the ILC is central for</p>	<p>-Proposal 1.E: The synergy between the discussion of the General Survey by the Committee on Application of Standards and the report by the recurrent item Committee will be improved as of 2014 when the timing of the General Survey discussion will take place the year before the recurrent item Committee discussion on related strategic objective (see GB.309/10 and subsequent decision).</p>

*the ILO but the methods of standard-setting might also need to be reviewed in the light of the discussions in LILS on ensuring updated and relevant standards. Does the current framework ensure sufficient flexibility for future challenges?"*

3. **IMEC:** *"Regarding the recurrent discussions, it will be important to ensure that they are prepared and carried out in a manner that fulfils the objectives of the 2008 Declaration...Recurrent discussions are intended to permit an assessment of the impacts of ILO work and identification of needs of constituents in order to ensure that the ILO fully understands and strengthens its response to the needs of its constituents."*
4. **Workers:** *"...We also believe that, especially, in the case of technical committees, the use of panels should be exercised with care as one should not transform committee work in exchanges of views. Rather, one needs to ensure to keep the focus on reaching negotiated tripartite conclusions, and it is, of course, obvious that the use of panels...should not be used in committees whose purpose is to adopt standards as the time should be used to reach a consensus of the text of the instrument."*
5. **Switzerland:** *"...Improvements to the working methods of the technical committees... should only concern standards issues, to the extent that general discussions should be dropped. Preparatory technical conferences would be made responsible for preparing, finalizing and consolidating draft standards in a single session. Five working days should suffice to complete this finalization and consolidation."*

#### **Standards Committee**

6. **Government G:** *"...notes that the deliberations of this Working Party are closely linked to the discussions in the informal working group of the Conference Committee on the Application of Standards. Both groups should work in a coordinated, coherent and convergent manner."*
7. **GRULAC:** *"...ways of increasing the predictability, objectivity and transparency of the proceedings of the Standards Committee should be sought. The delay in publishing the list of individual cases... reveals the need for more clearly defined rules. This delay... has seriously compromised the capacity of many delegations from our region to participate adequately in the Conference ... GRULAC thus maintains that the discussions of the informal Working Group... should be incorporated into the deliberations of the present Working Group."*
8. **AFRICAN G:** *"... Regarding improvements to the working methods of the Standards Committee, the African group considers that the Committee's functioning should be re-thought, taking account of criteria of transparency, objectivity and equity"*
9. **IMEC:** *"The Committee...experienced again this year some difficulties with respect to efficient use of time, primarily due*

-Proposal 2.E: What kind of modalities should be envisaged?

-Proposal 3.E: See comments to proposals 3 and 4.C (ILC agenda-setting) as well as 1.E

-Proposal 5.E: See comment to proposal 8.B (ILC structure)

#### General comments:

Since the Tripartite Working Group of the ILC Committee on the Application of Standards was set up, it has already met 11 times. Its recommendations for increasing transparency and enhancing its working methods have been submitted to the Conference Committee on application of Standards each year at the beginning of its work for consideration and adoption. The issues dealt with are over and above the matters covered by the provisions of Section H of the Standing Orders of the Conference. The outcome of the work of the Working Group which have already been adopted by the Conference Committee and thus by the ILC can be submitted to this Working Group for review for any Standing Orders' implications that it may have. It is important to note that an advanced preliminary list of cases is sent to Member States at least two weeks before the beginning of the ILC.

<p><i>to the late editions of the list of cases. Since the Committee’s work is essential for the credibility of the whole Organization, we see, with deep concern, on this development...”</i></p> <p><b>10. Workers:</b> “ <i>...Taking into account the specificity and technicity of the Committee on the Application of Standards...it is not a solution at all to integrate the work of the specific tripartite working group in this Working Party.</i>”</p> <p><b>11. ASEAN:</b> “<i>...we believe that the Committee on the Application of Standards should make available as soon as in advance the preliminary list and final list of cases to be discussed and make clear criteria for the section of those cases.</i>”</p>	
--	--

<b>F. ILC delegates and participants</b>	
<b>Proposals :</b>	<b>Office comments :</b>
<p><b>1. GRULAC:</b> “<i>... the fundamental criteria here is balance in tripartite delegations ... We believe that limiting numbers in delegations is neither desirable nor reasonable.</i>”</p> <p><b>2. ASPAG:</b> “<i>...ever-increasing cost implication of the increase of non-ILO constituents’ participation .... for each non-ILO participant we are paying US\$1,800 from the pocket of the governments. In view of the capacity constraints with respect to resources and premises, ASPAG suggests that the implication of such an alarming trend for the organization of the Conference be given high priority ...</i>”</p> <p><b>3. IMEC:</b> “<i>...has noticed the dramatic increase in the number of participants from national delegations over the past years. We also note that the Constitution already sets out some regulations concerning the composition of member delegations. It would, therefore, help inform this discussion if the secretariat could provide us with further information on the composition of national delegations and on the impact of the increased number of participants on the functioning of the ILC.</i>”</p> <p><b>4. Workers:</b> “<i>... Paragraph 32 tells us that in 2011 a total of 7,500 persons (all categories combined) attended the Conference. We would like to know what these categories are and get disaggregated figures including, regarding staff and its distribution. The figure of 1,750 staff for 4,000 participants seems, to us, disproportionate. While for us, all ILO staff should use the opportunity of the conference to create positive links with the constituents, we need to be rigorous, especially in indicating who has been temporarily hired and for what.</i>”</p>	<p>-Proposal 1.F: See attached as <u>Annex 1</u>, a more detailed table on the composition of national delegations</p> <p>-Proposal 2.F: When establishing the average cost by participant, it needs to be noted that some important costs components (including interpretation) are independent of the number of participants.</p> <p>-Proposal 3.F: See <u>Annex 1</u>. The main impact of the increased number of participants can be summarized as follows: i) no alternative space to the Palais des Nations (UNOG) currently available in Geneva; ii) need to use three large Committee rooms (presently Rooms XVII, XVIII, XIX); iii) increased security and other support services burden; iv) more badges to be produced and distributed; v) more copies to be printed.</p> <p>-Proposal 4.F: In fact, in 2011 the number of ILO staff actually working at the ILC as part of the secretariat was 460. The figure of 1,750 staff comprises <u>all</u> ILO and other support staff carrying a staff badge. Many ILO staff come to the Palais des Nations only for a specific meeting or discussion during the ILC, taking advantage of the presence of some constituents to meet with them. In any</p>

<p><b>5. Workers:</b> <i>"...in favour of maintaining the largest possible access to the ILC in order to maintain the parliamentary function, but we can find a way to better select the core group of participants from those who need to have a sporadic access to the Conference."</i></p> <p><b>6. Workers:</b> <i>"...It is also very necessary to remind...the need for gender balance both in delegations as well as in access to speaking time. We are ready to work with the Office in order to discuss more stringent rules."</i></p> <p><b>7. Workers:</b> <i>"... There is also the issue of access of NGOs.... We certainly believe that bona fide international non-governmental organizations are an important participant in the ILC. Trade unions have established working relations with many of them. On the other hand, there is the tendency to almost value more their presence, than the presence of social partners, and this is unacceptable..."</i></p> <p><b>8. Japan:</b> <i>"... expresses strong concerns about establishing limits regarding the size of delegations...Limiting the size...could have negative effect on the active contributions to the discussions and thus, the outcome of the International Labour Conference."</i></p> <p><b>9. Switzerland:</b> <i>"...There is no need to introduce rules governing the size of delegations. The provisions of the Constitution must simply be applied ... that is, two government delegates, an employer delegate and a worker delegate, with each delegate accompanied by no more than two advisers for each item on the agenda of the session. From the moment of registration of credentials ... the Office must determine which delegations are not in exact conformity with the terms of the Constitution and inform the countries concerned. Then, at the very beginning of the Conference, the Credentials Committee should submit a report to the Officers of the Conference proposing not to register excess numbers of advisers and other persons..."</i></p>	<p>event, they do need a badge to have access to the ILC premises. <a href="#">Annex 2</a> details the 7'500 badges issued per category.</p> <p>-Proposal 7.F: Since 2011, a clear priority is given to ILC delegates and INGOs speeches are systematically placed at the end of each plenary sitting.</p> <p>-Proposal 8.F: See <a href="#">Annex 1</a></p> <p>-Proposal 9.F: The provisions limiting the number of delegates, advisers and persons appointed in accordance with article 2 (3) (i) of the ILC Standing Orders are already being strictly applied. The only way to further limit the size of the delegations would be to introduce new limitations, in particular to the maximum number of persons in the categories of participants developed by practice (persons accompanying the Minister and other persons attending the Conference). This would require amendments to the Standing Orders.</p>
--	--

<b>G. Efficiency gains and others</b>	
<b>Proposals :</b>	<b>Office comments :</b>
<p><b>Efficiency gains</b></p> <p><b>1. ASPAG:</b> <i>"...administration cost lies in the ever increasing number of participants that continue to break records year after year. The number of servicing personnel regular staff, short-term staff, interpreters, and daily contacted staff in the meantime has reached an average of 1,750 persons each year. ASPAG wonders if the number of servicing staff is in any</i></p>	<p>-Proposal 1.G: See comment to proposal 4.F as well as <a href="#">Annex 2</a></p>

*reasonable manner proportionate to the total number of ...participants that it stands at only 4,500.”*

- 2. ASPAG:** *“... also wishes the secretariat to provide ...a disaggregated list of three categories of expenditure, namely, interpretation, local short term staff, and particularly paid overtime, that all together account for approximately 70 per cent of the...budget...whereas expenditure on interpretation services that presently stands at 42 per cent...continues to be the single biggest portion of the cost...the working group...should prioritize examining the possibility of establishing a permanent ILO interpretation office whose staff may flexibly serve other ILO administrative events.”*

- 3. IMEC:** *“...Wider and better use of technology. Arrangements should be made to allow submission and amendments electronically and to provide screens for the drafting in more technical committees whenever amendments are being discussed...A review of the distribution of Conference reports and papers, reducing the number of paper copies must be a priority. As far as possible, documents should instead be made available electronically either by email or by posting them on the website. Draft committee reports should be made available for review also for experts who have returned to capitals password protected, if necessary. Setting a percentage target for a reduction of paper would help focus minds on this issue and has worked well in other organizations.”*

- 4. Workers:** *“... The Office should actually have indicated how many of these meetings require interpretation and which ones are just taking place in a room free of charge – as it should be – and with no interpretation... Paragraph 36 states that almost 50 per cent of the costs of the Conference are for interpretation. We need to address this issue but we can also look at the larger picture supported by more information. First, we need to ascertain that interpretation is indeed a vital tool for an international organization...You will recall that my colleagues in the labour administration committee last June asked for more interpretation and more access of documents*

-Proposal 2.G: Please see disaggregated list of the three categories of expenditure in [Annex 3](#). In-depth cost-benefit analysis has shown that the most cost-effective operational basis for the management of interpretation in the ILO is to draw upon independent interpreters to perform this work (see [Annex 4](#)). This fact explains the relative volume of expenditure on interpretation at the Conference, in comparison with other meetings services, many of which are largely covered by the regular budget. In this respect, determining factors include the seasonal nature and tripartite structure of the meetings organized by the ILO. The management of the related professional conditions of work is a complex task, in which potential efficiencies are being constantly sought. The limits of efficiency gains are expected to be reached in 2012. Thereafter, the only remaining possibility for savings would lie in a review of the number, duration and timetable of preparatory group meetings.

-Proposal 3.G: The ILO has been a pioneer in the introduction of new technologies in the ILC, such as the electronic voting system and the Sub Amendment Management Module (SAMM). These efforts will be pursued in the future. Furthermore, the ILC budget for 2012-13 was reduced by 10% and it is proposed to take additional measures for the 2012 ILC, among them: (i) the abolition of evening/night sessions for non-standard setting committees (general and recurrent item discussions); (ii) the review of the handling of Provisional Records for plenary speeches.

-Proposal 4 G: See attached as [Annex 5](#), the trends in the number of meetings organized during the ILC, with and without interpretation.

*in different languages... This is not an issue for a simple cut of resources. Furthermore, the document says in paragraph 36 that the high cost is also due to the fact that the Office does not have permanent interpretation staff. One could maybe calculate what costs would be entailed by having some permanent staff taking care of the GB Conferences and technical meetings over the year...”.*

- 5. ASEAN:** *“...Measures to cut down costs can be made with respect to numeral restriction of delegates, translation, interpretation and document printing. The alternation between full sessions and lighter sessions should also be discussed...”*

**Others**

- 1. IMEC:** *“...Limiting the number of **side events** and making them subject to the approval of the officers of the Conference, the Office should also refrain from scheduling side events and other briefings on issues o particular interest to Governments in conflict with group meetings and committee sessions.”*

-Proposal 5.G: See the various Annexes