



Governing Body

319th Session, Geneva, 16–31 October 2013

GB.319/WP/GBC/1

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

WP/GBC

Date: 8 October 2013

Original: English

FIRST ITEM ON THE AGENDA

Improving the functioning of the International Labour Conference

Context

1. At its 317th Session in March 2013, the Governing Body, on the recommendation of the Working Party on the Functioning of the Governing Body and the International Labour Conference, decided:
 - (a) to propose to the International Labour Conference to implement in June 2013, on a trial basis and subject to certain derogations of its Standing Orders, the changes on which a tripartite consensus had been reached, as listed in paragraph 10 of document GB.317/INS/10;
 - (b) to request the Office to prepare for its 319th Session (October 2013):
 - (i) a detailed analysis of the trial implementation of those reforms;
 - (ii) a first set of proposed amendments to the Standing Orders of the International Labour Conference on the issues identified as those on which a tripartite consensus had been reached but which required, for their implementation, amendments to the Standing Orders at the 103rd Session of the International Labour Conference (2014); and
 - (iii) additional information on pending issues requiring further consultations and discussion.
2. In his Report to the Conference, the Director-General identified the governance of the Organization as one of the seven key areas of activities for the period leading to the ILO centenary in 2019. In his closing remarks to the Conference, while underlining the unique capacity of the International Labour Conference (ILC) to bring ILO constituents together as “the global tripartite Parliament of labour”, he stressed the “need of reform ... without impacting against its critical functions particularly in setting and supervising standards ... Let’s not make the mistake of talking down the value of our Conference. That would be an error of appreciation and of intent. Instead, let’s set about the task of changing it to make it still better. Refusing that challenge would be a failure of will and ambition”.
3. The Director-General’s views on Conference reform have been echoed by many constituents, who express a commonly held wish “to make it better”. The high value of the

Conference is widely recognized and appreciated: the ILO's unique capacity to use its tripartite constituents to develop contemporary and effective international labour standards; the importance of the supervisory role played by the Committee on the Application of Standards; the uniqueness of its world assembly of governments, employers and workers, together with the participation of a wide sector of civil society; its capacity to address critical issues of global concern, and the opportunity it provides for many informal interactions between and among constituents that no other forum can provide.

4. Many concerns with the operation of the Conference have, however, been expressed. These relate to: the length of the Conference sessions; the relatively low attention it receives from the international media; its influence compared to other similar forums; its heavy and bureaucratic procedures that inhibit flexibility and the capacity to respond effectively to emerging issues; the disconnect between committee work and the plenary; the disengagement of many delegates; and the inability of senior representatives of the constituents to commit the necessary time for full participation in the Conference.
5. There is a clear and recognized need of reform to allow the ILC to strengthen the critical role it plays in world affairs. The Working Party on the Functioning of the Governing Body and the International Labour Conference (the Working Party) has before it a large number of proposals for changing the way the Conference works. Some have received tripartite consensus, while others are still subject to further consideration. However most of the proposals relate to the procedures of the Conference, rather than fundamental reform.
6. Concern has been expressed in the Working Party and the Governing Body about the lack of progress and concrete proposals for reform. To this end the Office was requested to develop concrete proposals for change to assist the deliberations of the Working Party. Such proposals should be focused on improving the impact and influence of the Conference, and making more effective use of time and resources, while retaining and enhancing its core values and functions.¹
7. This paper seeks to meet that request. It is comprised of four sections:
 - A. Lessons learned from the 102nd Session of the ILC (2013).
 - B. Summary of issues on which consensus has been reached.
 - C. Summary of issues on which further discussion is required.
 - D. Two alternative approaches to reform.
8. Section D of the paper proposes two possible approaches to fundamental reform of the Conference. Both are based on a two-week duration for Conference sessions. The first approach is based on a two-year Conference cycle. In the first year of the cycle the focus would be on the programme and budget and policy issues, while in the second it would be on standard setting. The Committee on the Application of Standards and the recurrent item discussion would be held each year. The second approach is a reworked version of a proposal presented to the Working Party in March 2013. It generally maintains the current structure of the Conference but compresses its work into two weeks.
9. Most of the reforms referred to in sections B and C of this paper could be incorporated into either of these two approaches. It is also expected that other issues will arise that will need to be addressed if there is sufficient interest from the Working Party to further pursue either of these options.

¹ 316th Session of the Governing Body (Nov. 2012) and GB.318/PV/Draft.

10. These approaches are presented simply for the purpose of discussion in response to the Governing Body request. To assist the Working Party in its consideration, all current reform issues are summarized in the revised table attached. The references in each item summarized in sections B and C of the paper refer to their position in the table.

Part A. Lessons learned from the 102nd Session of the ILC (June 2013)

11. The Governing Body decided at its 317th Session to propose to the ILC to implement in June 2013, on a trial basis and subject to certain derogations of its Standing Orders, a number of changes on which tripartite consensus had been reached.² Some lessons can be drawn from the experience of this 102nd Session, in particular regarding the following issues:
- **Side events:** A side event is currently defined as a formal tripartite event on a theme which is not on the agenda of the Conference. As agreed, such events should be kept to a minimum and should be approved by the Director-General in consultation with the Officers of the Governing Body prior to the ILC session, or with the Officers of the ILC during the ILC session. In June this year no formal side events were organized but two information sessions were held. The experience of this session demonstrated that a clearer definition of the different types of formal (tripartite) events versus other types of informal information sessions is needed. Criteria should be established to identify the different categories of events held on the fringes of the ILC committee meetings (usually at lunchtime) which may or may not conflict with ILC work.
 - **Plenary structure:** The division of the plenary into four broad sections (opening sitting; plenary discussion on the Reports of the Director-General and Chairperson of the Governing Body; World of Work Summit; formal plenary with the votes and adoption of reports) was fully implemented with the following observations.
 - **Opening sitting of the plenary:** Although the technical changes envisaged for the opening sitting, such as displaying the names on a screen, were not entirely successful, the more strategic approach adopted for this session was very well received and resulted in a very high attendance rate. The opening statement by the Director-General, followed by the introduction by the Chairperson of the Governing Body of his report and the addresses of the Chairpersons of the Workers' and Employers' groups, allowed the opening sitting to set the scene for the entire Conference. Amendments to the ILC Standing Orders will be proposed to avoid an extra sitting for the suspension of Standing Orders provisions and to further shorten the opening sitting.
 - **Discussion of the Reports of the Director-General and the Chairperson of the Governing Body:** The Report of the Director-General was widely praised as being focused and well structured and the appeal launched to constituents "to provide clear and ambitious guidance on initiatives that can carry the ILO forward to its centenary well equipped ..." was heard. This Report generated a rich discussion, with substantive and targeted interventions. The Director-General's decision to reply to the discussion of his Report in his closing remarks and to place the follow-up of this discussion on the agenda of the 319th Session of the Governing Body was also welcomed. It is worth noting that the response in plenary to the report of the

² GB.317/INS/10, para. 10.

Chairperson of the Governing Body was limited, which may lead to reflect on the need for the Chairperson of the Governing Body to present orally his/her report to the Conference. The time limit of five minutes for interventions was, as a general rule, observed.

- ***World of Work Summit:*** The World of Work Summit was supported as an important initiative. It was held on Monday, 17 June. However, inviting Heads of State or Government to address the Conference on a specific date proved challenging. As a result, the participation of high-level guests was spread over three days, rather than concentrated into a single day as initially envisaged. Despite mixed results this year, it could be worth testing it again next year (with more time for preparation) before drawing any conclusions. Invitations should be sent earlier, targeting exclusively a specific day during the Conference. Apart from the special addresses on 17 June, the format of the high-level panel suffered from a lack of interactivity, with very little audience participation. It was felt that the choice of a stronger theme for the Summit would generate a more dynamic and interactive discussion.
- ***Plenary period IV:*** Plenary period IV, which included the adoption of all committee reports and outputs, as well as the vote on the Programme and Budget for 2014–15 and the votes on arrears of contribution, went smoothly. It was, however, felt that the ceremonial adoption in plenary of the committee reports should be shortened to avoid duplication with the adoption procedure by the committees. Both the Conference secretariat and delegates showed a high degree of flexibility, allowing the Conference to conclude its work on Thursday, 20 June at midday, that is half a day earlier than anticipated (N.B. The Governing Body had decided at its 316th Session to close the Conference on the third Thursday of the session instead of the Friday at midday). However, it should be borne in mind that the Conference did not undertake any standard-setting activities this year, which may have had an impact on earlier closing.
- ***Transparency, predictability and objectivity:*** These principles were upheld in the work of the ILC committees as well as in the regular interaction between the Conference secretariat and ILC Officers, both at the committee and plenary levels. The reports submitted to ILC committees were acknowledged as being of high quality and the timely distribution of these reports to the Conference was welcomed. It was, however, felt that communication could be further improved, in particular regarding tentative plans of work, programme changes and voting procedures.
- ***Workplans of general discussion committees:*** As part of the proposals tested in June 2013, the Governing Body decided in March 2013 that the general discussion committees (not the recurrent discussion committees) would “endeavour to complete their work by the Saturday of the second week”. While those committees were unable to complete their work by the end of the second week, efforts were made to complete discussions on schedule or earlier. The two general discussion committees held, respectively, nine and ten plenary sittings and two days of drafting groups. Time management could nevertheless be improved further with a review of working procedures. For example, the length of draft conclusions could be reduced, focusing on the key issues and action to be taken.
- ***Committee chairpersons:*** Due to consultations and negotiations within and among the regions, chairpersons were not selected sufficiently in advance. This reduced the possibility for appropriate pre-Conference briefings from the Office. In the future, every effort should be made by the Government group (with the support of the Office, if requested) to identify committee chairpersons. A clear calendar/time frame should be set, with the objective of securing selection by February/March at the latest.

- **Time management:** Most sessions of the plenary started and finished on time. The general discussion committees only held one evening sitting each. Indeed, strict time management made it possible to end the Conference half a day earlier than planned. Time management could be still further improved with careful pre-planning. The attention of the Conference or committee Officers should be drawn to the importance of maximizing the use of time available. Furthermore, considering the ever-increasing number of speakers in plenary, a measure that could be tested next year could be to request that speakers limit their interventions to four minutes, with a maximum allowed time of five minutes.
- **Provisional Record:** The translation and production of the *Provisional Record* (for plenary statements on the Reports of the Director-General and the Chairperson of the Governing Body only) was deferred until after the Conference, and each such speech made in plenary was Web-posted. During the Conference, the secretariat made various presentations to the groups to explain the new process in detail. This pilot experience worked well, with the 291 plenary statements posted on the Web almost immediately following delivery. Feedback from delegates was positive, many stressing the user-friendly nature of the system. The *Provisional Record* containing these statements was published on the Web in July, with a two-week deadline for submission of amendments. This approach had a positive impact on the organization of work during the Conference and resulted in a significant reduction in documents prepared during the Conference. While the extent of savings incurred has not yet been determined, the data available so far demonstrate that the absence of overtime for the staff involved in the preparation of the *Provisional Record* should have a significant impact on the overall cost of production of the *Provisional Record*.

Part B. Issues on which consensus has been reached

12. A consensus has been reached within the Working Party regarding the guiding principles and objectives of a review of the ILC:
13. The guiding principles of the reform process are (A.1):
 - (a) inclusive, comprehensive, constituent-led and consensus-driven;
 - (b) final reform will be finalized once all aspects are agreed, while with tripartite agreement some measures have been trialled at the 102nd Session of the ILC and could be trialled at the 103rd Session;
 - (c) the final reform will aim to be finalized by June 2015;
 - (d) recommendations should be made within the constitutional framework;
 - (e) amendments should be made to the ILC Standing Orders as appropriate.
14. The objectives of the reform process are (A.2):
 - (a) to strengthen the ILC as the supreme policy-making organ of the ILO;
 - (b) to maintain the five functions of the ILC (constitutional, political, technical, forum and assembly);
 - (c) to enable the ILC to meet the needs of constituents and the international community;

- (d) to ensure the ILC is efficient, transparent, consistent and objective;
- (e) to increase the visibility and authority of the ILC by discussing relevant and contemporary issues that are important to the world of work.

15. There is also tripartite consensus on a number of points relating to the overall structure, agenda, plenary and committees. These elements can be broadly summarized as follows:

- **Structure and duration of ILC sessions:** The duration of ILC sessions should be determined by the time required for the ILC to effectively undertake its work, while strengthening its policy-making role and maintaining its five functions – constitutional, political, technical, forum and assembly (B.1), and its structure should remain consistent across sessions (B.2).
- **Agenda-setting function:** The Governing Body is responsible for setting the ILC agenda and has the authority to determine the number and nature of items on the Conference agenda. The Conference can also decide to include an item on the agenda of its following session. The current composition of the agenda, which includes two parts, one dealing with the standing items and the other with the technical items placed on the agenda by the Governing Body, should be retained (B.3).
- **Agenda-setting process:** The agenda should meet constituents’ needs and address topical and relevant issues, as determined by the Governing Body or the Conference itself. The timing of final decisions on the agenda items should take into account the need to address topical or emerging issues, and the need for adequate preparation time for Conference papers, consultations and discussions, and in particular for preparatory work for standard-setting items (B.4).
- **Proposed agenda items:** Proposals for ILC agenda items, to be determined by the Governing Body, should come from the following sources: (i) governments and recognized representative employers’ and workers’ organizations; (ii) outcomes of recurrent/general discussions (resolutions, conclusions); (iii) outcomes of ILO tripartite or other meetings (Regional Meetings, sectoral meetings, meetings of experts); (iv) other work performed by the Office (B.6).
- **Technical items:** There is no fixed number of technical items required by the Constitution or the Standing Orders. The modalities for discussion of such items, that is whether an item will be dealt with in a technical committee, in the Selection Committee or in the plenary should be discussed by the Governing Body at the time the item is placed on the ILC agenda but the final decision on it is to be taken by the Conference (B.10).
- **Standard-setting items:** The development and supervision of international labour standards is a prime function of the Conference. The double-discussion procedure over two consecutive sessions of the Conference should remain the norm when setting standards. However, the number and type of discussions required for standard-setting activities should be determined by the Governing Body at the time the item is placed on the agenda (B.8 and B.9).
- **Recurrent discussions:** Following the adoption of the 2008 ILO Declaration on Social Justice for a Fair Globalization, as from 2010 the Governing Body has included a recurrent discussion on the agenda each year. It decided that, pending a

review of the first cycle, recurrent discussions would follow a seven-year cycle,³ with employment, fundamental principles and rights at work and social protection being discussed twice in each cycle, and social dialogue once. The continuation of this cycle and the possible establishment of a formal recurrent discussion committee in the ILC Standing Orders will be discussed by the Governing Body following a review (B.11).

- **Plenary structure:** The plenary should be divided into four broad sections: (i) opening sitting; (ii) discussion of the Reports of the Director-General and Chairperson of the Governing Body; (iii) World of Work Summit; (iv) formal plenary (adopt reports, votes) (B.12).
 - *Opening sitting:* The opening sitting would be a short sitting to formally open the ILC as provided for in the ILC Standing Orders. The ILO Director-General would introduce his/her Report. In addition to the opening statement of the President of the Conference, the Chairpersons of the Workers' and Employers' groups should be given the opportunity to address the Conference at its opening ceremony (B.13.1).
 - *Plenary period II:* Consensus was reached on the need to make the plenary more interactive. The Director-General's Report should address a social theme. The report of the Chairperson of the Governing Body should cover the programme implementation aspect. Delegates would each have five minutes to address the plenary on the topic of these reports (B.13.2).
 - *World of Work Summit:* The one-day World of Work Summit would 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 (B.13.3).
 - *Plenary period IV:* Plenary period IV would include the adoption of all committees' reports and outputs as well as votes as necessary (B.13.4).

Part C. Issues requiring further consultations and discussion

16. In addition to the above issues, on which a level of consensus has been reached, the following issues have been identified as requiring further consideration. These elements can be broadly summarized as follows:

- **Agenda-setting process:** Further clarification is required on the process for setting the Conference agenda, particularly in relation to consultation with the groups prior to proposals being submitted to the Governing Body (B.5).
- **ILC committees:** Further discussion is required on the mandates of the Conference committees, including the relevant Standing Orders provisions, and in particular the rules indicating where and how to handle proposed resolutions not related to the items on the agenda, for example by referring them to the Selection Committee (B.7).

³ It is to be noted that the current seven-year cycle is due to be completed in 2016 with the second recurrent discussion on fundamental principles and rights at work.

- **Standing-setting process:** Further discussion is required on the process for standard-setting discussions (B.9 and C.14).
- **Plenary format:** Further discussion is required on the options for making the plenary sittings more dynamic and interactive. These options include delegates' interventions on the Director-General's Report and in thematic debates, panels and discussions (B.13.2).
- **Side events and knowledge sharing:** While consensus has been reached on the need to minimize the number of side events during the Conference, further discussion is required on the nature of events (tripartite side events, information sessions, etc.) to be approved and other opportunities for sharing knowledge between the Office and delegates (B.14, B.15).
- **General and recurrent discussions:** The nature of reports, outputs, workplans and the organization of discussions require further discussion (C.9–C.13). To give effect to the ILO Declaration on Social Justice for a Fair Globalization, further discussions will be required to establish specific modalities for recurrent discussions to support their objectives, focusing on their strategic purpose, thus drawing a clear distinction between recurrent discussions and general discussions.
- **Committee drafting groups:** Further discussion is required on the membership and working procedures of drafting groups. The composition formula 8–8–8 was retained during the last sessions of the Conference in agreement with the three groups of constituents (C.15–C.17).
- **Technology:** The provision of screens in all committees, a secure website for delegates and other technology issues require further discussion (C.19–C.20).
- **Conference participation:** The size and balance of delegations, and the role of other members of delegations require further discussion (C.21–C. 22).
- **Conference reports:** Further discussion is required on the provision and distribution of hard copy Conference reports (C.24–C.25).

Part D. Two alternative approaches to reform

17. In considering any significant reform of the Conference, a key issue to be addressed is the relationship between the agenda, the structure and the duration of Conference sessions. In its present format, the Conference takes 17 days, including two weekends, to cover a highly complex agenda composed of a multi-component plenary (opening and closing sittings, discussion of the Report of the Director-General, High-level Segment, adoption of reports, votes, etc.) and a series of standing committees (Application of Standards (CAS), Finance, Selection, Credentials, Standing Orders, etc.) and technical committees (standard-setting (double or single discussion), recurrent discussions and a general discussion).
18. Some plenary components (such as the opening sitting) could be further condensed, and the working methods of some committees (such as the general discussion committees) reviewed, however some significant aspects of the Conference need to be addressed carefully, as they raise both political and legal questions:
 - **Standard-setting committee(s):** Under the single discussion format or during the second year of a double-discussion procedure, a minimum of **eight working days** is needed for debate, preparation of draft text(s), consideration of amendments and adoption of the standard;

- **Plenary:** This currently accommodates around 290 five-minute speech slots, totalling approximately **29 hours**. It is considered that the opportunity for delegates to address the Conference is of critical importance, however consideration could be given to different opportunities for such interventions.
19. Under the current structure, a full plenary requires approximately eight days, and a standard-setting process takes eight to nine days. It may be possible to reduce the time required for some technical committees (in particular general discussion committees), however the Committee on the Application of Standards also requires sufficient time to effectively complete its current workload. While it is possible to have some concurrent sessions, under the current structure of the Conference it is difficult to contemplate any significant reduction in its overall duration.
 20. To address the balance between achieving the principles and objectives of the reforms, and the need to make the Conference more efficient, dynamic and relevant, the following approaches are submitted for the consideration of the Working Party.
 21. Both of these approaches envisage commencing the session of the Conference on a Monday and completing it on the Friday of the following week. However, if it is considered that more time is required for committees, both approaches could be adapted to conclude the session of the Conference on the Saturday of the second week.

1. **A two-year Conference cycle**

22. The format and agenda of the Conference could be restructured to operate over a two-year cycle rather than the current one year. In the first year of the cycle the Conference would focus primarily on the programme and budget and policy setting. In the second year it would primarily focus on standard setting. Such an approach would require other reform measures, however all five functions of the Conference would be preserved and would result in sessions of the Conference being more focused, dynamic and influential.
23. The two-year cycle agenda would be aligned with the programme and budget cycle as follows:
 - year one (budgetary year) focused on policy setting and the programme and budget, with the main attention to be given to plenary discussions of the Director-General's Report, the programme and budget, recurrent discussion and general discussion committees, and the CAS. One day would be devoted to a World of Work Summit. Where required, a first discussion on a standard-setting item would also be conducted;
 - year two (non-budgetary year) focused on standard setting (single or second discussion), supervision of the application of standards (CAS) and recurrent discussion. One day would also be devoted to the World of Work Summit. There would be no discussion of the Director-General's Report but provision for delegates to address the Conference in plenary would be retained.
24. The main features of the two-year cycle proposal are as follows:
 - (a) **Both years**
 - (1) Recurrent discussions:
 - Eight days' committee work (Monday, first week to Tuesday, second week) (see details in the appendix).

- Conclusions: limited number of pages, reflecting the strategic purpose of recurrent discussions under the ILO Declaration on Social Justice for a Fair Globalization.
 - Drafting group:
 - composition: multiples of four, e.g. 8–8–8 formula;
 - meetings to be scheduled within a condensed plan of work in consultation with the officers of the committee.
 - Adoption of the report in plenary:
 - report to be presented to plenary by the reporter (limited to eight minutes) followed by the officers' presentations (limited to five minutes each);
 - individual comments limited to two minutes;
 - report adopted in its entirety (not chapter by chapter).
- (2) Committee on the Application of Standards:
- Ten days⁴ committee work.
 - CAS workplan to be reorganized after consultation with the CAS tripartite working group:
 - improved time management is one of the main achievements of the review initiated in 2006. The new concept should build on these improvements;
 - further efficiency gains could be made during the first day. The opening sitting could be reduced and new arrangements could be considered for group meetings;
 - introduction and discussion of General Survey limited to a maximum of three sittings;
 - report on the discussion of the General Survey to the committee for the recurrent discussion to be reviewed as the topic in year one will only be examined in year two.
 - New modalities will also have to be adapted to the outcome of the negotiations on the CAS follow-up.

⁴ The feasibility of a shorter duration will hinge first and foremost on agreement on modalities for adoption of the list of cases at the beginning of the work of the CAS. This crucial issue is part of the package of the CAS follow-up. Among the modalities which will have to be agreed upon, there is the issue of the arrangements for group meetings to take place upfront so as to enable the CAS to start its work on the first day (group meetings currently take place after the opening sitting of the CAS).

- Adoption of the report in plenary:
 - report to be presented to plenary by the reporter (limited to eight minutes) followed by the officers' presentations (five minutes each);
 - individual comments limited to two minutes.

(b) Year one: Policy setting and programming

(1) Plenary:

- Opening (Monday afternoon, first week):
 - procedural aspects to be substantially condensed;
 - substantive presentation of Director-General's Report;
 - [if needed, a brief introduction of his report by the Chairperson of the Governing Body.]
 - opening addresses by the Chairpersons of the Workers' and Employers' groups.
- Five days (Monday to Friday, second week) composed of:
 - one day for a World of Work Summit – special guest(s), keynote speaker(s) or panels – with the participation of persons other than delegates to the Conference;
 - three days for speeches for a general discussion of the Director-General's Report which could include the following elements:
 - (i) individual speeches limited to four (or five) minutes with strict time control;
 - (ii) possible collective statements (regional or subregional groups, like-minded groups, etc.) limited to five minutes;
 - (iii) interactive panels;
 - one day and a half for the *formal plenary*: adoption of committee reports, vote on the programme and budget and closing sitting.

(2) General discussions in committees:

- Eight days' committee work (Monday, first week to Tuesday, second week) (see details in the appendix).
- The draft conclusions would be adopted, as usual, paragraph by paragraph during the discussion of the amendments submitted to the committee. The adoption of the report (not of the conclusions) by the committee could however be delegated to the officers of the committee, with the understanding that individual delegates be given the opportunity to send amendments to their interventions by electronic means.

- Conclusions: based on a reduced number (maximum four) of points for discussion and limited to a maximum of five pages concentrating on policy guidance and action-oriented initiatives addressed in particular to the Office and the Governing Body (avoiding repetitions of the report's analytical work).
 - Drafting group:
 - composition: multiples of four, e.g. 8–8–8 formula;
 - two–three meetings to be scheduled within a condensed plan of work to be approved by the officers of the committee;
 - more efficient amendment process.
 - Adoption of the report in plenary:
 - Report to be presented to plenary by the Reporter (limited to eight minutes) followed by the officers' presentations (five minutes each);
 - individual comments limited to two minutes;
 - report adopted in its entirety (not chapter by chapter), with conclusions and possible resolution following immediately.
- (3) First standard-setting discussion in committees (as part of a double-discussion procedure) (see details in the appendix):
- Tripartite preparatory meetings could be convened, before the first or second discussion, not as a negotiation body but as an input to the committee work; costs could be covered by the savings resulting from the ILC reform.
 - Nine days' committee work (Monday to Saturday, first week, + three days the second week).
 - The draft conclusions would be adopted, as usual, paragraph by paragraph during the discussion of the amendments submitted to the committee. Adoption of the report (not of the conclusions) by the committee could however be delegated to the officers of the committee, with the understanding that individual delegates be given the opportunity to send amendments to their own interventions by electronic means.
 - Committee drafting committee could meet on Wednesday, second week. Depending on the progress made, a first meeting of the committee drafting committee could be scheduled on Saturday afternoon, first week. Should the committee decide to have a permanent committee drafting committee (see below), then the Wednesday could be used by the committee, for two additional plenary sittings.

The workplan could also be reorganized; with committee drafting committee to be convened after the afternoon sitting as from the second day

of discussion of the amendments (on the model of what was done in 2005 for the Committee on the Fishing Sector).⁵

- Adoption of the report in plenary:
 - report to be presented to plenary by the reporter (limited to eight minutes) followed by the officers' presentations (limited to five minutes);
 - individual comments limited to two minutes.

Tentative plan of work for year one (budgetary year)

	M	T	W	T	F	S	S	M	T	W	T	F
Opening sitting	■											
Recurrent discussion committee	■	■	■	■	■	■		■	■			
General discussion committee(s)	■	■	■	■	■	■		■	■			
CAS	■	■	■	■	■	■		■		■	■	
First discussion committee	■	■	■	■	■	■		■	■	■		
World of Work Summit										■		
Plenary: tripartite interactive debates								■	■			
Plenary: individual speeches								■	■	■		
Plenary: vote P&B											■	
Plenary: report adoption + closing sitting											■	■

(c) Year two: Standard-setting/review

(1) Plenary:

- Opening (Monday, first week.).
- Procedural part to be substantially condensed.
- Director-General's opening speech focused on the standard-setting work.
- The Director-General does not submit a report, therefore there would be no discussion of his Report during the plenary. However, the provision for delegates to address the Conference in plenary would be retained, and the plenary would be convened in parallel with the recurrent discussion and standard-setting committees as well as the CAS.
- One day for a World of Work Summit – special guest(s), keynote speaker(s) or panels, (Wednesday, week 2).
- Two half days for:
 - adoption of committee reports.

⁵ Lessons can also be drawn from the 94th (Maritime) Session of the ILC.

- One half day for:
 - vote on new instruments;
 - closing sitting.
- (2) Single discussion or second discussion (of a double-discussion standard-setting procedure):
 - Tripartite preparatory meetings could be convened, before the first or second discussion, not as a negotiation body but as an input to the committee work; costs could be covered by the savings resulting from the ILC reform.
 - Eight days' committee work (Monday to Saturday, first week + Monday and Tuesday, second week) including the amendment process (see details in the appendix).
 - Committee drafting committee could meet on Tuesday, second week. Depending on the progress made, a first meeting of the committee drafting committee could also be scheduled on Saturday afternoon, first week. Should the committee decide to have a permanent committee drafting committee (on the model of what was done in 2005), then the Tuesday, second week, could then be used by the committee, for two additional plenary sittings.
 - The workplan could also be reorganized, with committee drafting committee to be convened after the afternoon sitting as from the second day of discussion of the amendments (on the model of what was done in 2005 for the Committee on the Fishing Sector).⁶
 - The draft instrument would be adopted, as usual, article by article or paragraph by paragraph during the discussion of the amendments submitted to the committee. The adoption of the report (not the instrument), could however be delegated to the officers of the committee, with the understanding that individual delegates be given the opportunity to send amendments to their interventions by electronic means.
 - Amendment procedure⁷ using the Sub-amendment Management Module (SAMM system).
 - Adoption of the report in plenary:
 - report to be presented to plenary by the reporter (limited to eight minutes) followed by the officers' statements (five minutes each);
 - individual comments limited to two minutes.

⁶ Lessons can also be drawn from the 94th (Maritime) Session of the ILC.

⁷ Lessons could also be drawn from the amendment processes used during the 94th (Maritime) Session for the MLC, 2006.

Tentative plan of work for year two (non-budgetary year)

	M	T	W	T	F	S	S	M	T	W	T	F
Opening sitting	■											
Single or second discussion committees	■	■	■	■	■	■		■	■			
Recurrent discussion committee	■	■	■	■	■	■		■	■			
CAS	■	■	■	■	■	■		■		■	■	
Plenary for delegate interventions								■	■			
World of Work Summit										■		
Plenary: adoption in plenary											■	■
Plenary: vote and closing sitting												■
Conference drafting committee											■	

25. This approach would require a review of the working procedures of the recurrent discussions to better respond to the mandate of the ILO Declaration on Social Justice for a Fair Globalization, some readjustments in the working methods of the Committee on the Application of Standards (CAS)⁸ and further improvements to the plenary.
26. A Governing Body session could be held immediately following the closing of the Conference session, or on the Saturday.

2. A reworked two-week structure

27. A proposal for reducing the length of Conference sessions to two weeks was presented to the Working Party in March 2013. While there was some interest in the proposal, it was clear that more detail would be required, and a number of concerns would have to be addressed. A possible approach for shortened Conference sessions based on the current structure is as follows:

Overview

- The duration of ILC sessions would be reduced from three calendar weeks to two.
- Committees would work on different schedules to reflect the amount of time required to complete their respective workplans.
- Key aspects of reductions are:
 - official pre-ILC meetings⁹ would be held on the morning of the opening day of the ILC session;
 - one middle weekend (rather than two);
 - two days for plenary period IV.

⁸ Subject to the outcome of the CAS follow-up and to consultation of the CAS tripartite working group.

⁹ As part of the CAS follow-up, there is the issue of the arrangements for group meetings to take place upfront so as to enable the CAS to start its work on the first day (group meetings currently take place after the opening sitting of the CAS).

Group meetings

- Monday morning immediately prior to the opening sitting at 2 p.m.
- Further pre-ILC meetings could be held over the weekend.
- There would be an expectation that greater preparatory work for the ILC could be undertaken by the groups by email prior to the arrival of delegates in Geneva (for example, committee membership, group statements/positions, membership of drafting groups, etc.).

General/recurrent discussions (see details in the appendix):

- The total duration of the general discussion committees would be reduced from nine to eight days, with the same number of sittings. The overall duration of the recurrent discussion would also be reduced to eight days, with the same number of sittings. In both cases, the working methods may need to be revisited to avoid evening sittings.
- Committees will sit twice per day, with an option for extended or evening sittings at the completion of each phase of the discussion if necessary.
- The draft conclusions would be adopted, as usual, paragraph by paragraph during the discussion of the amendments submitted to the committee. The adoption of the report (not the conclusions) by the committee could however be delegated to the officers of the committee, with the understanding that individual delegates be given the opportunity to send amendments to their interventions by electronic means.

Standard-setting committees (see details in the appendix):

- The total duration of standard-setting discussions would remain the same for a first discussion (nine days) but would be slightly reduced from nine to eight days for the second discussion, with the same number of sittings:
 - Two sittings per day, with extensions if required.
 - Committee drafting committee could meet on Wednesday for a first discussion, and on Tuesday, second week, for a second discussion. Depending on the progress made, a first meeting of the committee drafting committee could also be scheduled on Saturday afternoon, first week. Should the committee decide to have a permanent committee drafting committee (see below), then the Tuesday/Wednesday could be used by the committee, for two additional plenary sittings.
 - Committee drafting committee might also be convened from 7 to 9 p.m. as from the second day of discussion of the amendments (on the model of what was done in 2005 for the Committee on the Fishing Sector.¹⁰
 - The draft conclusions or instrument would be adopted, as usual, paragraph by paragraph or article by article during the discussion of the amendments submitted to the committee. The adoption of the report (not the conclusions nor the draft instrument) by the committee could however be delegated to the officers of the committee, with the understanding that individual delegates be

¹⁰ Lessons can also be drawn from the 94th (Maritime) Session of the ILC.

given the opportunity to send amendments to their interventions by electronic means.

- Efficiencies found in work methods and preparatory work could reduce the number of evening sittings.

Committee on the Application of Standards (CAS)

- There would be a reduction in the number of calendar days from 11 to ten,¹¹ with no reduction in the amount of time available for discussion.
- The workplan¹² would differ from those of other committees.

Plenary periods I–IV

- Plenary period I (opening) would occur at 2–3.30 p.m. on day 1.
- Plenary period II (discussion of Director-General’s Report) would depend on the option chosen under B.13.2.
 - Discussion Wednesday to Friday of first week with further sittings on Monday and Tuesday of second week for delegates’ interventions.
- Plenary period III (World of Work Summit) would take place on Wednesday, second week.
- Plenary period IV (formalities) would take place on Thursday and Friday of second week.

¹¹ The feasibility of a shorter duration will hinge first and foremost on a binding agreement on modalities for adoption of the list of cases at the beginning of the work of the CAS.

¹² Implications for the workplan will have to be closely identified and examined by the CAS tripartite working group.

Week 1

Sunday	Monday	Tuesday	Wednesday	Thursday	Friday	Saturday
Preparatory group meetings	Morning Group meetings	11 a.m.–1 p.m. – Technical and standard-setting committees	11 a.m.–1 p.m. – Technical and standard-setting committees	11 a.m.–1 p.m. – Technical. and standard-setting committees	11 a.m.- 1p.m. – Technical and standard-setting committees	11 a.m.–1 p.m. – Technical. and standard-setting committees
		10 a.m.–1.p.m. – CAS	10 a.m.-1.p.m. – CAS – Plenary period II	10 a.m.-1.p.m. – CAS – Plenary period II	10 a.m.-1.p.m. – CAS – Plenary period II	10 a.m.-1.p.m. – CAS
	2–3.30 p.m. – Opening of ILC (plenary period I)	3.30–6.30 p.m. – Technical and standard-setting committees – CAS	3.30–6.30 p.m. – Technical and standard-setting committees – CAS – Plenary period II	3.30–6.30 p.m. – Technical and standard-setting committees – CAS – Plenary period II	3.30–6.30 p.m. – Technical and standard-setting committees – CAS – Plenary period II	3.30–6.30 p.m. – Technical. and standard-setting committees – CAS
	4–6 p.m. – Opening sitting of technical and standard-setting committees – CAS	7 –10 p.m. (if necessary) – Technical and standard-setting committees – CAS	7 –10 p.m. (if necessary) – Technical and standard-setting committees – CAS	7 –10 p.m. (if necessary) – Technical and standard-setting committees – CAS	7 –10 p.m. (if necessary) – Technical and standard-setting committees – CAS	7 –10 p.m. (if necessary) –CAS
	6–9 p.m. – Technical and standards committee – CAS					

Week 2

Sunday	Monday	Tuesday	Wednesday	Thursday	Friday	Saturday
Rest day	11 a.m.–1 p.m.	11 a.m.–1 p.m.	11.30 a.m.–1 p.m.	Plenary period IV	Plenary period IV	Governing Body
Secretariat finalizes all committee reports	Technical and standard-setting committees – CAS – Plenary period II	– Technical and standard-setting committees – Committee drafting committee (if required) – Plenary period II	– World of Work Summit – Committee drafting committee (if required)	Adoption of Committee reports – Voting – Conference Drafting Committee (CDC) (if required)	Adoption of Committee reports – Adoption of CAS report, – Voting – Closing ceremony	(if required)
	3.30–6:30 p.m. – Technical and standard-setting committees – CAS – Plenary period II	3.30–6:30 p.m. – Technical and standard-setting committees – Committee drafting committee (if required) – Plenary period II	3–6 p.m. – Committee drafting committee (if required) – CAS – World of Work Summit	3–6 p.m. Adoption of committee reports – CAS – Voting	3–6 p.m. Governing Body	
	7–10 p.m. (if necessary) – Technical and standard-setting committees – CAS					

Table 1. Proposals for reform of the International Labour Conference

Ref.	Revised proposal (from that presented to the March 2013 GB)	Process/ formalize existing practice/new	Status as at March 2013 GB	Related proposals	Comments
A.	Reform process (revised title)				
A.1	<p><i>Guiding principles</i></p> <p>The guiding principles of the reform process are:</p> <p>(a) inclusive, comprehensive, constituent-led and consensus-driven;</p> <p>(b) final reform will be finalized once all aspects are agreed, while some measures with tripartite agreement could be trialled at the 102nd (2013) and 103rd (2014) Sessions of the ILC;</p> <p>(c) The final reform will aim to be finalized by June 2015;</p> <p>(d) Recommendations should be made within the constitutional framework;</p> <p>(e) Amendments should be made to the ILC Standing Orders as appropriate;</p> <p>Review of Regional Meetings should occur when the ILC reform process is complete.</p>	Process	Tripartite support (original) SO – No	A.2	The one change relates to (c). Agreement on reform proposals to date has been slow; however, it is considered important to include a timeframe to provide an impetus to finalize the reform process in a timely manner. Therefore, (c) could indicate that the final reforms will aim to be finalized by the 104th (2015) Session of the ILC and fully implemented by the 105th (2016) Session, for review in 2018.

Ref.	Revised proposal (from that presented to the March 2013 GB)	Process/ formalize existing practice/new	Status as at March 2013 GB	Related proposals	Comments
A.2	<p><i>Objectives of the reform process</i></p> <p>The objectives of the reform process are:</p> <p>(a) to strengthen the ILC as the supreme policy-making organ of the ILO;</p> <p>(b) maintain the five functions of the ILC (constitutional, political, technical, forum and assembly);</p> <p>(c) enable the ILC to meet the needs of constituents and the international community;</p> <p>(d) ensure the ILC is efficient, transparent, consistent and objective;</p> <p>(e) increase the visibility and authority of the ILC by discussing relevant and contemporary issues that are important to the world of work.</p>	Process	Tripartite support (original) SO – No	A.1	<p>Consensus has been received for the reform objectives of (a)–(c).</p> <p>Additional objectives (d)–(e) supported by the Government group have been slightly amended to reflect the concerns raised by constituents to date and better clarify the objectives of the reform process.</p>
B. ILC structure					
Duration					
B.1 [was B.1]	<p><i>Duration of the ILC</i></p> <p>The duration of the ILC shall be determined by the minimum time required for the ILC to meet its five functions.</p>	New	Further discussion SO – No	A.1, A.2, B.2–3, B.5, B.9–10, B.12, B.13.1–4, C.2–3, C.8, C.11–14	<p>The duration of ILC sessions is a key issue for constituents. The proposal of two-week ILC sessions has been made by many constituents, and a draft was presented to the GB in March 2013. Two possible approaches for a two-week workplan have been presented.</p> <p>Benefits of two-week ILC sessions include:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ■ enhance the relevance of the ILC and legitimacy of the ILO; ■ increase delegate participation, particularly for those not part of drafting groups; ■ greater representation among all groups, including a likely increase in senior delegates¹ ■ provide greater impetus and momentum for committees to complete their work quickly; ■ reduced cost for ILO and Members.

Ref.	Revised proposal (from that presented to the March 2013 GB)	Process/ formalize existing practice/new	Status as at March 2013 GB	Related proposals	Comments
ILC structure					
B.2 [was B.2]	<i>General structure</i> The ILC structure should remain consistent across sessions.	Formalize existing practice	Tripartite support (original) SO – Yes/No	B.1, B.3	The proposal has been reworded to reflect that the review of ILC committees is now in B.7.
Agenda-setting process					
B.3 [was B.7]	<i>Agenda-setting function of the Governing Body</i> The Governing Body is responsible for setting the ILC agenda and has the authority to determine the number and nature of the agenda items.		Further discussion SO – Yes/No	B.2, B.4–11	The proposal has been reworded to clearly state the authority of the Governing Body as provided under the ILO Constitution.
B.4 [was B.8]	<i>Timing for setting the agendas of future ILC sessions</i> The Governing Body should make timely decisions on setting the agendas of future ILC sessions, taking into account the following principles: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ■ To allow for adequate preparation time for new standards, standard-setting items should be placed on the agenda at the earliest opportunity. ■ The ILC should consider topical or emerging issues. One agenda item could be selected at the post-ILC Governing Body session to allow for an item of this nature to be placed on the agenda of the next session of the ILC. 		Further discussion SO – Yes/No	B.2–3, B.5, B.13.2.1–3	This proposal formalizes existing practice, including past practice to agree to one item 12 months prior to examining a topical or emerging issue requiring urgent attention. It also reaffirms the principle that standard-setting discussions require adequate preparation time.

Ref.	Revised proposal (from that presented to the March 2013 GB)	Process/ formalize existing practice/new	Status as at March 2013 GB	Related proposals	Comments
B.5 [was B.13]	<p><i>Agenda-setting process</i></p> <p>The agenda-setting process is as follows:</p> <p>(a) Office develops a shortlist from sources at B.6 presented in a common form;</p> <p>(b) Office informally consults groups or the Geneva-based consultative group on the shortlist prior to the applicable session of the Governing Body;</p> <p>(c) the Governing Body discusses the shortlist of proposals (refined as necessary based on the consultations);</p> <p>(d) at the next session of the Governing Body the Office submits a revised list of proposals. The Governing Body:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ■ decides the number of proposals to be placed on the agenda; and ■ agrees,² on the items to be placed on the agenda and, where possible on the recommended modalities of their discussion. 	New	Further discussion SO – No	B.2–4, B.6–11, B.13.2.1-3	The agenda-setting process should be better clarified to improve transparency and rigour. The general approach includes comprehensive informal consultations prior to formal consultation during the GB. While emphasis should be placed on reaching consensus, a fall-back option should be devised for voting. Record votes or preferential voting systems could be made available (in a similar way to voting on the election of the Director-General in 2012).
B.6 [was B.9]	<p><i>Proposed agenda items</i></p> <p>The general principle that the ILC agenda should meet constituents' needs and address topical and relevant issues relevant to the ILO's mandate should be applied.</p> <p>The Office is responsible for submitting to the Governing Body proposals for future ILC agenda items, originating from the following sources:</p> <p>(a) governments and recognized representative employers' and workers' organizations;</p> <p>(b) outcomes of recurrent/general discussions;</p>	Formalize existing practice	Tripartite support (original) SO – Yes/No	B.5, C.10	<p>This proposal should include the general principle that the ILC agenda should meet constituents' needs and address topical and relevant issues relevant to the ILO's mandate. This proposal should guide the development of new ILC agenda items.</p> <p>The Office had developed a template for agenda item proposals – this is an important initiative to better inform the GB on ILC proposals. However, in the context of B.5, any discussion of agenda items must also include a discussion on the number of items, the type of discussion and the format of discussions for the ILC. These elements could be reflected in the template to ensure the GB is able to take account of these in making its decision on agenda items.</p>

Ref.	Revised proposal (from that presented to the March 2013 GB)	Process/ formalize existing practice/new	Status as at March 2013 GB	Related proposals	Comments
	<p>(c) outcomes of ILO tripartite or other meetings (Regional Meetings, sectoral meetings, meetings of experts);</p> <p>(d) other work performed by the Office.</p>				
ILC committees					
B.7 [was B.2 and B.5]	<p><i>ILC committees</i></p> <p>The Standing Orders should provide for the following committees:</p> <p>(a) one tasked with administration of the ILC and considering ad hoc issues when required (currently the Selection Committee);</p> <p>(b) Credentials Committee;</p> <p>(c) Committee on the Application of Conventions and Recommendations;</p> <p>(d) Finance Committee;</p> <p>(e) Standing Orders Committee (if required);</p> <p>(f) Conference Drafting Committee (standard-setting committees);</p> <p>(g) other ad hoc committees (i.e. for discussion of technical items) when agreed by the Governing Body at the time the item is placed on the agenda.</p>		Requires discussion SO – Art. 4-8, Art. 17	B.2, B.5	<p>The committees could be as follows:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ■ The Resolutions Committee, as provided for in the Standing Orders, should not be reactivated but the Standing Orders should provide clear rules on where and how to handle proposed resolutions not related to the items on the agenda. ■ Recurrent discussion committee: See comments at B.11. ■ Technical committees: The GB recommends modalities of discussion for each agenda item – refer comments at B.3 and B.5.
Standard-setting committees					
B.8 [was B.6]	<p><i>Standard-setting policy</i></p> <p>The development and supervision of international labour standards is a prime function of the ILC.</p>	Process	Tripartite support (original) SO – No	B.9	Consensus on this principle.

Ref.	Revised proposal (from that presented to the March 2013 GB)	Process/ formalize existing practice/new	Status as at March 2013 GB	Related proposals	Comments
B.9	<p><i>Determining standard-setting procedures</i></p> <p>The Governing Body is responsible for determining the number and type of discussions required for standard setting on a case-by-case basis. The Governing Body should consider the following principles:</p> <p>(a) the double-discussion procedure over two consecutive sessions of the ILC should remain the norm;</p> <p>(b) the single-discussion procedure should only be used exceptionally and only when practicable;</p> <p>(c) a general or recurrent discussion could precede a standard-setting discussion to examine policy, scope and definitional issues;</p> <p>(d) a preparatory meeting could be held prior to the first discussion, including a tripartite meeting of experts or a preparatory meeting prior to the ILC, to examine technical and threshold issues.</p>	New	Further discussion SO – Yes/No	B.3–5	<p>This proposal combines the former B.6 and B.11. It reaffirms the authority of the GB to exercise greater choice in how it places standard-setting items on the agenda. It emphasizes the need for adequate preparatory work to take place before discussions at the ILC. While it essentially formalizes current practice (i.e. the primacy of double-discussions), it emphasizes the capacity of the GB to take a flexible approach to standard setting on a case-by-case basis depending on the standard(s) being drafted.</p> <p>The coordination between the standards review mechanism (SRM) and important aspects of the ILC reform is an important issue which will have to be addressed and discussed in due course.</p>
General/recurrent committees					
B.10 [was B.10]	<p><i>Technical items</i></p> <p>Recommendations as to the modalities of discussion³ of technical items should be made by the Governing Body at the time the item is placed on the ILC agenda. The main modalities for discussion of technical items are:</p> <p>(a) a technical committee; or</p> <p>(b) by the plenary.</p>	New	Further discussion SO – Yes/No	B.3–5, B.13.2.1–3	<p>While there exist different modalities for discussion of technical items, in practice items have always led to separate committees. In the context of B.13.2.2–3 (plenary period II), the GB could consider the number of technical items, the type of committee necessary and how that item will be discussed.</p>

Ref.	Revised proposal (from that presented to the March 2013 GB)	Process/ formalize existing practice/new	Status as at March 2013 GB	Related proposals	Comments
B.11 [was B.12]	<p><i>Recurrent discussions</i></p> <p>Recurrent discussions would follow a seven-year cycle, with employment, fundamental principles and rights at work and social protection discussed twice, and social dialogue once.</p> <p>The continuation of this cycle and the possible establishment of a formal recurrent discussion committee in the ILC Standing Orders will be decided by the Governing Body following a review.</p>	New	Tripartite support (original) SO – Yes/No	B.3–5	This proposal combines the former proposals B.12 and C.5 (modalities for recurrent discussions). It reinforces the key role recurrent discussions have on the ILC agenda at this time. On the suggestion that special provision be made for them in the Standing Orders, this should be considered again by the GB following a review after the first seven-year cycle (and outside of the ILC reform process). In March 2013 there was a concern regarding the relationship between recurrent discussions and agenda setting. It was however agreed that the conclusions of recurrent discussions should be taken into account by the GB when setting future ILC agendas.
ILC plenary					
B.12 [was B.14]	<p><i>Plenary structure</i></p> <p>The plenary should be divided into four broad sections:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> I. Opening sitting II. Discussion of the reports of the Director-General and Chairperson of the Governing Body or other agenda item III. World of Work Summit IV. Formal plenary (adopt reports, voting) 	Formalize existing practice	ILC plenary	B.13.1–5	Some concern about the reference to the continuous plenary session (plenary period II) in the original proposal. The modality of plenary period II is yet to be decided (see B.13.2.2–3) and so reference to “continuous” has therefore been removed from this proposal.
B.13.1 [was B.14.1]	<p><i>Plenary period I: Opening sitting</i></p> <p>The opening sitting will be a short sitting (approximately one hour) to formally open the ILC session as provided for in the ILC Standing Orders. The ILO Director-General will introduce his/her Report.</p> <p>Procedures relating to appointing members of the Selection Committee and officers of groups will be displayed on screen and in a document with proposed nominations.</p>	New	Tripartite support (original) SO – Art. 76		While the new format was trialed in 2013, some constituents have suggested it was still too long (over two hours), and there was a lot of repetition among the many speakers. Consideration could be given to having just one keynote speaker (preferably the Director-General) as there will be other opportunities for the ILC officers to address the ILC either through participation in the World of Work Summit or in plenary period II.

Ref.	Revised proposal (from that presented to the March 2013 GB)	Process/ formalize existing practice/new	Status as at March 2013 GB	Related proposals	Comments
B.13.2 [was B.14.2]	<p><i>Plenary period II</i></p> <p>The right of delegates to address the ILC will be preserved.</p> <p>Three options are presented with two of them aiming to make the plenary more interactive.</p> <p>To ensure the discussions in plenary period II (under either option) stay focused on the report to be discussed, an additional day for delegates to speak on international labour issues of their choosing could be made available.</p>	New	Tripartite support (original) Trialled in 2013		<p>The principle that delegates should have the right to address the ILC must be retained; however consideration should be given to better ways for delegates to exercise this right, including organizing the plenary session to improve interaction and focus on the reports of the Director-General and GB Chairperson.</p> <p>Delegates do not always address the topics of these reports during their interventions to the plenary. Therefore, a different means of discussion would help focus delegates' statements on these reports – as suggested in options 2 and 3.</p> <p>Nevertheless, it is important for delegates to have the opportunity to address the ILC on international labour issues of their choosing. For this reason an additional day could be scheduled for such a purpose.</p>
B.13.2.1 [was B.14.2]	<p><i>Option 1: Discussion of the Reports of the Director-General and the Chairperson of the Governing Body in plenary</i></p> <p>The Director-General's Report should address a social theme. The report of the Chairperson of the Governing Body should cover programme implementation.</p> <p>Delegates each have five minutes to address the ILC on the topics of these reports.</p> <p>Plenary period II would run in parallel with the technical committees.</p>	Formalize existing practice	Tripartite support (original) SO – Art. 12(2)	B.1, B.5, B.13.2.2–3	<p>Feedback from a number of years shows that the status quo for plenary discussions of the Reports of the Director-General and GB Chairperson is not a popular means for debate on these reports.</p> <p>While the continuous plenary sessions are for discussion of the reports of the Director-General and the GB Chairperson, delegates often do not refer to these reports in their statements.</p> <p>Options 2 and 3 below could be discussed for a potential trial in 2014. Given the importance of ensuring delegates have a right to speak on international labour issues of their choosing, the possibility of devoting one day of the plenary specifically to this could be considered.</p> <p>Other considerations:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ■ timing of plenary period II sessions; ■ appropriate room to reflect few participants.

Ref.	Revised proposal (from that presented to the March 2013 GB)	Process/ formalize existing practice/new	Status as at March 2013 GB	Related proposals	Comments
B.13.2.2 [was B.14.2]	<p><i>Option 2: Short thematic debates on issues covered by Reports of the Director-General and Governing Body Chairperson</i></p> <p>The plenary would constitute a series of interactive thematic discussions based on specific issues in the Reports of the Director-General and Governing Body Chairperson.</p> <p>Plenary period II would run in parallel with the technical committees.</p> <p>The Office would organize the thematic sessions based on delegate preferences and moderated by an ILO expert with expertise relevant to the subject of discussion.</p>	New	<p>Tripartite support (original)</p> <p>Trialled in 2013</p> <p>SO – Art. 12(2) and (3), 13(2), 14(2), (3) and (6), and 16</p>	B.13.2.1, B.13.2.3	<p>This option would ensure discussion of the reports of the Director-General and GB Chairperson is interactive. The aim of such suggestions would be to encourage a “real debate” and allow delegates to address the ILC in their own capacity. However, this option could become logistically difficult to arrange and would rely on delegates’ willingness to take part and time to become accustomed to it.</p>
B.13.2.3 [was B.14.2]	<p><i>Option 3: Three-day discussion held in plenary to address one agenda item OR discussion of the Reports of the Director-General and the Chairperson of the Governing Body</i></p> <p>This discussion would focus on a social theme that:</p> <p>(a) takes the place of a general discussion (normally considered by a separate committee) as determined by the Governing Body with a report prepared by the Office; or</p> <p>(b) provides the format for discussion of the Report of the Director-General, which could potentially address a social theme identified by the Director-General (normally considered by a separate committee).</p> <p>Key aspects of the discussion include:</p> <p>(a) three-day discussion;</p> <p>(b) delegates would speak individually (not through spokespersons);</p> <p>(c) five-minute limit for delegates (strictly enforced);</p>	New	<p>Further discussion</p> <p>SO – Yes/No</p>	B.3–5, B.13.2.1–2	<p>This proposal could meet the objective of improving the interaction and dynamism of plenary discussions and should, when coupled with another day for delegates to make statements on international labour issues of their choosing, provide delegates with adequate opportunity to exercise their right to address the ILC. Initial thoughts on the organization of the discussion:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ■ To avoid running in parallel with all technical committees (and ensure greater participation), this discussion could take the place of one of the technical committees. ■ The topic of the discussion could be selected by the Governing Body (in the place of a separate item discussed by a committee) or the Director-General as the social theme for his/her Report. ■ This would take the place of static “discussion” on the reports of the Director-General and GB Chairperson as currently occurs. ■ Enables Employers’ and Workers’ delegates to address the ILC individually, as currently occurs in the CAS, as well as opportunities to coordinate statements among delegates.

Ref.	Revised proposal (from that presented to the March 2013 GB)	Process/ formalize existing practice/new	Status as at March 2013 GB	Related proposals	Comments
	<p>(d) address report prepared by Office (see options above);</p> <p>(e) draft outcome document (i.e. resolution or conclusions) prepared prior to ILC;</p> <p>(f) drafting committee revises draft outcome document following discussion;</p> <p>(g) discussion summarized in committee-style report;</p> <p>(h) outcome document submitted to plenary period IV.</p>				<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ■ The topic could link with the theme of the World of Work Summit. ■ Given short time for debate the report could include a draft output (conclusions, resolution) to focus discussion. ■ Drafting committee could revise output on the basis of discussion and submit to plenary along with committee-style report of discussion. ■ It ensures a greater array of views among delegates. ■ It is conducive to the proposed two-week workplan.
B.13.3 [was B.14.3]	<p><i>Plenary period III: World of Work Summit</i></p> <p>The World of Work Summit will be scheduled for one day following the work of technical committees. The Director-General will select the theme in consultation with the GB Officers, with tripartite participation and appropriate representation across regions.</p>	New	Further discussion SO – Art. 12(3), 14(2) and (6), and 16	B.2, B.5, B.12	<p>The Summit is an important initiative as it would help give the ILC the appropriate profile within the international community.</p> <p>The original proposal was to have a high-level event during the ILC and for high-level speakers to be invited for this day only (and not be scheduled in parallel to committee sessions). Ministers attending the ILC for the plenary should be scheduled around high-level speakers at the World of Work Summit or the day preceding it.</p>
B.13.4 [was B.14.4]	<p><i>Plenary period IV: Formal procedures</i></p> <p>Plenary period IV will only include the adoption of all committees' reports as well as take votes as necessary.</p> <p>Time-limits for all speakers will be strictly enforced.</p>	Formalize existing practice	Tripartite support (original) Trialled in 2013 SO – No	B.1, B.12	Efficiency and good time management are critical to complete the necessary work in the shortest possible time. Time-limits, including those by committee chairpersons, vice-chairpersons and reporters should be strictly enforced.

Ref.	Revised proposal (from that presented to the March 2013 GB)	Process/ formalize existing practice/new	Status as at March 2013 GB	Related proposals	Comments
B.13.5 [was B.14.5]	<i>Voting in plenary</i> To complement the current electronic voting system, a simple technical back-up option has been developed.	New	Tripartite support (original) Trialled in 2013 SO – No	B.13.4	The solution developed, which was already operational at the 2013 ILC, consists 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 the main Conference Hall, on which the delegates submit their vote. A key consideration is the need to reach quorum. Scheduling multiple votes in the same session may prove helpful to ensure quorum (i.e. so delegates vote on multiple issues at the same time to save time and decrease likelihood of delegates not returning for further votes).
Side events and knowledge-sharing activities					
B.14 [was B.3]	<i>Side events</i> The number of formal side events should be kept to a minimum and cause minimal conflict with the ILC agenda.	Formalize existing practice	Tripartite support (original) SO – No	B.5, B.15	This proposal should focus on “formal” side events that may conflict with ILC committee work. In determining whether events are “formal” (and therefore requiring approval by the DG in consultation with GB Officers), criteria should be established.
B.15 [was B.4]	<i>Informal knowledge sharing and Office briefing sessions</i> The Office will facilitate greater opportunities for knowledge sharing and networking among delegates through the following three means: 1. <i>Office-facilitated</i> : Specific one-hour informal sessions organized by the Office during the lunch breaks of the second week will: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ■ be facilitated by an ILO expert from the Office with Q&A format; ■ be based on a different subject each day; ■ be held in a small meeting room to ensure a low cost and reflect the informal nature of the sessions. 	New	Further discussion SO – No	A.2, B.14	One of the objectives of the reform process is to ensure the ILC adequately meets its assembly function. Informal knowledge sharing is an important means to fulfil this role. There are three ways this could be achieved (described at left): 1. This is a new proposal and is aimed at making available more informal and interactive sessions to interested delegates of the three groups and across the multiple regions. This would allow a greater opportunity for knowledge sharing among delegates with varied backgrounds and experiences.

Ref.	Revised proposal (from that presented to the March 2013 GB)	Process/ formalize existing practice/new	Status as at March 2013 GB	Related proposals	Comments
	<p>2. <i>Informal information sessions:</i> Additional events, including those not facilitated by the Office, are encouraged, although as far as possible these should be confirmed prior to the ILC, spread as equally as possible across the duration of the ILC and not conflict with the ILC agenda. To assist delegates, a forward schedule of informal sessions should be presented to the delegates at the beginning of the ILC.</p> <p>3. <i>Group presentations:</i> The Office will continue to make presentations to individual groups upon request.</p>				<p>2. Given the number and diverse array of informal information sessions, notice of them should be made available earlier to allow delegates to arrange their schedules accordingly and minimize duplication, so that full use of such sessions can be made.</p> <p>3. ILO presentations to morning group meetings upon request should continue as a valuable means for direct engagement between the Office and constituents.</p>
C. Working methods of ILC committees					
Process					
C.1	<p><i>Principles for organization of ILC committees</i></p> <p>The principles of “transparency, predictability and objectivity” should be implemented in the organization and functioning of all ILC committees.</p>	Process	Tripartite support (original) SO – No	A.2, C.11	This is an important principle in the functioning of ILC committees and relates to committee workplans and the consideration of issues as they arise in full consultation between the committee chairperson and delegates.
C.2 [was C.13]	<p><i>Time management</i></p> <p>All sittings of the ILC should start on time to maximize the use of time available.</p> <p>To assist with strict enforcement of time-limits in committees and the plenary (where required), digital countdown clocks should be provided in the room.</p>	Formalize existing practice New	Tripartite support (original) SO – No	C.13, C.18	<p>There was significant progress in starting committee sessions on time at the 102nd Session (2013).</p> <p>Consideration could be given to digital countdown clocks in each room to better regulate time-limits where these are imposed, as occurs in the GB room for the CAS.</p>

Ref.	Revised proposal (from that presented to the March 2013 GB)	Process/ formalize existing practice/new	Status as at March 2013 GB	Related proposals	Comments
C.3 [was C.11]	<i>Evening sittings</i> Planned evening sittings for non-standard-setting committees should be avoided.	Formalize existing practice	Tripartite support (original) SO – No	B.1	Under the proposals for two-week sessions of the Conference it may be necessary to hold regular evening sittings for the CAS (as happens in practice) to complete its work within the required timeframe. Technical committees may also have evening sittings at the end of each phase of the discussion to meet deadlines.
C.4	<i>Voting in committees</i> The Standing Orders should be amended to reflect current practice on weighting of votes to ensure equality between the three groups. A proposal could be presented relating to a simpler mechanism for delegate registration of committees for the purposes of voting, and a process to determine quorum and who has the right to speak at the beginning of each sitting.	New	Not yet discussed SO – Yes	B.13.5, C.5, C.21–22	Proposal suggested in GB.317/WP/GBC/1, Appendix II, paras 7 and 10, respectively.
C.5	<i>Simplification of Standing Orders</i> The Standing Orders should be amended to be made simpler and more easily understood in respect of committee processes, including the amendments process, voting and the adoption of reports.	New	Not yet discussed SO – Yes		Proposal suggested in GB.317/WP/GBC/1, Appendix II.
C.6	<i>Language of committees</i> The recognized languages of the ILC are English, French and Spanish. The place of Spanish should be better incorporated into the Standing Orders.	New	Not yet discussed SO – Art. 58	C.5	Proposal suggested in GB.317/WP/GBC/1, Appendix II, para. 13.
C.7	<i>Motions, resolutions and amendments</i> The Standing Orders should be amended to better reflect the different nature of the three issues to reflect best practices and past legal opinions.	New	Not yet discussed SO – Art. 63	C.5	Proposal suggested in GB.317/WP/GBC/1, Appendix II, para. 15.

Ref.	Revised proposal (from that presented to the March 2013 GB)	Process/ formalize existing practice/new	Status as at March 2013 GB	Related proposals	Comments
Committee on the Application of Conventions and Recommendations					
C.8 [was C.3]	<i>Working methods of the CAS</i> The process to improve the working methods of the Committee on the Application of Conventions and Recommendations (CAS) should remain separate from the process to reform the ILC until such a time that they can be incorporated into one another.	New	Further discussion (original) SO – No		The Working Party on the CAS could take into account the proposals for shorter ILC sessions and how the work of the CAS could be undertaken within this timeframe. As indicated above (see footnote 4), the feasibility of a shorter duration will hinge first and foremost on agreement on modalities for adoption of the list of cases at the beginning of the work of the CAS. This crucial issue is part of the package of the CAS follow-up.
General/recurrent discussions					
C.9	<i>Reports prepared for general/recurrent discussions</i> The ILC reports should be drafted to facilitate a constructive discussion. Key aspects of the reports include: (a) provide adequate background and context; (b) describe current situation and key trends and challenges; (c) describe and evaluate key areas of ILO action, including standard-setting, technical assistance, research and coherence/ coordination; (d) identify key areas for further action; (e) have discussion questions that relate directly to specific chapters; (f) include an appendix with best practice examples; (g) consider including (on a case-by-case basis) draft outputs, including draft plans of action or conclusions to better direct discussions.	New	Not yet discussed SO – Yes/No	C.10–13, C.23	The role of the reports should be to facilitate a constructive discussion by ILC constituents that leads to concise and targeted conclusions covering all means of action by the ILO and constituents. For this reason the chapters should be focused and discussion questions should be directly linked to each chapter. A specific chapter should deal with each relevant area related to the agenda item (i.e. trends and challenges, technical assistance, standards-related action, multilateral cooperation).

Ref.	Revised proposal (from that presented to the March 2013 GB)	Process/ formalize existing practice/new	Status as at March 2013 GB	Related proposals	Comments
	In the conduct of the recurrent discussion the Office and delegates should adhere to the requirements set out in the 2008 ILO Declaration on Social Justice for a Fair Globalization, namely the assessment of ILO action and priorities required over the next four years. ⁴				
C.10 [was C.4]	<i>Outputs for general/recurrent discussions</i> ⁵ The primary focus of general/recurrent discussions would be on producing a concise and focused output that: (a) focuses on the ILO's core mandate and areas of expertise; (b) identifies policy priorities that result in concrete action; (c) is user-friendly and clearly outlines conclusions and future action by the Office and constituents; and (d) identifies follow-up mechanism(s) for implementation.	New	Further discussion (original) SO – Yes/No	C.9, C.11–13	The goal of the output should be to: ■ communicate a shared vision; and ■ clearly identify roles and priorities for action of the ILO, governments and workers' and employers' organizations. Conclusions should be as short and targeted as possible.
C.11 [was C.6]	<i>Workplans of general discussion committees</i> General/recurrent discussion committee workplans should be realistic and have a greater emphasis on arriving at conclusions more rapidly.	New	Further discussion (original) SO – No	B.1, C.1–2, C.12	The workplans and timeframes for technical committees must be agreed in advance and adhered to. The workplans of committees will need to be carefully considered in the context of the two-week workplan. All efficiency measures included in the reform process and means to improve general/recurrent discussions should ensure more time in committees is used for constructive debate on the discussion points.

Ref.	Revised proposal (from that presented to the March 2013 GB)	Process/ formalize existing practice/new	Status as at March 2013 GB	Related proposals	Comments
C.12	<p><i>Overview of work process</i></p> <p>The process of general/recurrent discussions includes the following steps:</p> <p>(a) conduct discussion based on report prepared by the Office;</p> <p>(b) hold discussion based on “points for discussion”;</p> <p>(c) establish a drafting group to prepare draft output (i.e. “draft conclusions” based on a first draft prepared by the Office);</p> <p>(d) drafting group discusses and amends draft conclusions;</p> <p>(e) agree to final conclusions based on an amendments process;</p> <p>(f) adopt its report and conclusions with an introductory resolution.</p>	Formalize existing practice	Not yet discussed SO – Yes/No	B.1, B.13.2.1–3, C.9–11, C.13	<p>The current process (as described in GB.317/WP/GBC/1, Appendix II, page 32) continues to be a useful means to discuss issues important to the world of work in a tripartite setting. The process described here is the current one. However, note that:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ■ B.13.2.3 describes an alternative option to hold a general discussion other than in committee; ■ C.13 describes an alternative to how the general discussion is organized; ■ better structured and quality reports should improve the overall quality, relevance and constructiveness of the general discussion and resulting output (C.9–C.10).
C.13	<p><i>Organization of discussion</i></p> <p>To improve the dynamism of general/recurrent discussions, proceedings could follow the following format for interventions for each discussion question:</p> <p>(a) Employer and Worker Vice-Chairpersons open discussion with (maximum) five-minute interventions;</p> <p>(b) Governments make five-minute interventions;</p> <p>(c) Employer and Worker Vice-Chairpersons have the option of each making two further three-minute interventions during Government interventions;</p> <p>(d) Employer and Worker Vice-Chairpersons each make concluding five-minute interventions to sum up their positions;</p>	New	Not yet discussed SO – Yes/No	C.1–2, C.9–12, C.18, C.23	While constituents are considering means to improve interaction and dynamism in the plenary, there is also merit in considering alternate options for improving the dynamism of general/recurrent discussions, while maintaining the current format and practice of formal statements by constituents.

Ref.	Revised proposal (from that presented to the March 2013 GB)	Process/ formalize existing practice/new	Status as at March 2013 GB	Related proposals	Comments
	(e) in the time remaining, Governments make further three-minute interventions in response to the arguments of Employer and Worker Vice-Chairpersons and elaborate on the points they raised.				
Standard-setting committees					
C.14	<p><i>Overview of work process</i></p> <p>The process of standard-setting discussions includes the following steps:</p> <p>(a) discussion is based on a report prepared by the Office and draft instruments proposed by the Office following consultation with Members;</p> <p>(b) amendments to the text proposed are deposited;</p> <p>(c) all amendments submitted are examined and decisions taken on them (adopted, adopted as amended, rejected);</p> <p>(d) the draft instrument is established;</p> <p>(e) the committee drafting committee reviews the text ensuring linguistic coherence and legal clarity;</p> <p>(f) committee adopts its report and the draft instrument(s) and any related resolution(s).</p>	Formalize existing practice	Not yet discussed SO – Yes	B.9, C.20	The current process (as described in GB.317/WP/GBC/1, Appendix II, page 32) is likely to be the most effective mechanism to draft ILO instruments by a tripartite committee. However, efficiency gains may be found in the amendment submission process, good chairing and good time management. Preparatory work, including general discussions or preparatory meetings held prior to a standard-setting discussion, could also serve to improve the functioning of standard-setting committees by addressing threshold issues beforehand. This would allow the committee to discuss and agree on the text of the instrument(s) with these issues previously already agreed and therefore enable quicker drafting.
Committee drafting groups (general/recurrent discussions)					
C.15 [was C.7]	<p><i>Membership of drafting group</i></p> <p>Standard membership on drafting groups should be eight Government representatives, eight Worker representatives and eight Employer representatives (8–8–8).</p>	New	Further discussion SO – Yes/No	C.16–17	All three committees at the 102nd (2013) Session agreed to an 8–8–8 composition formula for drafting groups. The important factor is that the number of group representatives is a multiple of four to allow for equal regional representation. If specific provisions on drafting groups are inserted in the Standing Orders (see C.16), they could provide for an 8–8–8 composition with flexibility for the chairperson (in consultation with the committee) to decide otherwise.

Ref.	Revised proposal (from that presented to the March 2013 GB)	Process/ formalize existing practice/new	Status as at March 2013 GB	Related proposals	Comments
C.16	<i>Rules for establishment of drafting groups</i> The Standing Orders could be amended to provide simple guidance on how to establish a drafting group or subcommittee of ILC committees (including composition, selection, chairing, etc).	New	Not yet discussed SO – Art. 59	C.15, C.17	Proposal suggested in GB.317/WP/GBC/1, Appendix II, para. 14.
C.17 [was C.8]	<i>Drafting group</i> The drafting group could commence its work at an earlier stage of the committee's discussions in order to reduce the amount of time needed at the end of the discussions.	New	Further discussion SO – No	C.9–C.13	The premise of this proposal was to reduce the amount of time required by the drafting group at the conclusion of the general discussion. Should a number of proposals be implemented (see C.9–C.13, for example shorter conclusions based on a more focused discussion), the drafting group should only require one day to complete its work. In this context the drafting group would not need to sit during the discussion but for just one day at its conclusion.
Committee chairpersons					
C.18 [was C.9]	<i>Committee chairpersons</i> Chairpersons should be selected early and have a high degree of familiarity with the ILO, ILC committees and the committee topic. They should be appropriately briefed with effective support from the Office.	New	Tripartite support (original) Trialled in 2013 SO – No		The Government group will be requested to take this issue into account in its nomination of chairpersons for committees.

Ref.	Revised proposal (from that presented to the March 2013 GB)	Process/ formalize existing practice/new	Status as at March 2013 GB	Related proposals	Comments
Technology					
C.19 [was C.10]	<i>Use of screens in all committees</i> Screens could be provided in all committee rooms whenever amendments are discussed.	New	Further discussion SO – No	B.1	The human (full team of translators and SAMM operators) and technical implications of the SAMM system might be considered as disproportionate compared with potential efficiency gains. However, a move to a shorter ILC would mean less time to discuss amendments, and could mean that the efficiency gains of the SAMM system, despite the costs, would be required. In relation to the length of text, drafting committees use the SAMM system and discuss the sentence in question in three languages on a single screen. This could be replicated for committees, or alternatively have three screens – with one language on each screen. It is important that all delegates proficient in English, French or Spanish can equally participate in the amendment process and that one language is not favoured over another.
C.20	<i>Secure website for delegates during ILC</i> The Office could create a secure website specifically for ILC participants which allows for the distribution of reports, draft reports, forms for amendments, <i>Provisional Record</i> , daily bulletin and any other documents or processes usually made available in hard copy. ILC participants will be allowed to pass on their details for login to the secure website to the persons supporting them.	New	Further discussion SO – No	B.1, C.24	One function of the website could be for an email alert system for new documents and reports so that the release of reports is not missed by delegates. Lessons learnt from the Oslo European Regional Meeting (2013) should be incorporated into the ILC reform process where possible.
ILC delegations					
C.21 [was C.12]	<i>ILC delegates and participants</i> National delegations should have an appropriate balance between Government, Workers' and Employers' delegates and their advisers to ensure effective participation in the Conference.	New	Further discussion SO – Yes/No	B.1, B.3	Members have expressed a variety of views on the need for the size of delegations to be sufficient to cover all Conference activities.

Ref.	Revised proposal (from that presented to the March 2013 GB)	Process/ formalize existing practice/new	Status as at March 2013 GB	Related proposals	Comments
C.22	<i>Right to participate in committee work</i> Persons accredited as "other persons attending the Conference" by a Member cannot replace that Member's delegates and advisers. Their status could be clarified accordingly.	New	Not yet discussed SO – Yes/No		Proposal suggested in GB.317/WP/GBC/1, Appendix II paras 11–12.
Orientation services for delegates					
C.23 [was C.14]	<i>Online training modules for delegates</i> Existing online training modules for delegates should be further developed and promoted. This should include a training module on best practices for interventions. Geneva-based orientation services could also be provided prior to ILC sessions.	New	Tripartite support (original) SO – No	C.12–13	The Office will consider expanding its online training modules and encourage their promotion prior to the ILC. Consideration could also be given to holding on-site (Geneva-based) orientation sessions for new delegates at the beginning of ILC sessions to better orientate themselves with the UN <i>Palais</i> and committee rooms.
Printing					
C.24 [was C.15]	<i>ILC reports</i> The ILC should see an overall reduction in printed/hard copy publications. Only the necessary number of hard copy reports will be sent to individual Members prior to ILC sessions based on their needs. The Office will survey Members in late 2013 on their needs for hard copy reports in 2014. Regular surveys will be undertaken to ensure that data is up to date.	New	Further discussion SO – No		The Office could survey Members in late 2013 on the number of hard copy reports they require. This would update previous data held by the Office. Regular surveys could be sent on an annual basis to ensure data is up to date. Online surveys should be a quick and easy method to gather this data. All reports are available on the Internet earlier than when hard copies are received by Members and it would appear many delegations work from these rather than waiting for the delivery of hard copies.

Ref.	Revised proposal (from that presented to the March 2013 GB)	Process/ formalize existing practice/new	Status as at March 2013 GB	Related proposals	Comments
	<i>Provisional Record</i>				
C.25 [was C.16]	<p><i>Deferral of Provisional Record</i></p> <p>Translation and production of the <i>Provisional Record</i> on statements made in plenary period II by the delegates would be deferred until after ILC sessions, with the delegates having a period of one week to send amendments. Final <i>Record of Proceedings</i> to be produced by September.</p> <p>At the ILC session each speech in the plenary on the Director-General's Report would be posted on the ILO's website as soon as it has been delivered in the form of:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ■ audio recording of the original language; ■ audio recordings of the interpretation in English, French and Spanish; and ■ electronic copy of the speech as handed in to the secretariat with the annotation "Check against delivery". <p>In cases where a delegate needs to exercise the right of 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>	New	Agreed for trial in 2013 SO – Art. 23(1) and (3)	B.13.2.1	This was successfully trialled in 2013 with no complaints from delegates.
<p>¹ This was specifically noted by the Director-General in his Report to the 102nd Session (2013) (para. 86). ² Allowance should be made for some flexibility as in certain cases the GB needs more time to reach a consensus on the modalities of discussion of the agreed items. ³ See footnote 11 about the need for flexibility in the sequence of the GB decisions. ⁴ With the exception of social dialogue which will only be discussed once during the seven-year cycle. ⁵ As indicated above (see p. 11), further discussions will be required to establish specific modalities for recurrent discussions to support their objectives, focusing on their strategic purpose, thus drawing a clear distinction between recurrent discussions and general discussions.</p>					

Appendix

Outlines of possible plans of work for the technical committees in the framework of a two-week session of the Conference

Standard-setting committees

First discussion

- Opening: Monday afternoon, first week.
- Four–five receipts of amendments (2.30–3.30 p.m.), starting on Tuesday, first week.
- 14–15 plenary meetings (including one or two evening sittings during the first week).
- End of the discussion in the committee: Tuesday afternoon, second week.
- Committee drafting committee would meet on Wednesday, second week. Depending on the progress made, a first meeting of the committee drafting committee could also be scheduled on Saturday afternoon, first week. Should the committee decide to have a permanent committee drafting committee (on the model of what was done in 2005), then the Wednesday could then be used by the committee, for two additional plenary sittings.
- The draft report of the committee would be posted on the Web on Thursday, second week.
- The adoption of the draft report and conclusions by the Plenary of the Conference would take place on the last Friday.

It is worth noting that the possibility to submit corrections to the report would remain and that the President would refer to these possible corrections by identifying the paragraphs concerned at the moment of submitting the report to the plenary for final adoption (on the model of what was previously done at the Governing Body before the reform).

Second discussion

- Opening: Monday afternoon, first week.
- Four–five receipts of amendments (2.30–3.30 p.m.), starting on Tuesday, first week.
- 14–15 plenary meetings (including one or two evening sittings during the first week).
- End of the discussion in the committee: Monday afternoon, second week.
- Committee drafting committee would meet on Tuesday, second week. Depending on the progress made, a first meeting of the committee drafting committee could also be scheduled on Saturday afternoon, first week. Should the committee decide to have a permanent committee drafting committee (on the model of what was done in 2005), the Tuesday could then be used by the committee, for two additional plenary sittings.
- The draft report of the committee would be posted on the Web on Wednesday, second week.
- The adoption of the draft report and draft instrument by the Plenary of the Conference would take place on Thursday morning, last week.

- The conference drafting committee would meet immediately after the adoption by the plenary on Thursday, last week.
- The vote on the instrument would take place on Friday morning, last week.

It is worth noting that the possibility to submit corrections to the report would remain and that the President would refer to these possible corrections by identifying the paragraphs concerned at the moment of submitting the report to the plenary for final adoption (on the model of what was previously done at the Governing Body before the reform)

Recurrent discussion committees

- Opening: Monday afternoon, first week.
- Four–five plenary sittings on Tuesday and Wednesday first week: general discussion on four–five points.
- Distribution of tentative conclusions on Thursday, first week, beginning of the afternoon.
- Drafting group: two–three meetings on Friday, first week.
- Distribution of the draft conclusions: Saturday, first week, at 10.30 a.m.
- Group meetings on Saturday, first week, from 11 a.m. to 1 p.m.
- Receipt of amendments: Saturday afternoon, first week from 3 to 5 p.m.
- First part of the draft report (corresponding to the general discussion) posted on the Web on Sunday afternoon. Possible corrections to this first part could be received in plenary, and the first part of the report could be adopted in plenary on Monday afternoon, second week.
- Examination of the amendments to the draft conclusions in plenary: Monday – Tuesday, second week (four–five sittings).
- Draft report (first part with the corrections and second part corresponding to the discussion of the amendments) posted on the Web: Wednesday evening, second week.
- Adoption of the draft report and draft conclusions by the Plenary of the Conference: Thursday afternoon, second week.

It is worth noting that the possibility to submit corrections to the second part of the report would remain and that the President would refer to these possible corrections by identifying the paragraphs concerned at the moment of submitting the report to the plenary for final adoption (on the model of what was previously done at the Governing Body before the reform).

General discussion committees

- Opening: Monday afternoon, first week.
- Four plenary sittings on Tuesday and Wednesday first week: general discussion on four points.
- Distribution of tentative conclusions on Thursday, first week, beginning of the afternoon.
- Drafting group: two–three meetings on Friday, first week.
- Distribution of the draft conclusions: Saturday, first week, at 10.30 a.m.
- Group meetings on Saturday, first week, from 11 a.m. to 1 p.m.

- Receipt of amendments: Saturday afternoon, first week from 3 to 5 p.m.
- First part of the draft report (corresponding to the general discussion) posted on the Web on Sunday afternoon. Possible corrections to this first part could be received in plenary, and the first part of the report could be adopted in plenary on Monday afternoon, second week.
- Examination of the amendments to the draft conclusions in plenary: Monday – Tuesday, second week (four–five sittings).
- Draft report (first part with the corrections and second part corresponding to the discussion of the amendments) posted on the Web: Wednesday evening, second week.
- Adoption of the draft report and draft conclusions by the Plenary of the Conference: Thursday afternoon, second week.

It is worth noting that the possibility to submit corrections to the second part of the report would remain and that the President would refer to these possible corrections by identifying the paragraphs concerned at the moment of submitting the report to the plenary for final adoption (on the model of what was previously done at the Governing Body before the reform).

Committee on the Application of Standards (CAS)

Pending the outcome of the CAS follow-up and the consultation of the tripartite working group of the CAS, the Office is examining the options so as to ensure that the CAS can fulfil its mandate in accordance with its working methods, taking into account the shorter duration proposed for the session of the Conference.